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THE FACILITATOR: Good evening, everyone. We'll be giving it about five minutes; we have a few folks still signing in. I understand that the I-10 and Baseline crash that was there earlier is cleared up, so if anybody was going to be in that, they'll just be making it. So thank you.

Good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Loop 202 South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team Meeting. I'd like to welcome you all to this evening's meeting. For those of you who are new to this event, the folks sitting around this table here represent organizations throughout the study area. And this is their official meeting.

Do we have a motion to call the meeting to order?

CAT MEMBER: Move to open.

THE FACILITATOR: Moved.

CAT MEMBER: Second.

THE FACILITATOR: Second, thank you. All in favor.

CAT MEMBERS: Aye.

THE FACILITATOR: It appears, if my math is correct, that we have a quorum, so we are an
official meeting. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to review the EIS, have an open discussion on the draft, to have a recommendation process outline for our agreement, and to take questions from the public and adjourn.

Those of you who have -- Fred, if you take me to the agenda -- this is the process we will follow tonight. We'll try to stick to this time line. We have a 6:00 to 8:00 time frame, hopefully we can accomplish our business in that time.

For those of you who are -- CAT Members, as always, at your desk is a packet of information at your desk that we provided for you, as well as the meeting forms that we ask you to complete at the end. Members of the public, there are blue cards at the table back there, and should you want to ask questions at the appropriate time under "questions from the public" on the agenda, please fill out the cards and bring them to me or raise your hand and throughout the evening I'll come pick them up. And at the appropriate time to address these questions, I'll read your question and we'll do our best to answer your question for you, as time allows. If a question doesn't get answered during the evening, we normally get those responded to within, what time
MR. SPARGO: We'll go through it.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Ben's going to go through that process.

The folks along the wall here represent the study team, they represent ADOT, and they represent the Federal Highway Administration. These are the folks that have been working on this project for some time, and as you can see, every chair is taken, so thank you for joining us tonight. Ben Spargo is sitting right up here and he will lead the discussion in a few minutes, and the process we'll go through is as you have questions, Ben will either answer the question or direct the question to one or more of the folks sitting along the wall to try to get your questions answered all on the same page.

Okay, let's begin. As is our common practice, we have a review of the operating agreement and our statement of purpose, the purpose of this South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team is one purpose really to study the process and to provide a recommendation of build or no-build at the conclusion. We are at a stage with this particular team that following this meeting their organizations will be providing that recommendation of build or
no-build, so we have come to the end of the process.

This activity is a voluntary team; it's not a decision-making body, and it has a single purpose of providing that recommendation of build or no-build. We have established an operating agreement over time among the members here to have a quorum, to follow the process, treat each other with respect and dignity throughout the process, and to your credit we've been able to do that for the last many months.

So since this will probably be our last meeting, let's try to hold onto that concept just one more time and we'll be just fine.

Okay. Go ahead, Fred. Back up.

One more time, throughout the evening we'll be working on the time schedule for the agenda.

Fred will keep time for us. If we start to exceed any of the time frames, we'll ask your will to determine whether we continue on with that discussion in that area or move on to the next item and parking lot that item. We'll enforce the standards of behavior, and as always, go through the discuss, debate, and recommend process. We welcome the visitors and encourage you to ask questions through the blue card format I was talking about earlier. We will track any parking lot issues, and my guess is
given what we want to accomplish tonight and get out of here at 8:00 or so, we probably won't take a break. Can you handle two straight hours? Okay. If it turns out we need to, let us know and we'll give it a shot. Let's go through that again. I mentioned the session feedback forms. Go ahead.

And at this point I'd like to introduce Ben Spargo and Scott Stapp from HDR Engineering and they're going to walk us through the draft EIS review.

Ben.

MR. SPARGO: Thanks, Tom.

As Tom said, my name is Ben Spargo. I'm the roadway and project lead for HDR Engineering. Scott Stapp, who is the environmental lead, will be assisting me during the presentation to go through some of the environmental aspects. What we're -- what we've done with the agenda tonight is sort of broken it up into two steps. The first step is going to be more of a general overview of the draft EIS, providing sort of information on what's in there, for those of you that haven't really dug into it. We also asked Tom and Fred to send out an e-mail prior to this meeting, and solicited questions from the CAT. We did get 25 questions from the members, and
throughout the overview we will touch on some of the responses and questions that we received. What you have in front of you should be the PowerPoint presentation that we'll go through, as well as a 11 x 17 that lists the detailed responses for those questions that we had received.

As we go through the PowerPoint, you will see references to the questions, so you can follow along and review any of those that you want. When we get -- so the detailed answers to the questions are in the handout; the presentation is more of an overview of that. We do want to point out that all the answers in the PowerPoint and any that are provided verbally during the second part of the evening should be considered draft in their nature.

We do want to, you know, sort of leave the opening, just because of the process that we're in, this 90-day comment period that the real final responses are not -- are not final until they're presented in the final EIS, that way that they have been properly view by all of the agencies as well as FHW's legal department.

Also -- also, sort of a special case for this group is that we will be incorporating all of these questions into the Final EIS, so they -- so
they will be considered just the same as any comments that would have been given at the public hearing or any of the public forums or online through some of the other areas, so in the Final EIS there will be a designation or commenter that is generally a South Mountain CAT member, and that's where you can find sort of the final comments and responses.

So the following slides that I'm going to go through are a representation of the information in the Draft EIS. It's not a complete story. Really, to get that, you have to dive into the document. We did provide a number of documents spread along the tables for you to use. If we do get into some of the Q&A at the end, and we want to reference different areas of the document, we want to provide those so you can see where that information is in the Draft EIS itself.

As I mentioned, the second part of the evening where we have allotted another 40 minutes will be more of a general open-discussion Q&A, where we'll take questions from the CAT team, and we will use the study team and myself to try to answer those as best we can. A lot of the topics that we cover in the presentation in the slides are going to be geared towards what we heard from the CAT Members
themselves. They really touched on some of the key things that we've heard throughout this process. And for you and also for the public, also just want to note that all this information, as well as all the PDFs of the Draft EIS, the online public hearing, you know, everything associated with this project is available online at the Azdot.gov/southmountainfreeway. It's a great resource for the history of the CAT meetings themselves, as well as all the new information that's been put out during the 90-day period for the Draft EIS.

With that, we'll jump right in to Chapter 1, which is the purpose and need. An early step is really for the study team to determine if there's a need, and in the comparison that's made in the purpose and need is based on existing and future conditions without any major investment in the study area. The future conditions do, though, consider all the other planned elements from city plans to MAG's regional transportation plans, so it includes widening of other facilities, other new freeways in the region, as well as all the transit, light rail expansion, so that's considered in our base condition for future conditions that we look at.
By looking at that condition, if the owner, ADOT/FHWA, determined that there is a deficiency in the area that we're looking at, then they would go to the second step, which is presented in Chapter 3, which is the alternatives evaluation. But the purpose and need really just makes the case for the need for a major transportation facility in the study area.

The purpose, as identified for the South Mountain Freeway, is based on socioeconomic factors, the amount of population, employment, jobs growth that is projected in the southwest area of the Phoenix metropolitan area, the purpose and need is really developed based on using FHWA guidance. In the purpose and need we don't get into, you know, what or how we're going to solve that problem.

One of the questions in the -- from the CAT Members dealt with, you know, the whole idea of this being a bypass and when and where that was, you know, determined as the purpose and need. The purpose and need in the Draft EIS is really geared towards defining the problem, not really getting into the solutions.

Now, when we do get into Chapter 3 and the solutions, we do identify that one of the
benefits of what is being recommended would be that it would provide, you know, additional east/west mobility and serve as an alternate route to I-10.

Something that was noted by a CAT Member as far as the information that's presented in the purpose and need is that the data does look at, at least on the socioeconomic side, conditions from 2005 to 2035. And the comment dealt with, you know, how do we take into account what's occurred, you know, since 2005. And, basically, the complete data set that we used from 2005 is the most recent data available.

MAG is in the process right now and I believe that regional council is set to adopt new traffic and socio and economic projections coming up at their June meeting, and this new information will be used in the Final EIS to update the socioeconomic information that's presented in the document.

Now, as possible, in Chapter 4 in the environmental section, we did use 2010 census information for items such as social conditions and environmental justice, so where we needed the information, we did use the more updated population and information. Now, the traffic information that's presented in Chapter 1 and Chapter 3 is based on information obtained from the MAG Regional...
Transportation demand model. This model is state of the art, you know, it's one of the best models in the nation, and it's basically used for all transportation planning in Maricopa County and even into parts of Pinal County.

So all the cities in the region, as well as ADOT, use this model to make their transportation and infrastructure investments and plans for the future. And this makes things very consistent so that everybody is using the same information. Also, it does provide information related to all modes, and does capture -- MAG does a number of studies throughout the year and continuously looking at different impacts, you know, from the trucking industry, how to take into account airport traffic, external traffic for people that are commuting in from areas outside of the Phoenix metropolitan area. They do studies to account for all of that information and continually update their model.

Now, something to note with the 2035 conditions is that they do include, you know, as I mentioned, all of the other RTP facilities, so keep that in mind when we're talking about the future conditions with or without the South Mountain Freeway, but within the purpose and need section, all
of those other improvements and investments into transit and HOV lanes and other freeways and arterial improvements, those are all included in the modeling.

Chapter 2 of the document covers Gila River Indian Community coordination; it outlines sort of all the meetings that have taken place throughout the history of the project, really the conclusion to that chapter, you know, is that, based on where we're at today, with the community coordination and the actions taken by the community and their members, that ADOT and FHWA have determined that an alternative alignment on community land is not feasible. That's really where we're at today in the process.

Chapter 3 -- after Chapter 1, you know, we determined and put forth the reasons for a purpose and need, and Chapter 3 kicks off the look at alternatives development and screening, wherein in the graphic here it's sort of shaped like a funnel where we start with all the alternatives possible, looking at different modes, selecting the mode that best meets that need, and then going into and identify alternatives and refining those alternatives into the identification of a preferred alternative, in this case the W-59 and E-1 alternatives.
Now, there was -- there is a lot of discussion in the Draft EIS, you know, about non-freeway, other modes in addition to freeways. And the conclusion with regard to these is that alone, and that's really the keyword here, is that alone these alternatives would not be effective in meeting the travel demand that's projected for the study area.

Now, it doesn't mean that we're not going to continue to support those; the regional transportation plan, you know, has a lot of money invested in the other modes, and this freeway would be part of that plan and would support them even further, providing HOV lanes and an HOV direct connection in the West Valley; it would further support more commuter-type transit uses for the region.

Another question we had was in regard to alternatives in the eastern section. So what this map shows is all of the alternatives that were considered early in the process that would connect -- either connect to the San Tan Freeway, similar to at I-10, or that actually would stay north of the mountain and avoid the mountain. And again, the primary reason that these were eliminated, and this
is all presented in the Draft EIS, is that they would have significant community impact and a lot of the alternatives that extend U.S. 60 would go through very dense residential and commercial areas, impact thousands of homes and a number of businesses, and then within the Ahwatukee area, really, the E-1 alternative represented the alternative that had the least amount of community impacts, when compared to the other ones that were looked at.

And again, it does summarize the fact that, you know, at this time, there isn't, you know, an alternative that avoids, you know, the mountain in that area, because any of those alternatives to the south would be on community land and the community hasn't granted permission to study those alternatives. Another topic that I know we've touched on a number of times at these meetings that was also commented on, so we'll sort of go to it, and that is depressing the freeway. And, primarily, the comment is why can't we depress the freeway through the Pecos Road section? Which would be great if we could, some of the aspects that we've identified throughout the history and presented to this group is that the topography of the area and having the mountain just to the north and all of the water
flowing from the north/south across the freeway and onto the Gila River Indian Community, you know, made it very difficult to do a depressed freeway just based on the fact that you're more or less, you know, digging a large ditch that all the water wants to get into. So how do we -- how do we mitigate that and keep the freeway safe from flooding?

And what that would require is a number of pump stations, very large drainage basins north of the freeway to collect that water and pump it under the freeway and across. And, in turn, that would turn into more residential impacts, more right-of-way acquisition, greater cost to acquire that right-of-way, continually run the pump stations, and what's summarized here is some of those impacts and a comparison between the at-grade rolling profile in the Draft EIS versus the depressed profile. About 150 additional acres of land, 150 to 300 additional homes, and almost $470 million of additional costs. That's mainly the reason all those factors combined by ADOT and FHWA has decided to move forward with an at-grade rolling profile through this area.

Another item is the discussion of a no-action alternative. By identifying the W-59 and E-1 alternatives as the preferred alternative, you
know, ADOT and FHWA have eliminated the no-action alternative as from the -- from their -- it's not their preferred alternative. And some of the reasons why is based on just the additional transportation impacts, what's identified in the little graphic talks about added travel time. A lot of that discussion is in the economic section where we looked at delays with and without the freeway, and then also identified travelers like a dollar figure for your time stuck in traffic if the freeway's not there and then quantify that based on an annual basis.

Also, in Chapter 3, it discusses just the overall traffic distribution in the study area and surrounding areas, and shows that with the freeway, almost 300,000 vehicles per day would be removed from the arterial system, which would mean that the cities and local jurisdictions would have to invest much less, you know, in their systems. It would relieve a lot of the local traffic that's just trying to go from their home to the shopping or to schools, because all of that regional traffic would be on the freeway instead of on Baseline Road, Broadway Road, and some of the other arterials.

And then in the energy section of Chapter 4 it also discusses energy use with and without the
freeway. And again, the freeway provides less delay, greater speeds, which in turn results in less energy use from a fuel consumption standpoint.

The right-of-way for the freeway is generally in the neighborhood of 500 feet wide. We'd be constructing three general purpose lanes and an HOV lane in each direction for a total of eight lanes, and all of that would be constructed at one time. The right-of-way width is fairly similar to other loop freeways in the valley, as well as I-10. Most freeways are in the 350 to 500 feet wide, you know, it varies depending on the drainage channel width and other topography features that you're running into.

Chapter 3 goes into a lot of detail about the traffic, you know, on the freeway itself, provides information on, you know, the comparison between or among the action alternatives, as well as on regional arterial and freeway facilities with any of the action alternatives or the no-action in place, and mainly, all of the action alternatives provide similar operational benefits when compared to the no-action alternative.

And the projected volumes on the freeway itself would be very similar to what's experienced
today on other segments of Loop 101 and Loop 202 and the other regional freeways.

    All right. So, I do want to touch on Canamex. And the last thing I want to touch on is Canamex and trucking, in general. It's a comment that we hear a lot is that, you know, this is going to be part of Canamex, it's just going to serve trucks, and I really just want to go through some of the information that we present in the Draft EIS in contradiction to those statements.

    The first statement or at the top does show the definition of Canamex. This is based on the congressional definition from 1995, which is fairly broad in identifying, you know, I-10 or I-19 from Nogales to Tucson, I-10 from Tucson to Phoenix, and U.S. 93 in the vicinity of Phoenix to Las Vegas or to the Nevada border. And the definition is fairly broad, and that gives -- gave the local and state and regional agencies an opportunity to further define that within their region.

    And the map shows what MAG and ADOT or MAG adopted in partnership with ADOT to define the Canamex corridor in Maricopa County. And how they defined it that it would come up I-10 from Tucson and go on to I-8 west in the area of Gila Bend, where it
would connect to State Route 85 and continue north to I-10. And then at I-10, go further west to Wickenburg Road, Vulture Mine Road, up to Wickenburg, where it would potentially use the Wickenburg bypass, which is under study or in different areas of development, and continue along U.S. 93 up to the Nevada border.

Now, another point is that map 21, in July of this past year, also adopted the Interstate 11 corridor, which would provide a further bypass of the Phoenix metropolitan area, and would be incorporated into the Canamex corridor at that time. So all of this is just trying to support that really the purpose of the Canamex corridor is to bypass the Phoenix metropolitan area completely, and this is the adopted route, as adopted by MAG in coordination with ADOT as of April of 2001.

Now, further, with regard to other trucks, the designated and signed bypass for the Phoenix metropolitan area, there are signs at both ends of this corridor, it is SR 85 and Interstate 8, similar to the Canamex Road.

Now, we do understand that like other freeways in the region, trucks are going to use the South Mountain Freeway, as a normal business avenue.
And we project, based on the travel demand model and the information, that there would be about 10 percent of the total traffic on the freeway would be heavy vehicles.

Now, I should note that in order to come into and use the South Mountain Freeway, that would require trucks to enter the metropolitan area and come into some, you know, heavily congested, you know, areas. So trucks that are really through trucks, not doing business, you know, in the Phoenix metropolitan area, they would typically use that I-8 and SR 85 bypass of the area, because, although the South Mountain Freeway provides an alternate route to I-10 through downtown Phoenix, it still requires you to travel along a lot of congested freeways within the metropolitan area, areas that are going to continue to receive increased traffic from all of the new people, houses, and jobs that are coming to the area.

All right. With that, I am going to hand it over to Scott to go through Chapter 4 and Chapter 5.

MR. STAPP: Thanks, Ben. Anyway, Chapter 4 is -- discusses the affected environment. And what we're talking about there are the potential impacts
on the social, economic, and environmental setting that would be caused by either the action alternative or the no-action alternative, the no-build alternative. It also presents mitigation or actions taken that would reduce, minimize impacts to those resources as we go through, during construction, operation or maintenance of the facility.

And one kind of caution that I want to throw out is that Chapter 4 should really be reviewed in its entirety, because what's happening, I noticed this a lot during the public hearing and talking to people, for example, they focused on a particular issue, they focused on biology, they focused on Hazmat, whatever it was, but they didn't read the rest of the document. The document, there's a lot of interrelated things through Chapter 4 that basically will make sense as we go through, and I think that I'll hit on a couple of those as I go.

Which button is it? All right.

So the first thing, again related to a question that came in, was displacements mitigation. And again, to acquire property, we are required to follow, and ADOT does follow, the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act. And also Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of
1 1964.
2
3 And basically, in -- if access to a local property is removed, ADOT is required, if possible, to provide reasonable access to those properties. In addition, it's also important to note, that these negotiations would be with individual property owners and would be on a case-by-case basis. And again, what we recommend is if you do have additional questions on individual properties, to get with ADOT right away, they would be happy to talk to you about that.

4 The next one is on air quality, in that section we talked about regulatory overview, criteria pollutants, Mobile Source Air Toxics, environmental consequences, and conclusions. One of which is presented here, and that is that despite growth and vehicle miles traveled over time, we've also seen reduction in the number of -- in the pollutants that are produced over that same period of time.

5 In response to a couple of questions, there were some questions about some of the studies that were cited, and thinking that those summaries of the studies were incomplete, they are intended, by the way, as summaries. NEPA asks that we keep down unneeded -- unnecessary repetition, and again, to
basically give summaries where possible.

FHWA has not only reviewed those summaries, for the most part they came up with them, and those -- the summary of those reports is presented in the Draft EIS and considered by FHWA to be inclusive and satisfactory, because it actually uses those same studies, those same summaries of those studies in their interim guidance update on Mobile Source Air Toxics.

Also, it was pointed out that on page S-4, the statement regarding MSAT emissions stated that increased traffic volumes could produce elevated MSAT emissions near the proposed action. And, in fact, we agree with that comment, and that was in almost every place else in the document we said would produce elevated MSAT emissions or would produce those things.

So we agree with that comment and one thing to note is that between the Draft EIS and the Final EIS, a lot of the wording will change. In that we use the word "would" a lot in the Draft EIS. I'm sure you noticed that as you went through.

In the Final EIS most of those woulds will be changed to will. So what we're proposing here is a wording change on that particular issue to
say that increase traffic volumes will produce elevated MSAT emissions near the proposed action. Again, following up on the Mobile Source Air Toxics, questions related to specific health impacts. And as we got into a lot of detail of that, on page 469 of the Draft EIS, FHWA basically does not feel as though it -- we have enough information to reliably and credibly predict project-specific health impacts attributable to changes in MSAT emissions related to the alternatives that we're looking at, and because that information is incomplete. It's incomplete because, again, total exposure to MSAT emissions is an exposure from all sources, not just the emissions coming out of the tailpipe.

There are also uncertainties associated with both the emissions and the dispersion models that are used. There's a lack of national agreement on the air dose response values. It's unclear how to determine lifetime exposures. And again, that's over approximately a 70-year period. And also, there's no national consensus on what acceptable risk really is to people. A number of questions were asked about monitoring sites and emission trends. That really didn't come out of the Draft EIS, but they were more related to that air quality forum that was put on a
few weeks ago, and we wanted to hit some of those as well.

One of the questions was the closest monitoring site to Ahwatukee, which is actually the West Chandler monitor. It's important to note, too, that not all monitors measure or monitor all the pollutants that we're talking about. The west Chandler monitor does collect information on meteorological conditions, ozone, CO, and PM-10. Another question was asked about how about on the Gila River Indian Community, and they do have a monitoring site at the St. John's School, but that only contains meteorologic conditions and ozone.

As far as the emission trends, you may remember that a trend was shown, a trend short was shown at 65 miles per hour and how emissions factors are going the other direction, talking to you, how those emission factors went down over time. The questions were what were those based on, and again, the answer is they were average emission rates per vehicle based on all vehicle types in the Maricopa County area.

A follow-up question to that came in and that was how about if we reduce those speeds down to about 25, would we see the same trends, and the
answer is yes. You see those same emission trends at
the lower speeds.

Questions raised on noise, again, the
noise impact of the freeway on these noise-sensitive
land uses, mostly residences, was determined
according to the ADOT noise abatement policy, and one
thing to emphasize is that those will be refined as
design proceeds. So the more exact we get in design,
then those noise studies will be run again.

One question came up is why, for example,
were the noise levels at I-10 and 59 tended to be
lower than what you would expect. Well, again, the
models actually reflect what the existing conditions
are out there today. And because there are existing
noise barriers in the that area, then again, those
barriers are reflected in the modeling that's done.

The other question on noise was the South
Mountain Park and Preserve. It was evaluated,
according to ADOT's noise abatement policy, so you
know, that was considered in the analysis. As far as
water resources, we did look at surface water,
irrigation, canals, access to groundwater supply, and
one of the questions is, again, how do we know that
we can replace that well, in the -- the Foothills
well. And basically after -- after looking at data
from the Arizona Department of Water Resources, U.S. Geological Survey, and we could not find a reason that a replacement well location couldn't be found that would supply that water.

However, we also spent a lot of time in the Draft EIS on 4-100 talking about what happens if we can't. So again, ADOT is required to provide an alternative source of water, and those are described in great detail in that section.

For biological resources, we looked at a lot of wildlife and plant species protected through various state, federal laws, and regulations, western section. Again, we came up with there were no impacts to -- there were no effects to threatened and endangered species in the west. In the east it was pointed out that, again, we do have the Sonoran Desert Tortoise, which is a candidate species. And we do mention that there would be effects on that species from vehicle conflicts, displacement, loss of habitat, so on and so forth. So for mitigation for that, for the tortoise in particular, that mitigation would include, but not be limited to, additional coordination with Fish and Wildlife -- Game & Fish to determine whether, in fact, additional mitigation would be required, drainage structures through the
South Mountain Park and Preserve would be designed to accommodate multi-functional crossings.

And again, this is one of those areas that came up in the Draft EIS. If you were focused entirely on biology and you talked about the multi-use crossings, it's important to note that those crossings not only serve wildlife, but they serve people, and that's really what we were getting at in that. In other words, we're trying to maintain that connection between the Gila River Indian Community, in particular, and the South Mountains. So both of those issues are considered, and that's why they're called multiuse crossings. Also, educating construction personnel of guidelines for the desert tortoises here.

As far as cultural resources, we did spend a lot of time on looking at cultural resources in the area, again, those resources that do qualify for the National Register of Historic Places, generally, also including places of traditional religious, and cultural significance. And it was -- I think one of the questions was why didn't we look at the cultural impacts to the South Mountain Park and Preserve. And basically throughout chapter -- throughout the chapter, Chapter 4, we have talked
about the impacts on South Mountain Park and Preserve in a number of different places. This is a listing of a few of them, and then in addition they were covered pretty extensively in Chapter 5 where we talk about Section 4(f) impact.

Hazardous materials was the source of another question. Again, under the plan as we go forward, the transport of hazardous cargo is expected to be permissible on this facility. What we've stated in the document is that emergency responders would address the construction operation of the proposed freeway by amending the local emergency response plan to include the freeway. And that would include emergency response on the freeway, and alternative routes for the diversion of traffic in the event that a hazardous material incident occurred along the freeway.

One of the other things, again, this is another one where you had to go to another section of Chapter 4 to find it, is what happens if there's a spill. And in the water resources section, we talked about the fact that the drainage facilities along the proposed freeway would be designed to also function as chemical spill containment structures if that occurred.
Visual resources was the, again, the source of another question. We did look at visual character throughout the entire study area, and again, one of those specific questions was why didn't we consider visual impacts to South Mountain Park and Preserve. And again, we did, if you look at basically several parks through, we did look at many impacts to the park and preserve. And, in fact, those photos were taken from the National Trail towards where the freeway would be.

And as you can see in the top photo, towards the western end, the freeway would not be visible. In the one to the far west, where you can look down and see, which is probably pretty hard to see in this slide, but anyway, that is the casino in the background. So chances are you could also see a freeway facility in that as well.

Chapter 5, again, talks about the Section 4(f) evaluation. Again, covered under the Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, and basically it states that highway planners and designers must demonstrate their prudent and feasible alternatives for allowing a highway project to impact a Section 4(f) resource. What's a Section 4(f) resource, recreational trails, parks, and those types
of things.

So again, what mitigation are we offering for the South Mountains, it would be -- it would include, but again not be limited to, establishing slope treatment plans for the cuts through the ridge lines to make them blend more with the natural setting. There would be ongoing consultation with the Gila River Indian Community and other agencies regarding the design and locations of those multiuse crossings, some of those locations are tweaks, but still it might be important.

And again, contracting with the Gila River Indian Community so they themselves can perform a full evaluation of traditional cultural properties associated with the South Mountains. And again, in response to another question, the City of Phoenix would identify potential replacement recreational land which would be provided for the use of the South Mountain Park and Preserve.

MR. SPARGO: All right. Thank you. The last chapter is Chapter 6, which summarizes comments and coordination throughout the study process. It includes a section that describes the South Mountain CAT and meetings and different areas that the public and this group have influenced the process throughout
the project.

One thing within this area I did just
want to kind of touch on is sort of the study's next
steps later in the -- in our meeting, we'll go
through some of the next steps for the CAT group
themselves. But with regard to the study itself, at
the top is release of the Draft EIS, which was April
26 of this year.

We're currently in the 90-day comment
period, which ends July 24th. During that period we
do note, you know, the public hearing, CAT
recommendation, and a number of community forums are
being held to solicit comments from the public. Once
the July 24th date is over, that's when the study
team will sort of hunker down and start going through
those comments, and start developing responses. So
that will take us through much of the end of the year
to get those created as well as reviewed by ADOT and
FHWA.

The current schedule as released of the
Final EIS in early 2014, the Final EIS will include,
you know, any of the data updates that we described
today, as well as the section with all of the
comments received and responses to those comments.
And there will be a 60-day review period for the
Final EIS where people will have an opportunity to review the document, as well as their comments, to ensure that they have been addressed.

Following the 60-day comment period, the study team would -- would, you know, evaluate where we're at in the process, and the plan would be to submit the record of decision, which is really the ultimate document, decision document, for the project. And the current schedule would have that to the public in mid-2014.

If -- if a build alternative is selected, after the record of decision is published, that would kick off more of the gearing up towards construction, which would include property acquisition, and final design. There is construction funding in ADOT's five-year program in fiscal year 2015, which begins July 1st of 2014.

So -- so at this point, you know, the plan would be to get projects ready, you know, as soon as possible after the record of decision, if a build alternative is selected, and begin construction as soon as mid- to late-2014.

All right. That concludes the initial portion review of the Draft EIS. We're going to move into an open discussion. I think Tom is going to
facilitate that for us.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Ben and Scott.

Those of you that are following along in the agenda, we have just completed the Draft EIS Review. This leads us to the open discussion for the CAT Members, mostly seated at this table, and we have --

Fred, if you take me to the next slide -- who's got the clicker?

MR. SPARGO: Sorry.

THE FACILITATOR: As I mentioned at the outset of the meeting, along the wall is the study team and Ben is going to be directing traffic to any of the members along there who may be in the best position to answer the question. I'll turn over the mike to him to do so, and I'll manage the questions that come from the team, and we'd like to follow the process that if you have a question, we'll get your question answered, and we'll try to get on to the next person. If there isn't a person who has a next question and you have another question to ask, we'll take yours in that sequence. Try to get as many people who have the opportunity to ask questions as possible. So we'll try to manage that on that end
and, Ben, if you'll manage it on the other end, we'll go ahead and get started.

Before we do, any comments and questions on the next few minutes? Okay.

CAT MEMBER: What was that, Tom?

THE FACILITATOR: Are you okay with the process we're going to go through? Okay, good. Ben, I'm going to hand the microphone over to you.

THE FACILITATOR: Anyone have a --

MR. SPARGO: I was going to jump in and cover, again, I wanted to again reiterate sort of the process that we're going follow with the questions. If there are questions that require further details or any expertise that we don't have available tonight, we do have the parking lot available for us to table those questions to. What we're putting on here is that we've kind of made the indication that we would have all the questions that end up in the parking lot, full responses, similar to what you received today to those questions that were entered prior to the meeting, by July 5th, that way that you have an opportunity to get the questions answered, if they, you know, are of importance to your organization.

Again, the comments are, you know, should
be considered draft at this point, but we're going to
do our best to provide complete answers. We'd also
ask that you try to provide a very -- a detailed and
substantiate the concerns so that we can -- so we
have enough information to give you a complete
answer. As much as possible, we are probably going
to direct you to areas in the Draft EIS, where your
questions are answered for more information beyond
the answer that we provide you tonight.

THE FACILITATOR: And just one reminder
for the general public who are here, following the
questions from the South Mountain Citizens Advisory
Team, we have a short segment on recommendation
process and following that we will open questions to
the general public. And for those of you who plan on
asking a question, once again, there's blue cards
back there at the table by Terri, so please fill out
a card and let me have it, and I will make sure when
we get to that portion of the agenda, that we go
ahead and get your questions addressed.

Members of the Citizens Advisory Team?

Michael? Go ahead, Mike.

CAT MEMBER: Actually, I have two
questions. I gather I can only ask one at a time.

THE FACILITATOR: Well, if somebody else
1 isn't ready, we'll come back to you.

2 CAT MEMBER: I should be used to this
3 after 12 years, but I did submit a couple of
4 questions and basically you completely failed to
5 answer the questions, which seems to be the scope.
6 Just to zero in on part of the first question, it
7 actually, at the bottom, what you have as question 28
8 about the City of Phoenix will identify potential
9 replacement recreation land, what I was trying to
10 find out is if there is any federal law or any sort
11 of state law, whatever, that would require the
12 replacement land. I'm talking about South Mountain
13 Preserve. I gather there's about 30-some-odd acres
14 you're talking about taking, that the land that they
15 choose needs to be within the South Mountain area, or
16 would the city have the ability, say, to go buy more
17 land in the Sonoran Preserve area? Which to me would
18 not be mitigation.

19 MR. SPARGO: All right. We have to have
20 some people from ADOT Right-of-Way here. I don't
21 know if you guys have experienced that in other
22 areas.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're dealing with
24 a project outside the Phoenix area right now that
25 deals with that potential problem. Right now with
that situation, we do have the option it can be adjacent land or it can be land separated, but adjacent to another recreational facility and will just depend on the circumstance.

MR. SPARGO: Yeah, so I think just like every private property owner that may be affected, the City of Phoenix is going to be a group that is going to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. We've indicated that those discussions would be with the City Manager to determine, you know, what replacement land where, how much, all of that will be negotiated with ADOT and the City of Phoenix.

THE FACILITATOR: Go ahead.

By the way, Michael, don't let me forget to come back to you for your second question.

CAT MEMBER: I have two or three questions, but I'll just do one at a time. Will the Federal Highway Administration and ADOT propose mitigation measures to reduce harmful health impacts from air pollution affecting nearby population groups?

MR. SPARGO: And that's tied primarily to air quality and all groups. Darcy, I don't know if you want to -- if there's any legal -- legal areas that -- or other projects where mitigation or
mitigation for air quality impacts -- I think the
question was geared towards identifying any
mitigation for health impacts due to increased, you
know, air quality or some of the MSAT
CAT MEMBER: I can elaborate on it if you
wish.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're asking if
there's a federal law that would require that or are
you asking if there's any precedent for requiring
that?
CAT MEMBER: Does ADOT or Federal Highway
Administration plan to propose any mitigation
impacts, especially for the expected increase in
particulate emissions on nearby population groups?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: At this point not
that I'm aware of?
CAT MEMBER: Okay.
THE FACILITATOR: Next question.
CAT MEMBER: I've got multiples like
everyone else, I suppose. The one on, I guess I'll
just pick one, on Canamex when you refer to MAG and
ADOT's choice for the Canamex route, so I understand
that you -- that MAG and ADOT prefer it to bypass and
go I-85, but the congressional designation isn't
that. I mean, it's I-10, there's a space in between
I-10 to get you to U.S. 93, why don't we differentiate between those two in the report?

MR. SPARGO: Well, I mean, I think just as we explained it, in that I think the discussion was that, you know, the congressional definition is fairly broad.

CAT MEMBER: It's not broad on I-10. When you say "broad," and others have agreed with this, so it's not just me making this up. I mean, this is -- when you speak to some of the others that have been involved with this stuff over time, they will agree with you, that there's a gap between I-10 and U.S. 93. That's broad. So we don't know where it's going to go in between that little area. Well, I shouldn't say "little," in between that area.

But we do know that Congress said I-10 and U.S. 93. They didn't say I-8, I-85. And I-8, I-85 gets you to I-10, so -- and the congressional designation is I-10. So the gap of that, you know, that vagueness that you're describing is outside of I-8 and I-85.

MR. SPARGO: I understand. And we discussed this at length in that, you know, in the, you know, beyond, you know, what Congress, you know, stated, you know, that MAG and that ADOT have
identified, you know, their preference for it.

CAT MEMBER: Preference, that's an important statement that you just made, because that is their preference for it. That's not what it is.

MR. SPARGO: I don't know, is there any, I guess -- I don't know if Alan or anybody --

CAT MEMBER: Alan would be a good one to talk to, I think, because back East they see it a little differently, I think.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You know, and partially what we talk about is what is the intent of Congress and Congress doesn't supply you with their intent.

CAT MEMBER: No, they don't.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But what has happened is the Congress has let the jurisdictions designate what they think is the Canamex route, which is what ADOT and MAG have done. They have designated what they believe the Canamex route to be, which is the I-8 and 85, and that's, you know, that stood for quite some time. So I don't see that Congress is not going to come and say, oh, no, you designated it wrong. They leave their intent broad, so jurisdictions and states can make decisions about some of the individual pieces of that.
CAT MEMBER: But shouldn't you
distinguish between the two in the report? And the
reason I say that is because there's the statement
that the route would never be closer than 15 miles to
any of the proposed freeways, action alternatives.
Which that's correct, for I-8, I-85, which is, as Ben
stated, the preferred MAG and ADOT route, but that's
not the currently congressionally designated route;
the current designated route is I-10, so that
statement is not correct when you view what Congress
had currently has designated. And you can get it
changed just as you got I-11 added to U.S. 93, added
by Congress in map 21.

I think that's the intent when you say
they leave it broad for areas to determine it, sure,
they do, but you need to go back to them and get them
to designate it the way you want it to be. I mean,
the -- so shouldn't you -- shouldn't you distinguish
between that and the report, say, yeah, between what
MAG prefers and MAG and ADOT prefer and what is
currently designated. Because it doesn't -- that
statement, it doesn't, you know, is not correct.

MR. SPAROGO: I think the response is that
we can look at adding -- it's not already in there --
the congressional definition of what it is, and then
sort of go through the same process that we provided in the response to clearly show what, you know, what Congress has designated.

CAT MEMBER: Well, is it within 15 miles? Is the Canamex route within 15 miles of the action alternative?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would say no, because of the locals have identified the I-8, I-85 as the route in this area.

CAT MEMBER: How about with respect to Congress's designation, is it within 15 miles of Congress's designation?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, again, I mean, I -- I can read the definition the same broad way, which is that Congress allows the states and locals to make determination on some of the specifics within it, and more focused on the broad thing, but again, congressional intent is not provided on --

CAT MEMBER: No, but Congress's statement is provided; I mean, it's in the legislation; I don't want to beat this to death, but I guess I am, Congress says I-10, and I-10 is closer than 15 miles. So, I mean, it's not about Congress's intent. I mean, it's Congress's statement

MR. SPARAGO: I think what we'll do, then,
also is in laying out both sides we can also look at clarifying the statement to direct it to 15 miles within the adopted Canamex corridor, you know, the Canamex --

CAT MEMBER: "Preferred," as you stated earlier.

MR. SPARGO: -- again, draft responses, but, you know, the adopted Canamex statement between ADOT and MAG.

THE FACILITATOR: The next question is for John.

For those of you who are new to the CAT, you'll know that Chad is quite skillful in getting multiple questions on the table and having a running scenario with that all along, and we appreciate it. Thanks, Chad.

We'll get back to you, Michael.

CAT MEMBER: Well, with regard to Chad's comments on the Canamex and the fact that Congress does designate the route I-10, my question becomes without that clarity and without an absolute definition on the part of ADOT and Maricopa County that 8 and 85 are the actual Canamex designation, that gives you an opportunity to be very expeditious, because once the 202 Loop bypass is completed, items
that require mitigation on 88 -- on 8 and 85 aren't
going to come to fruition, because 202 already
exists, because you haven't made that clarity and you
haven't provided that certainty. So you obviate the
opportunity to complete that -- that proposed
preference. And I think that's a concern that hasn't
been addressed.

MR. SPARAGO: Well, I mean, I-8 is a
completed interstate highway today. State Route 85
is -- there's been a number of improvements made that
were programmed in the RTP, including at the
connection to I-8 in Gila Bend, as well as widening
from Gila Bend all the way to I-10 in Buckeye for it
to be a four-lane facility throughout that area.

CAT MEMBER: And then north of Buckeye?

MR. SPARAGO: And then north of Buckeye
there are, you know, there's plans, I mean, right now
there's a route using the, I think it's Vulture Mine
and other areas. But, you know, the long-term intent
would be where I-11 would, you know, replace that
facility and connect to, you know, at SR --

CAT MEMBER: I think it's the lack of
certainty that causes the real concern, I think, for
those people who have reason to believe that the
bypass route will track 202. I mean, it's pretty
clear on some of Canamex's own informational sites.

MR. SPARGO: Clear as to what?

CAT MEMBER: That the plan would have
been I-10, as opposed to the preferred route that you
guys identify. You're the only folks that represent
that as the preferred route. The congressional
statement doesn't say that, and Canamex people don't
necessarily say that. And none of the other counties
that would be participating in Canamex, Pinal or Pima
County, care, but they don't represent that in their
documents either. So you're the only group, this
particular highway segment's the only group that
represents that position. So I think clarity is what
we're seeking on that.

MR. SPARGO: Well, I mean, it's not just
this project that's pushing that out. MAG completed
a study in 2001 that identified -- that went through
a number of alternatives, including, you know, the
use of parts of this facility as part of it. And the
ultimate result of that study was designating I-8 and
SR 85 as their preferred Canamex corridor that was
later adopted by the regional council, ADOT, other
agencies stakeholded for part of that study that went
through the process of looking for other alternatives
and ultimately adopted I-8 and SR 85.
And part of that is also driving, you know, why we're investing in State Route 85 with money from the RTP today and into the future to upgrade that facility and the efficiency of it.

THE FACILITATOR: Any more? Yes.

CAT MEMBER: I thought I heard you say relative to Sonoran Desert Tortoise that mitigation was talking or consulting more, and that's not really mitigation. And I wondered if you would address that. Like, I mean --

MR. SPARGO: So the question was with regard to one of the mitigation items that we showed on the slide was in regard to further consultation and coordination regarding mitigation, and how that plays into the process. I don't know, Curt, if you want to --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, I think the point there is that coordination will happen with the Game & Fish department to determine what technical aspect would potentially benefit for mitigating the impacts. As a candidate species there is a requirement, but the point is ADOT and FHWA, it's their intent to continue the coordination and communication with Game & Fish to try to find out what might be something that would be mitigated.
CAT MEMBER: So wouldn't that -- I'm just -- this is part of the same question, by the way -- wouldn't that -- wouldn't that be something that you would have wanted to have done already, you know, so we could see --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The design of the project still has to occur yet, so as design continues or proceeds, then you're able to understand what the impact is going to be. And you can incorporate the design features that can, again, mitigate impacts to the species.

MR. SPARGO: And, I mean, there is mitigation. One of the other items touched on was the multiuse crossings, and the development and identification of where to locate those, you know, we're in consultation with Game & Fish, as well as the Gila River Indian Community, so there is mitigation included in the project today, and I think how we move forward and make sure that the intent of that mitigation to serve the different species, you know, continues to remain in the project is sort of what that continued coordination would be about.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. And that is ADOT's standard procedures with any of these types of projects.
THE FACILITATOR: Other questions on the first round before we come back to Michael?
Yes.
CAT MEMBER: I'll jump on their two questions.
THE FACILITATOR: Then we'll come back to you?
CAT MEMBER: The distance of the freeway will be, in the truck route, would be at least 10 miles less, and this reply was that it would be more congested on the new freeway, but I thought the whole idea of all the studies and all the information was that by making the freeway, congestion would be down significantly where it wouldn't really be congested. So if I'm a trucker, I still want to go the shortest route, especially if there's truck stops along that route, whereas if I go I-8 to 85, I miss all the Phoenix facilities, right? All the truck stops and everything? I have to wait until I get to Tonopah or something.
MR. SPARGO: Well, I definitely know that the document doesn't state anywhere that this project is going to solve all the problems, traffic-related problems, in the Valley, such that, you know, it will be free flow from, you know, Riggs Road all the way
out to Buckeye. What we're saying is that you
would -- you would have to enter, you know, the
metropolitan area, and we're talking about a
population of 3.6 million people, that's going to
continue to expand to 6 million. So while distance
is one factor, travel time is the other factor.

Now, at midnight it may make sense,
timewise you may be able to do it, but they are still
going to have to enter and sort of take that chance
to come into the -- not just on the east side, but
again, you're at -- you're at 59th Avenue and you
have to travel all the way to the west, and that area
is where we're going to see a lot of growth and where
there's a lot of congestion itself as well.

So our response is just that trucks that
are truly not doing anything in the Valley that don't
have any business or don't have any needed stops, you
know, in the Valley would be better served to use I-8
and SR 85 to bypass the metropolitan area. We do
discuss that we understand that trucks will use this
facility to facilitate their business within the
metropolitan area.

CAT MEMBER: Would you address that? I
didn't catch it in the numbers. I didn't read all
the details.
MR. SPARAGO: One of the response --

CAT MEMBER: I know that was a response in general, but do you actually have the data? What I did see in the study said you don't really measure the truck response versus what goes through versus what goes around. And different than the rest of the regional freeways in the area, none of the other regional freeways connects to points that are highly desirable to go from another metropolitan area, say, Tucson or Texas to L.A. Whereas, this section would have a through route perspective that you wouldn't necessarily have on the 202 on the east side, right? The 202 and the 60 through Globe. It's just not as desirable a location as getting from Tucson, say, to L.A., and I didn't see that aspect kind of indicated.

MR. SPARAGO: There is -- there is a figure in Chapter 3 that describes, basically, the users of the freeway, we can either go through or I can discuss it later, that shows basically what we did is we took the MAG model and sort of captured all the vehicles going through or all the projected vehicles that would go through the bend of the freeway, and identified their origin and destination. And then sort of mapped those and grouped them to sort of show--
CAT MEMBER: But you didn't compare that
to the current traffic on I-8 and I-85, did you? Did
you have that also?

MR. SPARGO: Well, that type of
information is some of -- is part of the study that
MAG is continually looking at, external trips --

CAT MEMBER: But it wasn't included in
here?

MR. SPARGO: Well, it's included in the
modeling that they do, so when we look at the
projected traffic on the facility, projecting who's
going to use the facility, there is a portion of that
traffic that will be vehicles that are starting
external to the metro area and their destination is
external to the metropolitan area, and that is
captured in the information that we present.

CAT MEMBER: Okay. I can look at that
while you ask Mike and the other guys.

THE FACILITATOR: Before we come back,
you've -- we've got two questions. You first and you
second.

CAT MEMBER: My question is water resources
that you have indicated on page 33. I notice the --
you had addressed a concern regarding the Foothills
Water Source on Section 4-100, basically the entire
On the southwest corner of Voya [phonetic] Street and Pecos, there's a very large water well for the Lakewood Community Association that supports 3,000 homes, and they're not even mentioned in the study. Is there a reason for that? Based on your route maps, that well would be displaced.

MR. SPARGO: Okay. I think that the specific well is based on information that we've heard, concerns that we've heard from the public, and they've been primarily geared towards that well. But any well impacted throughout the study area would be treated in a similar fashion.

So it's really just trying to come up with a representative condition that would then, you know, similar negotiation and desire to find replacement water and providing that would be done.

CAT MEMBER: If groundwater wasn't able to be located, an alternative says here, "In the event that well replacement is not possible, ADOT would replace the well through alternative sources of water." And could you elaborate a little bit on what alternative sources of water would include?

MR. SPARGO: Yeah, I'll start, and then I'll look to ADOT Right-of-Way to pipe in a little
On page 4-100, if that's the reference, there is almost a full page in there that goes through sort of a four- or five-step process as far as how well water is replaced. So it does discuss, you know, sort of the plan A, B, C, and D, as far as how that water would be replaced.

I don't know, Reggie, if you want to add anything regarding the different sources of water that would be available for replacing well water?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's nothing I can add to what you have already said.

MR. SPARGO: So I think anything would be on the table if they're not able to find --

CAT MEMBER: And ADOT would be prepared to cover the cost difference between the two? We have a substantial history in that community in trying to locate appropriate wells for our water source, and they've proven extremely difficult, if not impossible. And so we have a very large concern about how that would get treated. If a well was located south of the freeway, is there any way to get the source of water north of the freeway?

MR. SPARGO: I do think that the first, you know, plan A is to -- is to drill a new well within 650 feet of the previous well, because that
reduces the amount of some of the clearances that you have to complete.

CAT MEMBER: Unless you drill into somebody's living room, it would need to be south of the freeway.

MR. SPARGO: Okay.

CAT MEMBER: So is there a way to get the source of the water from a well that's identified on the south part of the freeway and get it to the north side of the freeway?

MR. SPARGO: Yeah, I would assume it could be pumped under the freeway. It wouldn't be ADOT's desire, because they do not really like to have utilities within their right-of-way.

CAT MEMBER: Nor would it be of the community, I'm sure.

MR. SPARGO: I understand. Again, that goes back to the whole, you know, everything will be on a case-by-case basis.

CAT MEMBER: One of these guys would be able to answer that. Is that what you're saying, I mean, you're going to transport water across the freeway if that's the last alternative, that's what you're saying?

MR. SPARGO: I think it would be a
negotiation where we would look at all the different options, and then we would select the option that is most beneficial to everybody.

CAT MEMBER: Is that physically possible, though, to pump it under, to do that, is that something that can be done? I think the guy in the green says you can, shaking your head up and down.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm a terrible poker player. Yeah, you can put directional drilling and put a pipe underneath the freeway; they do it all the time. That can definitely be done. It would be on the range of options, like Ben says.

MR. SPARGO: I don't think we're --

CAT MEMBER: I don't think it would be directional because it would be done before the road was built, so I guess you could put the conduit through there, but you can do all that, right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It can be done.

CAT MEMBER: If you have enough money, you can do just about anything.

THE FACILITATOR: Karen.

CAT MEMBER: I wanted to follow up on all the Canamex conversation. How does something like the I-8 and State Route 85 get enforced? I'm not familiar with that, so if that is the designated
truck route, how does something like that get enforced?

MR. SPARGO: The question was about enforcement of the Canamex corridor or the truck bypass route of I-8 and SR 85.

And I don't know if we have anybody here to answer that specific question.

CAT MEMBER: Because I think that would be part of the concern, is that if that's the designated route, how do -- one, how do the truckers know that; and two, how is it enforced? They can just say I'm going take the shorter route because I want to stop and go to the bathroom and take a shower and get some food.

MR. STAPP: Well, I mean, it would -- it would appear as though, I mean, it is signed on both ends, so that's how they know, but basically, as far as enforcement, I mean, please tell me if I'm wrong, I don't see how you could, simply because a lot of trucks have legitimate business within the Phoenix downtown area.

CAT MEMBER: True.

MR. STAPP: And distinguishing those vehicles, I would think, would be impossible.

CAT MEMBER: So there's no way to -- I
don't know how to phrase the rest of it.

CAT MEMBER: I think it says in the report that they don't want to because it doesn't meet the purpose and need. Right? That's the answer to her question. In the report it addresses that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And as I understand it from talking to (unintelligible), who is familiar with the route and has been around the agency for a long time, I-8 and I-85 are assigned that way, but also the truckers have maps; they're using maps; it's usually indicated on the maps they have that they get for traveling. It's not a Rand McNally map, it's a map that they get from the American Trucker Association that indicates the major routes.

THE FACILITATOR: Any other questions before we go back on the second round? Everybody who hasn't asked a question, would you like to ask one before we move forward?

CAT MEMBER: Yes.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

CAT MEMBER: My name is Derrick Denis, and I'm an environmental consultant and business owner here in Arizona, Arizona Hair Company. Get your haircut there, those of you who have hair still. I represent the Foothills Preserve, 611 homes, Pecos
and 30th Avenue. I've been a member of this committee or community, this group for, I think, over eight years. It's been a while. And I appreciate the hard work that goes into all these presentations. My community and I acknowledge this is a vastly complicated issue and we believe we are probably the most, if not one of the most, impacted neighborhoods by the construction of the freeway, and by the existence of a constructed freeway.

We recognize, as a community, that there's really no way to have these discussions without sounding like a NIMBY, a "not in my backyard advocate." But people in my community want some assurances. They want assurances. Now, I know that our ability here is not -- we don't have a lot of sway. We have a vote in the community, as a representative of build/no-build, but we don't have a lot of the data that the community is asking for, my community is asking for, I'm assuming all the communities are asking for. Which is how will I get to the I-10 freeway if this thing is built, how will my children's bus reach our neighborhood when this freeway is built. So these are the kinds of questions I'm being asked over and over and over again. I don't have the answers, although that's not
what this forum is for. Those are the questions that
the community is begging for.

    The Environment Impact Statement is pretty
straightforward. Our noise levels right now, 45
decibels, background, unmitigated. We're going to go
up to 78 decibels, mitigated, a huge increase.
Mitigated we're going to be at 63 decibels, still a
huge increase. The light, the traffic, the air
quality, the real estate values, all these things are
degradations to our community and our perception, and
I'm assuming that everyone is on board with that,
that seems logical, a degradation to our community.

    So my question to the group, and I don't
know how many community folks are here, I think most
people here are experts and involved with this
project, what is the abbreviated message I should
deliver to my community? Is the message, "I'm sorry,
too bad, it's for the greater good, suck it up,
you're going to get what you get" or is there a more
positive message that I can deliver? And that's my
question to this group.

    MR. SPARGO: I think that's a tough
question, but I mean, it's a good question. I think
some of the concerns related to, you know, if it's
built, you know, how do I get around, some of that
information is not directly in the Draft EIS, but it is available on the website. We do have maps that show within the online hearing what the freeway would look like, where the access points would be along the freeway.

I can't say that based on -- based on our implementation and construction phasing plan that traffic would continue to be open. If we do build the freeway in a similar fashion to where Pecos Road is, it would be built such that part of the freeway would be built north of Pecos Road while traffic remains active on Pecos Road itself, and then when we go to construct the south half of the freeway, traffic would be shifted to the north half of the freeway with some temporary ramps to continue to provide access, so during construction we wouldn't be detouring all traffic to Chandler Boulevard; there would be a similar facility available to move traffic as Pecos Road.

To your community itself, the nearest access point would be at 17th Avenue, but Chandler Boulevard would be constructed from where it ends at around 19th Avenue through the -- through the 620 property or along the state land where Phoenix has recently purchased property to connect from, I think,
around 19th Avenue out to Chandler Boulevard or 27th Avenue to provide access to the communities at the far west end of the facility.

CAT MEMBER: You said those statements, for example, that's a big question is the Chandler --

MR. SPARGO: There are some maps in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS that go into local access, and how certain properties that access will be impacted, how that would be sort of reconnected within local access.

CAT MEMBER: Okay.

MR. SPARGO: I mean, the broader question about, you know, about the greater good. I do think that that is generally the message where we're at in the process right now, is that ADOT and MAG and FHWA have decided to put forth this alternative. They have identified a build alternative; the W-59 and E-1 is their preferred alternative at this time. We're looking for public input, comments and questions for them to consider as they continue forth. If they continue along that build alternative direction, you know, what they really want to hear is how -- how do we make this facility the least impactful to the communities that it will be impacting?
I don't know -- that is a complete answer. I don't know if anybody wants to add to that, but that's generally the -- you know, how the Draft EIS is presented, it goes through and identifies the need and why the freeway is the best mode to meet that need. And it goes through all the different alternatives, and because there's no other action alternatives in the eastern section, it identifies the E-1 as the preferred alternative.

THE FACILITATOR: I need to let you know at this point we've reached within, actually, six seconds of our 40-minute time allotment for the questions. I know we have a number of questions to continue. Is it the pleasure of the CAT to continue in the question period and extend it beyond the 40 minutes?

CAT MEMBER: Yes, it is for me.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. We'll do so. Anyone else who hasn't asked a question in the first round who would like to do so, please do so now.

CAT MEMBER: Is there going to be a time limit on this extension?

THE FACILITATOR: That's a good question. Do you want to establish a time limit? One of the things you can consider is this, we have everybody
assembled here to hopefully answer the questions as much as they can without a parking lot scenario, so I would encourage you to get your questions answered. For those who don't, if these periods of time get extended where we actually need to go and leave the facility, the questions can still be submitted and answered at a later date. So it is your call.

Do you want to increase these question-and-answer periods by 15-minute increments? If so, we can do that. Fred's keeping time, and I'll call time at the end of 15 minutes and we'll decide where we are at that point. Is that fair enough?

CAT MEMBER: Agreed.

THE FACILITATOR: Fred, start the clock.

Okay. Michael, we're back to you and then Alan.

CAT MEMBER: Okay. My second question, which was actually one that I had submitted and there was no discussion on it, is for those who like to follow along with things, with regards, the only place I can find any reference to is in Chapter 5, page 16, the map on the right, which sort of shows the ridges and the proposed freeway.

And the question I have, if you look at that map, there is a difference from where the
mountain preserve line goes, you can see it goes on an angle, between the north ridge and the south ridge and the community line. And the freeway then goes on the inside of the community line.

The question I have, between those two areas, there's about, I figured, somewhere between 2- to 300 acres of private land, which I can find absolutely no mention of mitigation or anything; if the freeway is built, as it is shown, there's no exit being considered for any of the private property. I mean, I understand where the freeway cuts through, there's probably about three or four property owners there. They will be dealt with. The question really is there's still a whole chunk of private land that's left over.

And besides, for that I know for a fact, even though I know it's not directly mentioned, that once you get into the preserve, you also get into a number of cultural sites that that -- there's an old road that leads right to it. So what I'm trying to find out, I guess, bringing it together is something about that. There's no mention, at least I couldn't find any mention, of that entire area anywhere in the draft.

MR. SPARGO: Yeah, I mean, so the question
was dealing with this property that sits between the south ridge and the north ridge, and just what the outcome would be with the --

CAT MEMBER: The private land, within that.

MR. SPARGO: Again, we're going to go back to the fact that throughout the document we do not identify mitigation for every single piece of private land that we're impacting. We do provide specific or mitigation for how they will be dealt with, and that's what was presented throughout the presentation. So, again, these properties would be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, based on their condition, what access they have today, you know, what access is going to be provided in the future, and that would be negotiated with ADOT Right-of-Way and the property owner during the acquisition process, so it would be -- and the question it would be up to them to show that they have access to the property today, legal access, and then --

CAT MEMBER: Legal -- let me -- right now there are -- only access is actually through the community land, and I don't know under state law, is that considered legal access even?

MR. SPARGO: And again, I think that would be something that ADOT Right-of-Way would investigate
at the time of the acquisition process, because we're not out, you know, talking to every single property owner and figuring out all of this right now. That a lot of that activity will kick off after the record of decision. But at that time they would determine, you know, what the requirements are to acquire that property.

THE FACILITATOR: Al?

CAT MEMBER: My second question is will Federal Highway Administration and ADOT propose mitigation strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions either during construction or during the lifetime of the freeway? An example might be to provide incentives for contractors who are doing the construction to adhere to the green roads standards or guidelines.

MR. SPARGO: Yeah, the question was dealing with greenhouses gases, and whether ADOT and FHWA proposed any mitigation to reduce or minimize greenhouse gas emissions during either conduction or operation of the freeway. I'll look to either Scott or Darcy to help.

MR. STAPP: Well, and I think the answer is currently there's no mitigation proposed, but again, I think that it's something that we would take back
to ADOT and FHWA and examine that with them to see if, in fact, it is something they want to pursue?

CAT MEMBER: All right. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Second question or first question from anybody on the second round, Chad and then Michael?

CAT MEMBER: The census projections that were or the census numbers that were used so they were 2005 in the report, this may be something for the MAG guys so it was 2005 in the report, in the -- that we -- that we based all of the population, all the socioeconomic stuff was based on the 2005 special census, it says in here that MAG is now in the process of adopting new projections based on the 2010 census, which I think is what we should be doing all along, so it seems like MAG is on board with that concept, but it says that these new projections will be incorporated into the Final EIS, if they're not in the draft. If they show up for the first time in the final, how are we able to review and comment on them?

MR. SPARGO: The question was how the public -- I guess what the review process is for the Final EIS when it comes to new information that's presented in the Final EIS. I don't know if any NEPA or FHWA want to address sort of that process?
MR. STAPP: I mean, the Final EIS when it's released will be available for a 60-day review for the public.

CAT MEMBER: But then how do we -- so there's -- you're saying then that's -- all of our -- the way I understand our ability to dispute any of this stuff down the road, and maybe I'm wrong on this, is that it needs to be done by the end of the draft period, so in order to get stuff into the final, we've got to dispute the draft. So if the final comes out, there's really no mechanism we can make some comments, but you don't have to address them, right?

MR. STAPP: That is correct.

CAT MEMBER: So how do we -- so any of our concerns with how you're viewing the 2010 numbers, which are what your purpose and need will be based on, an important part of this report, we won't be able to get a response from you out of? That doesn't seem to me to be appropriate. It seems to me that's the whole purpose of the draft process, right, is to give you the opportunity if we identify something as being incorrect to fix it? The final process doesn't provide a mechanism for that.

Would you agree with that?
MR. STAPP: I would agree that there is a review process, but it's not necessarily -- and you can submit comments, but FHWA is not obligated to address those comments.

CAT MEMBER: Yeah, and so something that important shouldn't you retain that ability to have those questions addressed, just like you're doing now very well, shouldn't that very important -- the purpose and need, at least the purpose and need, I mean, if you want to step down to some of the smaller stuff in the report, I mean, even if you want to go to whether it's above grade or below grade, I mean, but purpose and need seems to me to be an important part of this. Shouldn't we have the ability to review that stuff through a draft process?

MR. SPARGO: I think that --

CAT MEMBER: I guess no is the answer.

MR. SPARGO: I think the answer is no. I think the information that's presented in the draft is the best information that we had available at the time of submitting the Draft EIS. It's not going to be the only thing that is updated in the final, and that if there is a significant change, let's say, in the purpose and need, like the new projections are, you know, totally different than what --
CAT MEMBER: They are.

MR. SPARGO: -- than what they were projected in 2005, we'll have to evaluate how to move forward with that.

CAT MEMBER: I think you must agree that 2005 is dated or you wouldn't be making an update using 2010, which, as we know, is three and a half years ago. So this draft was released, you know, three months ago, which was well into 2013, and we had the 2010 census; that's why I think it's getting updated, but it would be good, I think, to retain the ability to review those numbers because they're going to vary and we all know they're significantly different from -- 2005 projections were based on a very high growth period; 2010 was hardly that.

I'm good. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Michael.

CAT MEMBER: I'm torn between which direction I want to go in, because I've got really two follow-ups to other commentary. What I wanted to talk about, though, again was the routing as it relates to truck traffic. And in the EI -- in the Draft EIS, ADOT proposes or you state, you postulate how much truck traffic and how much freight actually is handled in Phoenix. Roughly a third of the
freight in the United States reaches our area. And
that you identify a significant percentage of it
simply bypasses us. But what's omitted in the study
and what's not discussed is what you mean by
"bypasses us," because we have so many
freight-handling facilities, particularly on the west
end, the freight bypasses us. Not utilizing your
preferred route, but through the spoke and hub system
of the intermodal transportation that exists with
Swift and Knight and the other transportation
companies.

So trucks coming in from the east terminate
at a hub on 51st Avenue, even though their loads will
continue to go west or north, they drop their load,
they terminate, pick up a load, and go back. So
that's how freight bypasses Phoenix to a significant
percentage. It really never utilizes that Canamex
bypass route, because it needs to reach its hub along
the 51st Avenue route.

So that question is not addressed, I think
it speaks to Karen's issue as to how do you enforce
it? Well, you can't because somewhere along your
preferred route they're going to have to track
backward to get to 51st Avenue, more of a comment
than a question, because it's not addressed here.
And it kind of makes me concerned, because in Chad's question you're using data that's clearly inaccurate on its face right now, today, in this study and if it's addressed and our questions and complaints during the open session, we've got until July and you knock that low-hanging fruit back to us, then you change direction midstream and use new, updated figures that we can't address.

And again, similar to the way that the truck traffic and the loads are handled doesn't seem appropriate. That's two individual instances, not to mention what I think would be Al would have with MSATs. It's out there. We don't see a need to solve it, because we don't have the right data to solve it, so we don't really think it's a problem, we're going to skip over it, and update it later. And I think that's an issue because we can't address it effectively or factually with the data that you've presented because the data is out of date and incorrect.

I guess the question would be is how are you going to fix that?

MR. SPARGO: Well, I think that what we do is that the Final EIS will include the updated socioeconomic information. It will also include any
other updates that we've identified. There's some other information with regard to jurisdictional waters; noise would be updated based on the new traffic data, things like that. So there's going to be updated information in the Final EIS. The other thing that will be in the Final EIS is a series of appendices that would include all the comments and concerns that we hear from this group, as well as the public hearings, and things that were submitted via e-mail that will each be responded to directly in the appendices. And the Final EIS will allow you to review the document, as well as your comments and concerns, and those responses. And if there are further responses that you're able to make comments to ADOT and FHWA, they'll consider those comments; there's no, you know, as been stated, there's no requirement that they provide you with a direct response, but they would consider those concerns.

CAT MEMBER: Right, so you give us one bite at the apple, but it's incomplete. That's my concern.

THE FACILITATOR: We have completed -- I believe we have completed the first extra 15-minute segment. Would you like another?

CAT MEMBER: I would like one more.
THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

CAT MEMBER: I'm good with that.

THE FACILITATOR: That seems like a good use of our time. When we get close, when they throw us out of the building, we'll have to back up on that, because we have a couple other agenda items, but we certainly have time for another 15-minute segment.

CAT MEMBER: When are we required to leave the building?

THE FACILITATOR: 9:00.

Ready to start the clock, Fred?

Who is next? Anybody who hasn't asked a question?

CAT MEMBER: On the second one?

THE FACILITATOR: Yes. At some point I'm going to get lost on what round we're on.

CAT MEMBER: I have a lot of questions, but I'm just going to ask one. So maybe you can point me in the EIS where I can find this, but I'm wondering if there was any kind of economic analysis of the costs associated with failing to meet the air quality standards in the Phoenix area relative to increased emissions associated with this freeway, and particularly, the increased truck traffic. And so
there's both the health impacts, which are of great
cconcern, and the economic aspect of those health
impacts, but also just the cost overall of not
meeting our quality standards.

MR. SPARGO: I -- I'm going to -- I don't
think that it is addressed. The question was
regarding whether there's an economic analysis of not
meeting the regional, you know, air quality
conformity.

CAT MEMBER: Consider it an indirect,
perhaps --

MR. SPARGO: I don't believe it's included
in the EIS, although I do know that Lindsay Bauer
from MAG, the air quality panel, in April went
through a pretty thorough review of the sort of the
conformity process, as well as how this project, you
know, as the regional plan, how it sort of works into
that, as well as how MAG is budgeting for the
different criteria pollutants and things like that,
and how this project sort of falls into that plan.

So there's a lot of information provided
based on that, but I think the -- the other response
from this group would be that the South Mountain
Freeway, as part of the regional transportation plan,
is in MAG's different air quality conformity
planning. So they have, you know, and those plans show it conforming to the different thresholds and budgets moving forward. Is that generally right?

MR. STAPP: Yeah.

MR. SPARGO: So I think your question to me is sort of pushing a negative, saying that project Y is going to cause MAG to not meet those criteria, where what was presented by Lindsay showed that they could include a project in their plan that would -- that would cause the plan to not be in compliance with the regulations.

So this project is included in their -- in their transportation plan that they're using to show conformity with FHWA and EPA.

THE FACILITATOR: Al, I think -- are we to you? Anyone else on the second round?

CAT MEMBER: Is there any representatives from the Gila River Indian Community here today?

MR. SPARGO: Not that I know of.

CAT MEMBER: Can ADOT provide some feedback to me on what options would be available for if and possibly when GRIC decides to make a route on their land for consideration between now and when you start construction?

MR. SPARGO: Yeah, the question, I think,
is generally asking about the process or how a GRIC alignment would be worked into the process between now and the record of decision or even into, you know, getting ready to start construction. I'll try to answer. I think that the answer that we've discussed internally is really it all depends on when that comes. As far as how it would be incorporated and what that proposal by them looks like, and whether it's something that FHWA and ADOT can move forward with. So it's hard to answer, you know, if it -- if it comes between, you know, now and the final Draft EIS or Final EIS being released, ADOT and FHWA would consider how best to present that. It could be in the form of another Draft EIS where we would have another hearing and go through this review process again. It also could be done as an addendum, but it all just kind of depends on when in the process occurs, and what that actual proposal looks like.

CAT MEMBER: Do you think there would be a large change in the EIS on a route further south of Pecos? Or would it -- there's a lot of similarities, so would it really change a whole lot?

MR. SPARGO: Well, we would have to do the same type of and level of analysis from the design
side, as well as the environmental side, for that alignment, so all of the Chapter 4 sections that have tables and graphics and things like that, we would have to do the same type of analysis for an alternative on their land, you know. It is a very different, you know, condition than what the Pecos Road alignment is.

Now, regarding, you know, and I think as an alignment, it does have its benefits as far as avoiding some of the community as well as the, you know, Section 4(f) parts of the park and things like that, so it depends on what that alignment, where it's located, because, in some respects, we are sort of -- we have less flexibility in that it likely would be an alignment dictated by the community, not something where we would get to select our preference for an alignment on their land.

CAT MEMBER: So in summary, ADOT is open to that option still?

MR. SPARGO: Yeah, I mean, I think that as we've stated throughout, that, you know, the communication is open with the community on that subject, as well as, you know, they are right adjacent to the planned freeway, so it would be working on other activities, but we will just have to
wait and if that time comes up, we would address it based on what the proposal is.

THE FACILITATOR: Al. Anyone else before we go to Al?

CAT MEMBER: Ready for third round? I may have missed this during my review of the EIS, but will the project include any park and ride lots or any other mass transit-related infrastructure, such as providing for a sufficient right-of-way to allow for a new rail transportation alternative someday?

MR. SPARGO: I'll try to hit that in the two parts. The first part or the second part about the rail is that it does not include additional right-of-way beyond what's needed for the freeway itself. For a future rail corridor. With regard to transit-related facilities, we are including the HOV lanes with the construction of the freeway, as well as a directed HOV connection at I-10 in the west, so that HOV traffic can go directly from the South Mountain Freeway to and from the downtown direction along I-10.

There are no specific set-aside pieces of lands for park and ride lots; however, I would assume that, you know, ADOT Right-of-Way would work with Valley Metro and other, the City of Phoenix, that if
there are remnant parcels from the freeway right-of-way acquisition, that, you know, they would definitely work with them, if any of those locations would be good candidates for park and ride or other transit centers.

THE FACILITATOR: Next question?

CAT MEMBER: Whether this is a bypass or not, so it seems to me that in the report, in these responses here you say, "It provides an alternative route to the highly congested I-10." Apparently, that's in the RTP. In the 1985, oh, the ballot, that everyone, the proposition, I don't know if it was 300 at that time, which number it was, says it will connect as we've described, the purpose of it, but it will also function as a bypass route.

So is it a -- do you agree that it's a bypass route? And if you do, how does that -- which you seem to because of these two statements that I just described -- how does that -- you then go on to say, "It's not the goal of ADOT and FHWA for the proposed freeway to function as a truck bypass."

MR. SPARGO: Well, I think part of it is in your definition of what "bypass" means.

CAT MEMBER: What would your definition of that be?
MR. SPARGO: I would say it provides an alternative route to I-10, so it bypasses that section of I-10 through the Broadway curve and downtown Phoenix?

CAT MEMBER: I think everyone would agree with that. So it is a bypass, so we've decided that it does do some of that.

MR. SPARGO: Just as just about every other of the loop freeways bypass a certain segment of congested areas, the Red Mountain Freeway provides a bypass to the 60 to provide additional east/west connectivity. The 101 is somewhat of a bypass for I-17, depending on where you're coming from, so --

CAT MEMBER: Why does it then say in the report that it's not a goal to function as a truck bypass, so you're saying -- it's a goal to function as a vehicle bypass but not at that truck bypass in light of what Mike said about all the warehouses being up in that area?

MR. SPARGO: Well, I think that and the use of the truck bypass, we're getting more into the questions that we've heard today about this being the Canamex corridor, this being the route that every single truck going through Phoenix is going to use, so I think that's possibly where we are, and we're
not building this facility specifically for trucks;
it's really going to serve a larger commuter purpose of moving traffic from the East to the West Valley.

So I think that's where sort of the differentiator is, that it's not specifically being built for trucks.

CAT MEMBER: Oh, no, no. And it doesn't say that, it just says it's -- it's not a goal. I mean, it is a goal for it to function as a truck -- to give the ability for trucks to go wherever they want to do what you just described so that is the goal of it, to say that it's not the goal -- that it's the goal to give vehicles an alternative route, but not the goal to give trucks an alternative route is incorrect. I mean, because it's -- because it goes on to say that limiting trucks wouldn't meet the purpose and need.

Maybe I should have said that because that's important to note, too. I mean, it says that you, under mitigation, none of these -- you could -- you could restrict trucks, it says in there, but then it goes on to say that that wouldn't meet the purpose and need. So that says that it is a truck bypass. I mean, so is it a truck -- is it intended to give the ability for trucks to bypass certain other areas of
the RTP and if it is, why does it say it's not a goal in the report, in one area?

MR. SPARGO: I think that in the way that we're sort of meeting on this and that we can look at how it's put, and whether it's talking about that larger bypass of the whole metropolitan area or the bypass of I-10.

So I agree -- so I'm saying I agree that we need to look at how that's phrased and make sure that it's referring to the correct definition as we've just discussed bypass.

CAT MEMBER: Is it a truck bypass or not?

MR. SPARGO: Well, I mean, it's an all-vehicle -- it's going to provide a bypass of I-10 through the Broadway curve and downtown area.

CAT MEMBER: So it will function as a truck bypass?

MR. SPARGO: Yes.

CAT MEMBER: Okay. All right.

THE FACILITATOR: How many minutes we have, Fred?

We have a minute 20 seconds in this current segment. One more question in this segment and then we'll talk about whether you want another one or not?

CAT MEMBER: The hazardous transport,
because I know I looked, and I guess the Phoenix area there's only two areas that are restricted for hazardous cargo; and that's under the tunnel in Margaret Hance Park and the Salt River, the 202, and that's one of the questions I asked. If you added that one section, a limited access freeway, there's no routes, if you're where we live -- I'm about as far out as you can get -- if there were a chlorine chemical spill, and chlorine is heavily used in the drinking water, so if there were some sort of an accident with that, the only way we would have to go is the limited access on Chandler or the existing arterial streets and all of them head east; there's no southern route, northern route, or western route; isn't that trouble?

I know you'd said there would be drainage for collection, but you know we just had that in the East Coast; they had that train derailment, I know, a few years ago. We had one in a remote area where there was a train derailment that had a nasty spill; this is a heavily populated area, and I would be curious what the response was

MR. SPARGO: The question was just about the transport of hazardous materials and sort of what the, you know, how the different routes or
restrictions are done. I don't know, Kelly, if you
wanted to touch on sort of the process that goes into
designated thumb routes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sure. Every
freeway or highway has a -- Kelly, hold on a second,
let me get the --

THE REPORTER: He needs to speak up. I
can't hear him.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not loud enough?

Thank you. Basically, the functional classification
of this freeway would be just like any other limited
access freeway in the state, in that hazardous
materials cargo within the restrictions of hazardous
cargo and material designation, in the events of an
accident where they would, say, close the freeway for
a period of time and clean it up, I believe your
question would be what would happen to the traffic.

CAT MEMBER: What would happen to the
people that live in an area that would have to be
evacuated; there's very little routes out. Right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The emergency
responders of every jurisdiction have a contingency
plan. Your emergency responders have primary
control. ADOT has a series of hazardous materials
contractors that they have available to augment the
emergency responders in an area, if required, but in terms of rerouting of traffic, that falls within the jurisdiction of the state patrol or what is it here, DPS. And they would make the determination.

Now, if you had a hazardous materials behind you, obviously, they could not go onto a public street as an alternative; they would have to wait until the properly designated road is reopened, so that's how that would be dealt with.

Does that answer the question?

CAT MEMBER: It's the answer you have, but it's not one that I look forward to. Right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nobody looks forward to that kind of an accident. But there are contingency plans and emergency responders that have this all in their plan.

THE FACILITATOR: We are at the end of the 15-minute segment. Would you like another?

CAT MEMBER: Yes.

If there's only one question, let's limit it down to that question.

THE FACILITATOR: Let's deal with it.

Chris, go ahead.

CAT MEMBER: Dealing with mitigation of issues in this study, our community has several
that -- questions that -- who do we contact specifically if we wanted more detail on an answer?

MR. SPARGO: Let me just clarify the question.

CAT MEMBER: We have -- we are going to be having displacement issues regarding houses, as well as a well, water wells. And we're interested in learning more about this before the public hearing process is concluded. Who can I contact to get more detailed specific answers to the questions?

MR. SPARGO: ADOT Right-of-Way is the correct place to go. They, outside of calling them in their office, they also will be present at all the public forums that we'll have. The public forum in the Ahwatukee area is next Tuesday evening. So they'll be located there, if there are residents that would like to come and speak with ADOT Right-of-Way representatives.

We're in kind of a, you know, unique area of the study in that we're in this 90-day comment period. So typically questions that are submitted to the website or e-mailed or, you know, come in through different avenues are grouped in with all those comments that will go to the Final EIS, so you won't get an immediate response to those questions.
But we do have some representatives from ADOT Right-of-Way here today that could possibly hook up with you after the meeting, get you contact information, but also, that they'll be at all of the public forums. They were at the public hearing. We bring them everywhere we go.

CAT MEMBER: Can you ask them to identify themselves, please.

MR. SPARGO: Yeah, Reggie, I don't know if you want to raise your hand.

CAT MEMBER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And let me add that there's information on the back table that are left on our schedule. So those who are interested, there's a stack of advertisements for you to take back to your community.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for the question period.

We are now at the agenda item on the recommendation process, and if you would be kind enough to look at that slide in the packet. Fred's going to put it up on the screen. We have just a few minutes before we open the questions to the general public. Those of you who are members of the committee, I encourage you to stay for the last
couple of minutes, because we have some closing
remarks to give you more direction before we
conclude.

You may recall, folks, that a number of
months ago now, it might have even been more than a
year and a half ago, we talked about "the end game"
for this particular system advisory team. That end
game was supposed to provide a recommendation from
your organization that you represent. And we talked
about and adopted a form for gathering that
recommendation from your organization that forms
drafts on the screen and in your packet. And
essentially it states the purpose of this particular
team, and the fact that this recommendation is coming
on behalf of that organization to build or no-build
and a place to provide some comments.

We are at that point now and if you look at
the agenda, the schedule of events on the left side
of the slide, that we are getting to the point where
we've got through the various activities associated
with the Citizens Advisory Team, and we're at the
point beginning tomorrow where we're going to open
that recommendation process to your organizations and
try to conclude that by July 24th, to fit into the
schedule that you've heard outlined here tonight.
And so there's a number of ways that we can get this document to your organization for you to make the recommendation. One of the methods will be that Fred will be providing you, via e-mail with a link to click on that link. That will produce this form for you to complete and it will be submitted.

For those of you who don't have access to computers or the Internet, we can do this through the mail, if you like. But we would like to review the form itself, build or no-build, and any comments your organization may want to add. You'll notice on the bottom of this particular form an attachment, should you want to provide some attachments to this. We can't do it on the Survey Monkey, but you can do it as an e-mail to Fred and he'll incorporate it into the packet. And if you're doing that through snail mail, he'll attach that to your recommendation.

This needs to be reviewed by your organization. You have been kind enough all these months and in many cases all these years, to represent your organization with integrity. And we don't want that to slip at the end. This recommendation needs to be vetted by your organization, and the response provided. We all on the same page on what we agreed to a while back? We
still in agreement?

We'll send this stuff via e-mail to you, if you request a hard copy, just give Fred a call or e-mail at his normal contact, and he'll get you that information and we're going to follow the deadline.

CAT MEMBER: When will this go out, tomorrow or --

THE FACILITATOR: Will it go out as early as tomorrow?

MR. ERIKSON: Yes.

CAT MEMBER: And the following is recommendation of blank member, should that be our name or the organization we're representing?

THE FACILITATOR: On the Survey Monkey, it will have the name of your organization; it won't have a place for your individual name. Your organization will be the entity. Okay? Good question.

CAT MEMBER: And the results of this will be posted online? How do we know what the results were?

MR. SPARGO: Yes, as part of the -- it will be posted in the normal CAT meeting information. When we have all finalized, it will also be incorporated into the Final EIS as well.
CAT MEMBER: So you -- so you can't send something out on July 25th when you count the ballots in your office? Seems pretty easy to do. 12 people said no-build and 13 people said build, seems pretty easy.

MR. SPARGO: Yeah, and that's part of how it's going to be reported by KCA.

CAT MEMBER: Seems a little too convoluted.

MR. SPARGO: Sorry.

THE FACILITATOR: As long as you're giving us the authority to send these results out through e-mail, we can do that; is that okay with everybody?

CAT MEMBER: I'd also like to know who doesn't respond. I would like to know if you have a lack of response. I think that's important for accountability.

MR. SPARGO: Yeah, I mean, I think that in the response, however we do it, you'll either be able to tell based on who is missing, because we'll definitely identify organization and their recommendation, so either by absence or some other way.

THE FACILITATOR: I appreciate the committee staying together for a few more minutes,
while we take questions from the public.

CAT MEMBER: I have one procedural question about the vote. Since we're a committee that is met and required for a quorum, how could, if you have members that don't vote, and they fall below a certain threshold, unless you have at least 13 votes, you won't have -- you've got to have enough votes to have a quorum on our recommendation, how are you going to make sure that occurs?

THE FACILITATOR: I'm not sure that we have to have a quorum of the votes. We had to have our quorum per our operating agreement with one another at the individual meeting. When it comes to the votes, the votes are your votes, and I think that's consistent with our operating agreement but good point. Any other comments or questions?

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. If you have a question, please bring it up to me. As has been our process in the past, we have a period of time to read questions from the general public. We will read as many of them as we can before Fred calls time. If a question is provided and not answered due to time limitations, it will be answered and posted on the website, the way we've been doing.

So, fair enough? I'm going to do my best
on this, so if I botch up some words, let me know.

Are these all from the same --

MEMBER OF PUBLIC: No.

THE FACILITATOR: Have you identified who is who?

MEMBER OF PUBLIC: No.

THE FACILITATOR: Let's do that. Okay.

MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Sure.

THE FACILITATOR: What Fred is passing out is the meeting evaluation form, please fill it out.

The first question is from Tiffany Sprague.

MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Sprague.

THE FACILITATOR: "Has the Arizona Game & Fish been consulting regarding wildlife habitat and mitigation efforts. For example, planning for any wildlife proxy requires a multi-year effort to determine the species, attempted crossing locations, and where to place structures, in-depth analysis on appropriate site, etc. Was Game & Fish consulted on multi-functional design based on available information such structures do not work for many species?"

MR. SPARGO: Curt, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, in early, I think it was 2002, 2003, Game & Fish was approached
about the opportunity for providing structures on the
west end of the South Mountain Preserve area and a
meeting was held with FHWA and Game & Fish to talk
about the options. It was determined by Game & Fish
that the jurisdictional washes there, the corridors,
the movement corridors, the obvious locations for
multi-functional crossings would best serve wildlife,
and -- you can't hear?

In 2002, 2003, a meeting was held between
FHWA and Arizona Game & Fish Department to discuss
the opportunity for placement of wildlife crossings.
It was determined that the jurisdictional washes
provided the best opportunity, those are movement
corridors for a wide variety of wildlife. And it was
determined that because of the, let's say, the
population densities of wildlife in the area, it was
most beneficial on the western side of the South
Mountain Preserve to kind of access between the
floodplains and the Gila River; as far as the
designs, that's something that I think is potentially
still on the books to discuss. It was determined
that those were the best locations and opportunities
for any kind of crossing structures in the project
area. And that area has the most impact in terms of
lack of development.
MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Can I ask a follow-up to that?

THE FACILITATOR: Let me get through these. Ariel LeBarron. "Can you look at public transit and transportation more closely to fit the needs of the citizens, both in the South Mountain area, but the Valley as the whole. Use the money for the freeway for this instead. Use examples from the counties and cities to create a working system that in the end could make money for the state." Is that a question or a comment?

MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Well, could you use that money for public transportation?

THE FACILITATOR: Can they use the money designated here for public transportation? I'm sorry, I didn't get that.

MR. SPARGO: Now, the regional transportation plan that was developed in 2004 did include a much more robust public transit portion when compared to what was done in 1985, and that included a lot of local and regional buses, as well as extensions to the light rail, the initial 20-mile segment.

So the region has already shown an investment into that system, but along in the
1 RTP there was also a freeway system, which working
together to provide, you know, all modes of travel
for the community.

   With regard to the funding itself, there
are some firewalls built into the regional
transportation plan and it does limit the ability to
both use freeway funds for transit projects, as well
as to take money from transit projects and use them
for freeways.

   So that would be something that would have
to probably be, you know, vetted at the top of MAG.
It would be a decision made by them, but there are
fire walls built in that would really limit or do not
allow the mixing of those funds.

   THE FACILITATOR: Scott Sprague. "In
pre-design meetings for I-11, ADOT representatives
have repeatedly stated that no part of the I-11 or
scenic drive has been identified beyond a very wide
30-mile swath between Phoenix and Las Vegas. Upon
approaching Phoenix, ADOT has insisted that many
alignments through and around the city are still on
the table. This contradicts what the map shows
tonight. Please explain the disconnect."

   MR. SPARGO: Can I have you repeat just the
part about where the information was coming from that
it's not --

THE FACILITATOR: ADOT representatives.

MEMBER OF PUBLIC: I can clarify, if you like. In pre-design meetings with the I-11 route, they, ADOT, has provided maps for where they're looking and they purposefully, upon request of a more refined map, they said there's nothing set. This is all that's been decided is this 30-mile swath, and again, I have no, this is just a guess, but there's a swath between Phoenix and Las Vegas and then their map has actually several arrows that spread out at the Vegas end and Phoenix end, and they said even those areas aren't even in consideration at this point or they're pre-designed. That's the next step is entering Phoenix, so I'm just curious, if that's very pertinent to that meeting, so if it's set, it's going to be over there, it's more important to me for that meeting than this meeting.

MR. SPARGO: I guess I'm not in tune with all the things going on with I-11 study. I don't know if anybody wants to add anything, but we can follow up after this meeting with more information regarding that, with the I-11 team that's doing that study.

THE FACILITATOR: Scott Sprague. "If
transit, light rail is truly a priority for the
future of the Valley's transportation infrastructure,
why was a co-located line not considered as part of
this project?"

MR. SPARGO: A co-located line, I mean, we
do in the Draft EIS discuss the option to co-locate
lines. There are some of those that are in the plan
today along I-10 west from downtown, as well as the
potential for something in around the SR 51 corridor.
I think the unique part is that being more of a loop
facility, it doesn't facilitate as much for the type
of uses that the light rail is, where it's being
developed more as a -- more in the spokes from the
downtown area.

And just like ADOT and MAG do, you know,
regional freeway planning and sort of put this system
together that works together, you know, Valley Metro
and the transit planners have looked at where the
best places are based on the density of population,
the jobs, and the housing and things like that to put
together their plan. And they've identified the
corridors that you see in the RTP at this time.
Which are more geared towards those other areas and
not this area.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Let's do the
follow-up to your question, then I'll wrap up with
the last one.

Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Okay. Regarding the
Game & Fish being approached in 2002 and 2003, have
the discussions continued since then, because a lot
of information has been learned about appropriate
wildlife crossing structures since 2002, and made
leaps and bounds of discovery since that time.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not specifically on
that topic, no.

MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Okay.

THE FACILITATOR: One last question, the
others remaining here we either addressed earlier
tonight or have been referenced in the EIS, the
draft. So we'll put the responses to these on the
Internet so we have time for closing. Fair enough?

The last question, then, from Scott
Sprague, "What about the Tucson Shovelnose Snake?,"
is that what it's called, it is another candidate
species in the region.

MR. SPARGO: Yeah, it is a candidate
species, so therefore, as a candidate species
therefore it isn't something that has a regulatory
requirement, but it will be considered. The initial
assessment is that there really is not much appropriate habitat.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. That concludes the open questions from the general public.

I'd like to introduce Chaun Hill. And before Chaun comes up or while she's coming up, please keep in mind we do have a quorum and we need to close the meeting out shortly thereafter, but Chaun has a couple comments. I have a closing comments, and then we'll return.

CAT MEMBER: I have a question. What are they going to do with these after the meeting?

THE FACILITATOR: What are we going to do with the Draft EIS documents after the meeting?

MR. SPARGO: We use them at the public hearings, to provide the public an opportunity to look through. We'll have them at the public forums as well. Beyond that, we don't have any.

CAT MEMBER: My community has their annual meeting next week and having one of these available would be beneficial.

MR. SPARGO: We've made them available for people on the Citizens Advisory Team that have made that request. So if you would like one, just talk to me at the end and we can make that arrangement.
MS. HILL: It's my turn?

THE FACILITATOR: It's your turn.

MS. HILL: I've got to say that I am -- I'd like to introduce myself first. I'm Chaun Hill. I am the project manager for the South Mountain Freeway, and I'm very, very enthusiastic about this project, but what I'd like to say to you all this evening is your dedication to this project and the things you've brought forth to this effort are unprecedented.

You have been diligent in your efforts. You've had years and years and years to think about this. You remained vigilant in your positive things that you've brought forth to consider in this overall process, and I just can't say thank you enough for all the dedication and all the things that have really benefited this project overall for your participation.

So that's really the bottom line. It's unprecedented to have a committee that's gone this long and really, really made the effort to understand the process, and be involved in the process. You're to be commended immensely and thanked for your participation in this process.

So again, I thank you. ADOT thanks you.
And I'm sure above all, the communities -- the areas of the community that you represent thank you as well.

So thank you for your participation in this process and know that you've really brought forward things that would never have been considered to this depth without your participation. So thanks a lot.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Chaun. In our closing remarks as facilitators, I would just echo what Chaun has said. When we first got together to reconstitute the South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team, you might recall that was a bit of disarray at the time. And for the dedication for you to creating an operating agreement, working with each other throughout the process at times when it was very difficult to be civil and to treat each other with respect you chose to do so, and when you look around, whether it's local or state government or certainly at the federal level, at the amount of dysfunction that takes place there, you really are commended for how you worked together.

We'll be the first to say that these sessions aren't always perfect, and we don't always get all the information we need or in some cases we don't always like the information we get, but the
level of information that you brought is truly appreciated by members of the community, and for those of you who have done all this work so hard representing your organizations, they should be extremely proud of you. I don't even know whether the organizations that you represent know how much time you've put in, not just in these sessions, but in getting ready for these sessions you're to be commended for that, so we thank you very much.

At this point I would like to call for a motion to adjourn. And keep in mind this motion is to not only adjourn the meeting, but to end the relationship of the South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team, as you prepare your recommendations. So somebody so move.

CAT MEMBER: I make a motion.

THE FACILITATOR: State your motion.

CAT MEMBER: I make a motion to adjourn.

THE FACILITATOR: And?

CAT MEMBER: And move forward -- what is that?

CAT MEMBER: And dissolve this committee.

THE FACILITATOR: We have met the purpose.

Do we have a second?

CAT MEMBER: Second.
THE FACILITATOR: All in favor, aye.
Opposed?
CAT MEMBERS: "Aye."
THE FACILITATOR: We are adjourned. Thank you very much.

(Proceedings concluded at 8:34 p.m.)
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