

**Table 2** Environmental Factors Accounted for in the Decision

Type of Impact	No-Action Alternative	Action Alternatives			Context and Intensity of Impacts for all Action Alternatives
		W59 Alternative + E1 Alternative (Selected Alternative)	W71 Alternative + E1 Alternative	W101 Alternative and Options + E1 Alternative	
<b>Land Use</b>					
Agricultural converted to Transportation (estimated acreage)	No immediate conversion would occur, other than what could occur from other planned transportation projects. Because of planned development, it is likely that land uses would be converted to transportation-related urban uses.	708	650	836-969 <sup>a</sup>	Of the action alternatives, the W101/E1 Alternative and Options would have the greatest impact. Loss of agricultural land attributable to any action alternative would be negligible relative to the amount of land in the region and to other land development trends that are contributing to the loss of agricultural land.
Residential converted to Transportation (estimated acreage)	No immediate conversion would occur, other than what could occur from other planned transportation projects. Because of planned development, it is likely that land uses would be converted to transportation-related urban uses.	164	395	282-348	The W71/E1 Alternative and Options would result in the greatest conversion of residential to transportation, followed by the W101/E1 Alternative, and then the W59/E1 Alternative. Conversion of residential land caused by any action alternative would have a negligible effect on residential land availability relative to the amount of land in the region designated for residential use.
Commercial/Industrial converted to Transportation (estimated acreage)	No immediate conversion would occur, other than what could occur from other planned transportation projects. Because of planned development, it is likely that land uses would be converted to transportation-related urban uses.	177	220	186-218	The W71/E1 Alternative would result in the greatest acreage conversion of commercial/industrial use. Conversion of commercial/industrial land caused by any action alternative would have a negligible effect on commercial/industrial land use availability relative to the amount of land in the region designated for such use.
Open Space/Undeveloped converted to Transportation (estimated acreage)	Planned development will inevitably cause rural-to-urban land conversion, but no immediate conversions would occur other than from other planned transportation projects.	712	617	630-711	The W59/E1 Alternative would convert the most open space/undeveloped land of all the action alternatives. Loss of open space/undeveloped land attributable to any action alternative would be negligible relative to other land development trends that are contributing to the loss of open space/undeveloped land.
Public/Quasi-public converted to Transportation (estimated acreage)	No immediate conversion would occur, other than what could occur from other planned transportation projects.	13	17	20	Any of the action alternatives would have a negligible effect on the availability of public/quasi-public land in the region.
Total land use conversion (estimated acreage)	No immediate conversion would occur, other than what could occur from other planned transportation projects.	1,813	1,938	2,161-2,191	The W101/E1 Alternative and Options would result in the greatest impact of any of the action alternatives. Land conversion attributable to any action alternative would be negligible relative to the amount of land in the region and to other land development trends that are contributing to land conversion.

(continued on next page)

**Table 2** Environmental Factors Accounted for in the Decision (continued)

Type of Impact	No-Action Alternative	Action Alternatives			Context and Intensity of Impacts for all Action Alternatives
		W59 Alternative + E1 Alternative (Selected Alternative)	W71 Alternative + E1 Alternative	W101 Alternative and Options + E1 Alternative	
<b>Social Conditions</b>					
Consistent with local and regional plans (provide a freeway in the Study Area in a planned corridor meeting goals and objectives of the long-range plans)	This alternative would not be consistent with the intent of the local and regional plans to provide a freeway in the Study Area and to promote growth along the corridor.	Yes	Yes, but inconsistent in location.		The W71/E1 and W101/E1 Alternatives would be consistent with local and regional plans, but not in location. The W59/E1 Alternative is most consistent with local and regional plans.
Community character and cohesion	No immediate substantial impacts on community character and cohesion; planned development within communities would have an effect.	Visual and noise intrusions to existing neighborhoods in Laveen and Estrella villages. The freeway would bisect developed properties and disrupt cohesion and existing internal site circulation. Visual and noise intrusions would affect rural, natural areas and recreational areas adjacent to the E1 Alternative.		Visual and noise intrusions to rural and industrial areas in western Estrella Village and in Tolleson. Options would interrupt the cohesion both of dairy operations and farmsteads. Visual and noise intrusions would affect rural, natural areas and recreational areas adjacent to the E1 Alternative.	The action alternatives would introduce an intensive land use adjacent to less-intensive, less-compatible uses in some areas. The impact of any action alternative would intensify as community character would transition from agricultural to residential, as has been ongoing and planned for several years. To reduce community intrusions caused by the action alternatives and to reduce impacts on the character of surrounding communities, the Arizona Department of Transportation will implement mitigation such as reducing the amount of right-of-way required, providing alternative access to the local road network to satisfy emergency services access requirements, and using noise barriers, aesthetic treatments of structures, and landscaping.
<b>Environmental Justice and Title VI<sup>b</sup></b>					
Effects on minority, low-income, female head-of-household, elderly, and disabled populations	As congestion on surface streets increases, all neighborhoods would be affected equally. Travel times for local buses would increase, affecting low-income and minority populations.  The No-Action Alternative would result in no property acquisitions and no household relocations. Therefore, environmental justice populations would not be affected by right-of-way acquisitions.	Minority, elderly, female head-of-household, low-income, and disabled populations would be adversely affected by the proposed action; however, no disproportionately high adverse effects on these populations would occur.		Minority, elderly, female head-of-household, and disabled populations would be adversely affected by the proposed action; however, no disproportionately high adverse effects on these populations would occur.	All action alternatives would adversely affect protected populations, but impacts would not be disproportionately high after comparing projected impacts or benefits with those experienced by all populations in the Study Area. Even if one were to reach a contrary conclusion and determine that disproportionately high and adverse effects will occur as a result of the freeway, there is substantial justification for the freeway. It is needed to serve projected growth in population and accompanying transportation demand and to correct existing and projected transportation system deficiencies (see Chapter 1, <i>Purpose and Need</i> , of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). There is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of the South Mountains, as discussed in Chapter 5, <i>Section 4(f) Evaluation</i> , of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Mitigation measures presented in Table 3 on page 38 would result in reduction, minimization, and avoidance of impacts as well as overall benefits to all populations in the Study Area (see SOC-6, DIS-1, DIS-2, DIS-3, NOI-1, CUL-1, CUL-4, CUL-5, CUL-6, S4F-13, S4F-15, S4F-16, S4F-17, and S4F-18).

(continued on next page)

**Table 2** Environmental Factors Accounted for in the Decision (continued)

Type of Impact	No-Action Alternative	Action Alternatives			Context and Intensity of Impacts for all Action Alternatives
		W59 Alternative + E1 Alternative (Selected Alternative)	W71 Alternative + E1 Alternative	W101 Alternative and Options + E1 Alternative	
Impacts on minority populations protected by Title VI	Not applicable	Minority populations protected by Title VI would be adversely affected by the proposed action; however, no disparate impacts on these populations would occur.	Minority populations protected by Title VI would be adversely affected by the proposed action; however, no disparate impacts on these populations would occur.		All action alternatives would adversely affect minority populations protected by Title VI; however, no disparate impacts on these populations would occur after comparing projected impacts or benefits with those experienced by all populations in the Study Area. Even if one were to reach a contrary conclusion and determine that disparate adverse impacts will occur as a result of the Selected Alternative, there is substantial justification for the freeway. It is needed to serve projected growth in population and accompanying transportation demand and to correct existing and projected transportation system deficiencies (see Chapter 1, <i>Purpose and Need</i> , of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). There is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of the South Mountains, as discussed in Chapter 5, <i>Section 4(f) Evaluation</i> , of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Mitigation measures presented in Table 3 on page 38 would result in reduction, minimization, and avoidance of impacts as well as overall benefits to all populations in the Study Area (see SOC-6, DIS-1, DIS-2, DIS-3, NOI-1, CUL-1, CUL-4, CUL-5, CUL-6, S4F-13, S4F-15, S4F-16, S4F-17, and S4F-18).
<b>Displacements and Relocations</b>					
Residential displacements (as of 2013, approximate number)	0	168 houses 680 apartments	960 houses 0 apartments	1,061–1,439 houses 0 apartments	The W59/E1 Alternative would displace fewer residential properties than would the W71/E1 or W101/E1 Alternative, in part because local jurisdictions have planned for the proposed action along an alignment on 55th Avenue (most similar to the W59 Alternative) and among the commercial and industrial development along the W59 Alternative. The displacement projections are consistent with a project of this magnitude located in a growing region. Land acquisition and relocation assistance services for the project shall be available to all individuals in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.
Business displacements (approximate number)	0	42	26	14–30	The W59/E1 Alternative would displace more businesses than would the W71/E1 Alternative or the W101/E1 Alternative and Options. The displacement projections are consistent with a project of this magnitude located in a growing region. Land acquisition and relocation assistance services for the project shall be available to all businesses in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.
Effects on homeland security	No impacts on security-sensitive sites would occur.	The W59/E1 Alternative would be near a fuel tank farm.	No impacts on security-sensitive sites would occur.	No impacts on security-sensitive sites would occur.	While the W59/E1 Alternative would be located near the fuel tank farm, the Arizona Office of Homeland Security and the City of Phoenix have concurred that the W59/E1 Alternative and the fuel tank farm could coexist (an earlier version of the alternative was located closer to the tank farm).
<b>Economic Resources</b>					
Existing taxable land base conversion to nontaxable use (estimated acreage)	0	1,609	1,748	1,934–1,965	The W101/E1 Alternative and Options would convert the most taxable land base of any action alternative, primarily because the alternative and its options are the longest alignments considered. The conversion would be consistent with other projects of this magnitude.

(continued on next page)

**Table 2** Environmental Factors Accounted for in the Decision (continued)

Type of Impact	No-Action Alternative	Action Alternatives			Context and Intensity of Impacts for all Action Alternatives
		W59 Alternative + E1 Alternative (Selected Alternative)	W71 Alternative + E1 Alternative	W101 Alternative and Options + E1 Alternative	
Estimated annual loss of tax revenues for existing land uses in Phoenix (property and sales tax/general fund)	No immediate reduction would occur. Continued planned development within the Study Area and future transportation projects would affect property and sales tax/general fund revenues in the area.	\$4,576,900	\$5,594,900	as much as \$2,286,900–\$3,567,100	The Cities of Avondale, Phoenix, and Tolleson would experience reductions in sales and property tax revenues (Avondale and Tolleson would not be directly affected by the W59/E1 or W71/E1 Alternative). For Phoenix and Avondale, reductions would be inconsequential, regardless of which action alternative were implemented. However, under the W101/E1 Alternative and Options, tax revenue losses for Tolleson would be substantial; the City would experience a 20 to 24 percent annual reduction.
Estimated annual loss of tax revenues for existing land uses in Tolleson (property and sales tax/general fund)		No effect on Tolleson property and sales tax/general fund revenues would occur.		as much as \$3,632,500–\$4,114,800	
Estimated annual loss of tax revenues for existing land uses in Avondale (property and sales tax/general fund)		No effect on Avondale property and sales tax/general fund revenues would occur.		as much as \$387,600	
Travel time (impacts in \$/year)	No savings would result under this alternative.	Any of the action alternatives would result in over \$200 million (in 2013 dollars) per year savings after construction of the entire facility.			
<b>Air Quality</b>					
Failure to meet CO <sup>c</sup> 8-hour and 1-hour standards	Congestion on the local arterial street network and regional freeway system would increase, leading to increased travel times and increased CO emissions.	All action alternatives would increase 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations near the proposed action; however, these increases would not cause exceedances of the health-based National Ambient Air Quality Standards in 2035. The action alternatives are anticipated to reduce congestion and travel times within the region, resulting in reduced regional CO emissions.			
Failure to meet particulate matter standards (PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> ) <sup>d</sup>	Increased traffic congestion on the transportation network would lead to increased travel times and increased PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> emissions.	All action alternatives would result in short-term increases in PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> concentrations during construction. All action alternatives would increase particulate emissions near the proposed action; however, these increases would not cause exceedances of the health-based National Ambient Air Quality Standards in 2035. The action alternatives are anticipated to reduce congestion and travel times within the region, resulting in reduced regional PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> emissions.			
MSATs <sup>e</sup>	MSAT levels would decline from existing levels because of compliance with strategies identified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s national control programs.	For all action alternatives, increased traffic volumes would produce elevated MSATs emissions near the proposed action. The action alternatives would reduce congestion and improve regional traffic conditions, which would reduce regional MSATs emissions. Additionally, overall MSATs levels would decline from existing levels because of compliance with strategies identified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s national control programs.			
Transportation conformity	Not consistent with the <i>Regional Transportation Plan</i> and Transportation Improvement Program.	The action alternatives would be consistent with the <i>Regional Transportation Plan</i> and Transportation Improvement Program because they would provide a planned transportation facility needed to improve traffic in the Phoenix metropolitan area.			
<b>Noise</b>					
Number of receivers (e.g., groups of residences) eligible for noise mitigation	Activities associated with planned development would affect noise levels but would not be mitigated by the proposed action.	114	109	53–68	Any of the action alternatives would introduce traffic noise where it currently does not exist or produce it at higher levels than now experienced. The W59/E1 and W71/E1 Alternatives would affect the greatest number of noise receivers. With the placement of noise barriers in selected locations along the action alternatives, freeway noise would be reduced to levels that would meet Arizona Department of Transportation policy and Federal Highway Administration regulations for abatement where possible.

(continued on next page)

**Table 2** Environmental Factors Accounted for in the Decision (continued)

Type of Impact	No-Action Alternative	Action Alternatives			Context and Intensity of Impacts for all Action Alternatives
		W59 Alternative + E1 Alternative (Selected Alternative)	W71 Alternative + E1 Alternative	W101 Alternative and Options + E1 Alternative	
<b>Water Resources</b>					
Loss of water resources (wells potentially affected)	0	121	57	57-75	The W59/E1 Alternative would affect the most groundwater wells. The number of wells potentially affected is consistent with a project of the magnitude of the proposed action. The well replacement program as outlined by State law is followed by the Arizona Department of Transportation on its projects throughout the region.
<b>Floodplains</b>					
Conversion of floodplains (estimated total acreage)	The No-Action Alternative would have no impact on floodplains. Any future projects to provide access across the Salt River would have potential floodplain impacts.	94	127	48-52	The W71/E1 Alternative would have a substantially greater impact on floodplain acreage than would either the W59/E1 Alternative or W101/E1 Alternative and Options. However, regardless of action alternative, the impact on the overall natural and beneficial values of the floodplain would be effectively mitigated through an elevated crossing (on piers) of the floodplain, using appropriate bridge design.
<b>Waters of the United States</b>					
Loss of jurisdictional waters (estimated acreage)	0	In the Western Section, the W59 (Selected) Alternative is anticipated to affect less than 0.5 acre of jurisdictional waters (the Salt River) and would be permitted under a nationwide permit. In the Eastern Section, the E1 (Selected) Alternative would cross several jurisdictional waters. The E1 Alternative is anticipated to permanently affect between 1 and 2 total acres of jurisdictional waters (ephemeral washes), including potential disturbances of greater than 0.5 acre at individual wash crossings that may require an individual permit; Clean Water Act permitting would be determined during the project design phase.			
<b>Topography, Geology, and Soils</b>					
Change to topography, geology, and soil conditions	No direct effects.	In the Western Section, shallow groundwater conditions might influence both the design and method of construction of bridge foundations. In the Eastern Section, bedrock units would likely be encountered, resulting in difficult excavation conditions in cut sections that would require blasting to facilitate removal. Appropriate design, as commonly applied to projects of the size and features of the proposed action, would mitigate any geotechnical-related construction effects.			
<b>Biological Resources</b>					
Loss of habitat	No direct effects.	All action alternatives would result in the conversion of cover, nesting areas, and food resources for wildlife habitat provided by the natural plant communities found in the Study Area. Much of the land through which the proposed action would pass has already been converted to urban, agricultural, and transportation uses (see Secondary and Cumulative section in this table).			
Loss of wildlife of special concern	No direct effects.	The action alternatives in the Western Section may affect foraging behavior along the Salt River of individuals of the Sonoran Desert population of bald eagles that have nested west of the Study Area, but there would be no take of bald or golden eagles under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.			
Effects on threatened and endangered species	No direct effects.	In the Eastern Section, the action alternatives may affect the Sonoran desert tortoise.	The yellow-billed cuckoo was listed as threatened and critical habitat has been proposed near the W101 Alternative. In the Eastern Section, the action alternatives may affect the Sonoran desert tortoise.	The project will not affect any currently listed threatened or endangered species. The Sonoran desert tortoise is a candidate species and is currently being reviewed for listing under the Endangered Species Act, but it is not listed at this time. In the Eastern Section, the action alternatives may affect the Sonoran desert tortoise. Direct effects could include mortality from equipment and activities during construction and by vehicle traffic after completion. Individuals may be displaced by construction activities and the removal of food sources and cover habitat. Indirect effects could include the degradation of habitat caused by the introduction of invasive species.	

(continued on next page)

**Table 2** Environmental Factors Accounted for in the Decision (continued)

Type of Impact	No-Action Alternative	Action Alternatives			
		W59 Alternative + E1 Alternative (Selected Alternative)	W71 Alternative + E1 Alternative	W101 Alternative and Options + E1 Alternative	Context and Intensity of Impacts for all Action Alternatives
Loss of habitat connectivity	The No-Action Alternative would have no immediate effect. Planned and existing development could eventually cause impacts.	Some wildlife movement in the Western Section might be restricted because of the barrier that would be created. Wildlife movement has already been substantially affected by ongoing development. In the Eastern Section, the action alternatives would create a physical barrier that could, depending on design, decrease movement of wildlife to and from the South Mountains and Sierra Estrella. In response, multifunctional crossing locations have been identified to provide potential movement corridors under the freeway.			
<b>Cultural Resources</b>					
Archaeological sites (NRHP <sup>f</sup> -eligible sites affected)	0	16	12	10-11	All action alternatives would affect large prehistoric village sites. The extent of these impacts would be determined by subsequent testing. Therefore, it appears that all action alternatives have similar potential for affecting archaeological resources. Impacts would be effectively mitigated through use of strategies outlined in the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement and the commitments in Table 3.
Historic sites (NRHP-eligible sites affected)	0	The W59/E1 and W71/E1 Alternatives would cross the Roosevelt Canal and historic Southern Pacific Railroad, but neither would affect the eligibility of the sites. The W101/E1 Alternative would also cross the railroad with similar outcomes. Impacts to the canal and railroad would be mitigated through the use of bridges to span the resources. All of the action alternatives would affect Phoenix South Mountain Park/Preserve.			
TCPs <sup>g</sup> (NRHP-eligible sites affected)	0	All of the action alternatives would affect the South Mountains TCP.			
<b>Prime and Unique Farmlands</b>					
Conversion of prime and unique farmlands (estimated acreage)	No immediate loss would occur, but because of planned development, loss of farmland to urban uses would occur.	723	636	870-923	The W101/E1 Alternative and Options would have the greatest prime and unique farmlands impacts, followed by the W59/E1 Alternative, and then the W71/E1 Alternative. Placed in context, the impacts on prime and unique farmland from implementation of the proposed action, regardless of action alternative, would be negligible. Further, farmland impacts among action alternatives in the Western Section would be inconsequential in differentiating among the action alternatives.
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>					
Disturbance of hazardous materials (number of high-priority sites)	0	5	4	1	The W59/E1 Alternative would potentially interact with the greatest number of hazardous materials sites. Implementation of the W101/E1 Alternative and Options would involve one high-priority site. Appropriate design, as commonly applied to projects of the size and features of the proposed action, would effectively mitigate hazardous materials-related effects.
<b>Visual Resources</b>					
Alteration of visual resources	No immediate impacts would occur; planned development would result in the ultimate appearance of urban use.	Impacts on views from residential and rural uses would include construction impacts, new traffic interchanges, and visibility of the new facility. Impacts would not change the low-to-moderate visual quality of views along the W101/E1 and W59/E1 Alternatives. The W71/E1 Alternative would have a higher level of visual sensitivity because of more planned residential development than the other action alternatives; this would create a slightly greater magnitude of impacts. Visual impacts from severe road cuts through ridgelines of the South Mountains would alter views of the natural setting.			All action alternatives would introduce a substantial human-made feature into the environment. The W71/E1 Alternative would create a slightly greater magnitude of impacts, followed by the W59/E1 and W101/E1 Alternatives. Measures to minimize the effects of altering the views include using slope treatments, rock sculpting, native vegetation landscaping and buffering, and native vegetation transplanting to blend the appearance of the freeway and slope cuts with the surrounding natural environment, as feasible.
<b>Energy</b>					
Regional energy consumption in 2035 (millions of gallons/year)	2,874	2,848	2,853	2,850	Fuel consumption would vary because of differences in vehicle miles traveled, vehicle mix, and fuel economies. The action alternatives would provide benefits compared with the No-Action Alternative.

(continued on next page)

**Table 2** Environmental Factors Accounted for in the Decision (continued)

Type of Impact	No-Action Alternative	Action Alternatives			
		W59 Alternative + E1 Alternative (Selected Alternative)	W71 Alternative + E1 Alternative	W101 Alternative and Options + E1 Alternative	Context and Intensity of Impacts for all Action Alternatives
<b>Temporary Construction</b>					
Temporary construction impacts	No impacts would occur.	Temporary negative effects on air quality, noise levels, water resources, residential and business access, pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and utilities would be comparable among action alternatives. Measures to minimize temporary construction impacts will be implemented. For example, to reduce the amount of construction dust generated, particulate control measures related to construction activities will be followed. To reduce noise impacts, equipment will be regularly maintained, construction-related noise generators will be shielded from noise receivers, and hours of operation will be evaluated to minimize disruptions.			
<b>Material Sources and Waste Materials</b>					
Estimated deficit (amount of fill material needed, in millions of cubic yards)	No materials would be required.	10.00	6.45	7.20-10.20	The W71/E1 Alternative would have the smallest deficit, while the W101/E1 Alternative Eastern Option would have the largest deficit. These amounts are not considered excessive for a project of this size.
<b>Secondary and Cumulative</b>					
Secondary impacts	Growth in traffic, population, and related effects would occur with or without the proposed action, resulting in increased congestion. The action alternatives would also result in secondary impacts on biological resources, water resources, air quality, cultural resources, land uses, community character, and economic conditions.				
Cumulative impacts	All alternatives would occur in an already urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area), an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions' land use planning activities for as many as the last 25 years. The purpose of the proposed action is not to promote economic development but to respond to a growing need for additional transportation capacity as a result of regional growth occurring now and as projected. Therefore, the action alternatives are not expected to contribute to induced growth in the region. For the action alternatives, the minimal contribution to overall traffic use is expected to have both positive and negative consequences. Cumulative impacts may occur on biological resources, water resources, cultural resources, land uses, visual resources, recreational land, noise, and air quality.				
<b>Section 4(f) Resources</b>					
Section 4(f) resources affected	No use of Section 4(f) resources would occur.	All action alternatives would result in the direct use of Section 4(f) resources in the South Mountains. There is no feasible and prudent alternative that avoids			

<sup>a</sup> W101/E1 Alternative includes ranges because of design and alignment options. <sup>b</sup> Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 <sup>c</sup> carbon monoxide <sup>d</sup> PM<sub>10</sub> – coarse particulate matter, PM<sub>2.5</sub> – fine particulate matter <sup>e</sup> mobile source air toxics <sup>f</sup> National Register of Historic Places <sup>g</sup> traditional cultural properties

**Overall Transportation Needs**

- The W59 Alternative will better link the southern areas of the region with the central metropolitan area and will provide an alternative route to I-10 for regional connectivity.
- The W59 Alternative will be more consistent with local and regional transportation plans, including the RTP.
- Northbound and southbound motorists using the W101 Alternative would have a direct connection to SR 101L (Agua Fria Freeway) and would not have to travel on I-10 (Papago Freeway). This

would complete a true loop around the Phoenix metropolitan area.

- The W101 Alternative would need additional widening improvements to SR 101L (Agua Fria Freeway).
- The W59 Alternative will need additional widening improvements to I-10 (Papago Freeway).

**Consistency with Regional and Long-range Planning Goals**

- The W59 Alternative will result in less land being converted to freeway use, thereby optimizing opportunities for planned development.

- Since the mid-1980s, City of Phoenix land use planning has progressed in recognition of the planned location of the proposed freeway near the W59 Alternative. Related land use planning for the Phoenix Villages of Estrella and Laveen has been consistent with the City's long-range land use planning.
- The location of the Salt River crossing of the W59 Alternative will be consistent with the Rio Salado Oeste joint use project planned by the City of Phoenix, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and the Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC).