



**South Mountain Corridor Study
Citizens Advisory Team
Meeting Summary**

Date: March 29, 2010
Time: 6 p.m.
Location: South Mountain Community College

SMCAT Members Attending:

Ahwatukee Village Planning Committee, Paul Everett
Arlington Estates HOA, Camilo Acosta
Foothills Club West HOA, Michael Hinz
Foothills Reserve HOA, Jim Wesley
Laveen Village Planning Committee, Wes Lines
Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council, Michael Goodman
Sierra Club, Sandy Bahr
Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce, Woody Thomas
The Foothills HOA, Chad Blostone
Valley Forward, Steve Barclay

SMCAT Members Absent:

Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce, Carola Tamarkin
Arizona Public Health Association, Al Brown
Calabrea HOA, Brian Smith
City of Avondale, Carnell Thuman
Cottonfields Community HOA, Timmothy Stone
Estrella Village Planning Committee, Peggy Eastburn
Gila River Indian Community
Kyrene School District, Karin Smith
Lakewood HOA, Chris Boettcher
Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development, Laurie Prendergast
Maricopa County Farm Bureau, Clayton Danzeisen
Mountain Park Ranch HOA, Diane Kreckler
Pecos Road/I-10 Landowners Association, Nathaniel Percharo
South Mountain Village Planning Committee, Tamala Daniels
South Mountain/Laveen Chamber of Commerce, Lisa Bray

Staff and Consultants

Michael Bruder, ADOT
Larry Langer, ADOT
Doug Nintzel, ADOT
Timothy Tait, ADOT
Alan Hansen, FHWA
Ken Davis, FHWA
Bob Hazlett, MAG
Ami Brogan, HDR
Tricia Brown, HDR

Brent Cain, HDR
Pamela Cecere, HDR
Heather Honsberger, HDR
Ben Spargo, HDR
Scott Stapp, HDR
Ben Patton, Triadvocates
Fred Erickson, KCA
Tom Keller, KCA

Citizens:

William Ramsay
Doug Murphy
Michael Brady
Terri Smith
Dave Foltz
Cathryn Creno
Hayden Maynard
Liz McKenna
Will McKenna
Robert Oppermann
Frank Herold
Tim Lawk
Dian Lippincott
Martin Lippincott
Brandon Lin
Kathy Boyle
Leala and Henry Martinez
Greta Rogers
Corey Harris

Meeting Agenda	Speaker
Welcome and introductions	Tom Keller, KCA
SMCAT role and responsibilities	Tom Keller, KCA
SMCAT communication process	Tom Keller, KCA
SMCAT questions and comments	Tom Keller, KCA
Update to South Mountain Freeway Draft EIS and Design Concept	Mike Bruder, ADOT and Ben Spargo, HDR
Public Outreach and GRIC Coordination Update	Timothy Tait, ADOT
Next Steps – Draft EIS Review Process and SMCAT Process	Timothy Tait, ADOT
Visitor comment session	Tom Keller, KCA

Meeting began at 6:02 p.m.

Tom Keller: Good evening everyone. Welcome to the meeting of the South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team. Members of the team are around the table. At the current time, we are three members short of a quorum. So no particular voting activities will take place until we have a quorum tonight. So, hopefully, we will get the quorum within the next few minutes.

We would like to go ahead and begin. We have a number of agenda items tonight.

For those of you who have arrived and haven't had a chance to see why the room is bigger than it was the last time, and see what's set up on the tables, it's an aerial photograph of the study area from I-10/Pecos Road on the east side all the way to I-10 on the west side.

We have a number of policies and procedures that we go through as a team, for those of you around the table, you are very familiar with the process, for those of you who are guests tonight, this particular body has one primary responsibility and that is to provide a recommendation for a build or no-build decision on the 202 freeway. Each of these individuals represents an organization, an HOA, a school, something like that, and their job is to gather the information presented at this meeting, take that information back to their constituents to produce that recommendation for a build or no-build.

When we formed, awhile back, we also created an operating agreement. We follow the process, procedures, and agenda that we have here. Including portions of the protocol, I won't read them off the screen, but basically, it's to treat each other with respect and dignity, make sure that every one has a chance to ask questions and hear the answers.

You may hear us talk about a parking lot - where an issue comes up that we can't address, tonight, that's being scribed, we gather the information and provide the answers on the Web site.

Throughout the meeting, you'll see members of the team asking questions during the presentation, if you're a member of the community, we welcome you to ask questions and you'll see on the table in the back there are blue cards, these blue cards are for you to write questions down and as we get to the question portion of the agenda your questions will be collected and if we have multiple questions from one individual, I'll try to make sure all of your questions get answered.

Any other administrative business, no questions, ok let's begin please.

Mike Bruder: Good evening, my name is Mike Bruder. I'm the project manager from ADOT [Arizona Department of Transportation] for the South Mountain Freeway study and Design Concept Report. What I'd like to do tonight is give a little bit of a transition from the presentation we heard last time from Bob Hazlett and Eric Anderson from MAG [Maricopa Association of Governments] regarding the overall financial condition of the freeway programs and get into some more of the details on how that effects the South Mountain project and where we are in the analysis process. I believe as Bob and Eric

went through the project, they went through some of the changes in the project. One of them was going from 10 lanes reduced to 8 lanes, what that does is reduce the impacts to the adjacent neighborhoods and any of the vacant lands as well and it reduces the right-of-way cost of the freeway. As you can see, there have been some areas outlined on those roll plots that outline the needed area. The way we do that is by using retaining walls and I have a graphic that shows this. It tightens in the freeway corridor and allows us to build the same number of lanes in less right-of-way.

Some of the other things they talked about last time were shifting of the connection slightly west to 59th Avenue and using the 59th Avenue right-of-way for frontage roads that would parallel the freeway from I-10 to Lower Buckeye Road. And, also the MAG vision for South Mountain, was to construct all the lanes at one time. Typically, we would build three general purpose lanes and come back later in time to add HOV [high occupancy vehicle] lanes to the median and additional general purpose lanes to the outside of the freeway.

These two diagrams show the original proposal for the South Mountain Freeway and the bottom one is the current proposal for the South Mountain Freeway. As you can see on the top one, we had some gentle side slopes that came out of the right-of-way line for the freeway and what it did was allow for what we call a recoverable slope. In other words, if you happen to drive off over the shoulder, it allows you to recover your vehicle without it turning over or going off the freeway. And again, we would typically build the three lanes and the future expansion would be in the median. There are pluses and minuses to that. Overall, it gives you a larger right-of-way footprint, but there are advantages as you come in and construct the lanes. You don't have to do any reconstruction on the freeway or construct the ramp terminals on the crossroads. This is probably the easiest way for the contractor to construct it.

The current proposal is what you see on the bottom, and that's where the savings come in. We save in the amount of right-of-way we have on the side here and you can see the vertical retaining walls on the side to accommodate the shoulder and the roadway pavement. We leave a 10 to 20-foot space along the side for maintenance vehicles. So they can come in and maintain the wall and any barriers we might have along the side. The current proposal is to build all four lanes at once including the center median and that way, you have an 8-lane facility with 3 general purpose lanes and carpool lane in the middle.

Some people ask "how does that effect future expansion of the freeway?" And as you can see, it would make things very difficult. You'd have to come in and buy another strip of right-of-way and now you're not paying market value, you're paying freeway frontage values for that property, so the costs go up slightly when you have to buy an additional strip along the freeway. Also, you would have to relocate the retaining wall and anything else that might be on the outside. So, it gets a little more costly, and also it affects the off-ramps and on-ramps of the freeway because as you spread out the geometry of those ramps change and you have to bring that back to the grade of the roadway.

This is the way the current freeway program is being developed and what it's called is a Prop 300 cross-section. To give some more details of what the impacts are going from

10-lanes to 8-lanes, [engineer] Ben Spargo is here from HDR to go through some of the details.

Thank you, Mike. Is there a question?

SMCAT Member: Could the retaining wall be a sound wall?

Mike Bruder: Yes, that could be a combination wall depending on the particular area, if a sound wall is warranted we would build the retaining wall to accommodate the sound wall, as well.

Ben Spargo: Mainly, I wanted to give an overview of environmental and engineering changes. The last time I presented to this group was probably October 2008 and I really wanted to touch on where we were in the process and from the recommendations by MAG. The main thing for us to do with engineering and environmental is to redevelop the right-of-way footprints from 10-lanes to 8-lanes because as Mike said it does change the right-of-way that would be needed. The other thing is to look at traffic projections because having 8-lanes versus 10-lanes definitely is a different condition. The third variable is that all the data was updated to reflect current conditions. Not a lot has changed in the environment and in society in the last three years. All of these updates and analysis continue to be done for all of the alternatives that we're considering, one of the alternatives that we are still considering is the no action alternative, and generally, what's shown on the map is a view of the study area without the South Mountain Freeway. What is shown in black is a City of Phoenix project, the Avenida Rio Salado, that they are studying which would provide a connection to downtown south of I-17 [Interstate 17]. In the blue dashes is the SR [State Route] 801 corridor, that project is still being studied by ADOT. There are a couple of different alignments that they are considering west of 99th Ave. So, this shows what would be left if South Mountain was not constructed.

Although ADOT and FHWA [Federal Highway Administration] identified the W55 Alternative in 2006 as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative, the W71 and W101 Alternatives remain part of the NEPA study. When we talk about updating right-of-way footprint and the study, this was done for all of the alternatives. So, we compare the same characteristics of the corridor. In the eastern section, the E1 Alternative remains the only action alternative.

On the environmental side, one of the first changes that occurs when going from 10- to 8- lanes is whether the 8-lane facility still meets the purpose and need for the project. Having 10-lanes adds more capacity, but the 8-lane facility still provides a needed regional link in the system to provide additional capacity in the Southwest Valley and helps optimize the overall traffic and how it interacts with the other projects like SR 801 and the Avenida Rio Salado project.

In the past, we've discussed a number of topics and each topic took the revised footprints and updated data to reflect current conditions and updated reports. The Draft EIS reflects these changes.

The main conclusion for this group is in looking at the relative impacts of the W101, W71

and W59; which is what we will discuss going forward. The relative impacts do not substantially change and ADOT and FHWA are moving forward with W59 as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative in the Western Section.

So for this group, that alternative will remain the focus along with the E1 Alternative and the no action alternative as we move forward.

On the engineering side, a lot of the same processes had to be updated. Previously, we presented a number of technical documents or technical issues that would change with an 8-lane configuration. Some of these include tunneling through the mountains or review of profile options along Pecos Road. An 8-lane configuration provides different options for those things, so we had to go back into those documents to update them and make sure that the conclusions we made previously are still valid.

Additionally, a lot of time has passed and with that, the design process has progressed and some changes in the alignment and in the design are not necessarily just because of the 8-lane configuration and the change to 59th Avenue connection. We've also been conducted additional coordination with the SR 801 project, making sure that we don't build something that they are going to have come back and tear up in 10 or 15 years.

We've been talking to some of the major utilities, SRP and the railroad, making sure that what we're doing is going to work with their planned facilities. As well as any opportunities that we've had to purchase some right-of-way, we've done some modifications to optimize the right-of-way takes with those properties. Further coordination with our stakeholders has also refined the proposed mitigation and those elements are included in what's shown on the maps.

The next slides show some general impacts mainly focused on the area of the right-of-way, as well as, some of the displacements, with the W71 and W101 Alternatives and that third variable, time, is really what's controlling the changes on the map. A lot of the lots that we saw on the previous data given to the CAT, a lot of the numbers were high in lots and a lot of the lots have turned into homes now which is why you see a big change in some of those numbers.

In the Western Section the W55 and W59 comparison, a lot of the differences are with the new alignment along 59th Avenue. The number of businesses has decreased with that shift to 59th Avenue, but there are more single family homes that would be impacted mainly south of I-10 and west of 59th Avenue where the system interchange connects to I-10. And there are two apartment complexes along 59th Avenue between Van Buren and Roosevelt. They have approximately 680 units between the two complexes.

In the Eastern Section, we have a lot of higher priced right-of-way with the residential areas and it made sense to use retaining walls to reduce the right-of-way as much as possible. The 120 single family homes can be broken down to 70 homes near 24th Street and then, 30 homes just west of Chandler Boulevard near the end of the Pecos Road area. A number of homes are in the Dusty Lane area and some are unbuilt lots in that area at the end of Pecos Road. That's where these impacts are. The business that is identified here is the community church located at 24th Street. We wanted to identify that in the table, as well, as a displacement.

A couple of high level maps here, we're going to progress into the 11 by 17 plots that we have given out. In general, we took the maps on the large plots and we cut them into pieces, and those are available on the www.southmountainfreeway.com Web site through ADOT. You can download them from the CAT area – library – maps. What this shows is the change since the overall right-of-way between the 10-lane and 8-lane configuration. The 10-lane right-of-way is shown in purple, this is the W55 and W59 alternatives. Where you see the areas where there is a faint purple line that goes over the white - that shows the areas where the 8-lane may be a larger right-of-way area than the 10-lane. Those areas are due to some of the factors I discussed, coordination with SR 801 and additional coordination with agencies and stakeholders in the area.

This is the E1 Alternative again, the yellow is the 8-lane and the purple is the 10-lane, the main areas where we could save right-of-way was through the 32nd Street area, as well as, some areas near 17th Avenue and then, through the park area. There is a small strip where the right-of-way was reduced through that area. That's all seen in more detail on the large plots and the aerial maps that are available on the Web site.

With that, I'm going to get into each map and go through one or two of them and open it up for the CAT. If there are areas that you want Mike and me to focus in on, tell us.

Generally, this shows a key map of the 21 different aerial maps that are on the Web site. They are numbered sequentially from 40th Street/Pecos Road and they wrap around to I-10 and three maps along I-10 on the west and some of the improvements that are planned for that area.

I wanted to point out a few of the things on here, from the legend. I know some of it is hard to read but, hopefully, the colors can draw out some of the major things. The orange lines denote locations where potential sound walls or retaining walls or combo walls would be located. Generally, these would be located at the edge of the freeway to try to mitigate as much noise as possible. We've discussed noise walls a number of times with this group, the design of the noise walls would progress through the design process going out to the community to discuss this with them including the treatments on the walls, so there is a pretty long process that ADOT goes through in really nailing those down. In the blue, the light blue with the dark blue around it, those are generally drainage basins and are tied to the proposed drainage plan. We've discussed drainage a lot in this group because it's a very challenging issue, especially along Pecos because there is a lot of water coming off of the mountain that wants to cross the freeway. Some of the light blue areas show where we have culverts under the freeway to allow the water to pass from the north to the south. The magenta or purple/pink color shows where there would be new bridges, bridge structures, so in this case this is showing the freeway going over 40th Street and there would be a structure built to facilitate that grade separation. The Gila River Indian Community boundary is down at the bottom, everything south of that is part of their land and the solid green line outlines the northern boundary of the SRP utilities easement. There are a lot of high voltage power lines and other utilities running within that line. We made a point of keeping the freeway right-of-way outside of that, so we didn't have any impacts with those facilities.

We'll go to the next slide to show the purple hatching. We tried to generally show where the previous right-of-way was so that in some instances you can see where those differences are located and what right-of-way was saved with the revised 8-lane configurations. In this area, the freeway was really pushed down towards the SRP easement with retaining walls on the north and south sides to really try and reduce the impacts to those homes.

So with that I will open it up to the CAT - whether you'd like me to go through each one and hit the highlights. I know we have some other topics but I want to provide some time for you to ask questions on what you see. It has been probably since 2005 that we really had a large scale plot that showed the vision of the freeway for the entire corridor. I know we've done some spot meetings to show where some major changes were made, but this was the largest update to that information to provide information about what it's going to look like on the ground, if it is built.

SMCAT member: Do you have a profile graphic so we can see heights throughout the corridor? Is that something you are going to do? I think that it is important to provide that profile. You did it on the last discussion.

Ben Spargo: It's not something we have, but it's something we can do. In general, the profile is about the same as it was before. It's something we can bring, if that's a desire of the team.

SMCAT member: I would hope you would do that again

Ben Spargo: The profile really hasn't changed, going back to the 8-lane engineering, we went back to some of the decisions made about profile and made sure the conclusions we made were still valid, in general the relative differences between the 10-lane and 8-lane configuration were still the same. For the most part, those decisions remain the same.

SMCAT member: That was a loose graphic, it wasn't based on as much analysis, it seems to me you know exactly what the heights are.

Ben Spargo: I'm not saying we don't have it, it's something we have, I just don't have the graphic here tonight.

SMCAT member: It doesn't need to be done to the detail that you have here, if you say they are relatively similar to the last schematic done years ago, maybe we could assign some heights along that schematic to give it more firm information.

Ben Spargo: I think we put that together to identify crossings and put that in the parking lot. One thing we did attempt to show the relative height at least with two things crossing. So in this case, 24th Street is crossing the freeway and we've shown the structure for the freeway going over 24th Street to indicate that condition. But, I see where additional detail could be useful.

SMCAT member: Most people think these roads will look similar to Santan Freeway and Red Mountain Freeway, but it won't. You only have one view here, but if you give the

profile view or at least state the heights that will help people understand that it's not the same.

SMCAT member: Sometime ago, there was an argument against your willingness to put the highway below grade, simply because the right-of-way didn't allow for that and we would have to take more homes, now you've reduced the scale and scope of the road to the extent. What's the implication for taking it at least partially below grade. Secondly, it doesn't really dovetail to this, we talked in October 2009 about upcoming air quality studies, or the air quality panels, this is obviously a different density and there have been changes, where have you published the changes to the air quality studies.

Ben Spargo: On the slide that covers all the studies that we cover on the Draft EIS it says that air quality is one of the studies and going from 10-to 8-lanes definitely changed the air quality. We will touch on the process and where we're going in Tim's discussion and when that new information will be provided.

SMCAT member: I think that's critically important to the air quality panel, and the second question would be the impact on proximity to the schools on MSATs [Mobile Source Air Toxics] and how that will be mitigated, that has all changed since 2008 and now it's changed again so there is a double issue there.

Ben Spargo: What will be reflected in the analysis with the 8-lane facility will be part of what Tim will touch on later as part of the process and where the air quality discussion would come in relation to the issuance of the Draft EIS.

Regarding the road being put below grade, I don't have the data for the analysis, but it was part of what we looked at with 8-lanes, the amount of water that crosses the freeway doesn't change, no matter how many lanes there are. So, the amount of water that would cross the freeway remains the same so, the amount of storage that we would need upstream of the freeway would generally remain the same. With 8-lanes, we could pull that in a little in those areas where we've reduced the amount of right-of-way, but in general, the relative difference didn't change between the above ground and the elevated option to the depressed option. There still were substantially more houses required to do it, as well as, additional cost in pump stations and other facilities to make it work.

SMCAT member: That assumes that you've engineered to the existing flow and not what you've been allowed to the historical standard.

Ben Spargo: Yes, we deal with a certain level of storm depending on the type, whether elevated or depressed.

SMCAT member: No, I mean the amount of the water running across, you're engineering to the post development flow, right?

Mike Bruder: The water going into the Community will be the same as it is today, that's one of the constraints that we've had since the beginning.

Ben Spargo: We could build much larger culverts to let much more water flow to the south.

SMCAT member: Can you go to sheet 7, this represents the end of Pecos Road as it is today and you've shown street reconstruction but you haven't shown what is going to happen to the Foothills Reserve and how that is going to end up. I can take this back to my constituents and they are going to ask that.

Ben Spargo: We discussed that a little, our response is that we would discuss it with the City of Phoenix and get whatever confirmation we need. In general, the plan is that Chandler Boulevard to the west that connects from north/south Chandler Boulevard to 17th Avenue would be constructed before the freeway is done, and that access point on the very west side of Pecos Road get access from Pecos Road and curves up Chandler Boulevard. This is all State Land department land and I believe City of Phoenix had purchased the northern part of that area, and the idea would be that they would construct Chandler Boulevard to make the connection from 17th Avenue to Chandler Boulevard into those two developments.

SMCAT member: Again, the purpose of this is to take back to my constituents what's happening, and right now we're not, we need to do this properly, so people are not going to feel left out, maybe we could have City of Phoenix come to this meeting and present.

Ben Spargo: The existing development agreement doesn't have that road being constructed, as I recall it, until State Land auctions that land to the south, so you just have to hope that someone wants to buy that land before you start knocking down Pecos Road.

SMCAT member: If that land didn't convey, would the RTP pay to build that road?

Mike Bruder: Good question, we'd have to discuss this with City of Phoenix to see how that would play out.

SMCAT member: The point is, you're showing the streets in the area that I'm representing being reconfigured - you have to show the whole picture and you're not.

SMCAT member: I have one question, this shows a retention basin to the south of the freeway, is it going to be free flowing to the south of the freeway?

Ben Spargo: To move the water to a more natural crossing, a lot of times, we aren't able to keep the exact location of the existing wash so in some cases, we've had to relocate it, right now there is an existing culvert, but where the water is actually going to cross the freeway is here, so to keep the flows to the Community land the same, we have relocated and provided an additional wash to get it into the natural wash. So, there are some locations where that occurs, this is another location where it crosses here, but comes around to get into the natural wash to the south.

Tom Keller introduced Timothy Tait, ADOT as the next presenter.

Timothy Tait: Since our last meeting, we actually had a public meeting on the W59 changes. So of course, we continue to make updates to the Web site. Hopefully, you're able to find the new and the archived materials. We've been putting quite a bit of effort trying to make it a little easier. We've got this challenge of archiving and making available all of the previous information we've discussed, while at the same time differentiating from the new stuff. Because what we're talking about today is different than what we've talked about previously.

Newsletters went out prior to the public meeting and we had the public meeting in February. The meeting was pretty well attended and a few of you were there, so thanks for coming, it was a good meeting, engaged crowd, lots of interest certainly, especially from the large property owners in the area and those who own or manage the apartment complexes that would be in the footprint.

And of course, we were at the Laveen BBQ. It's the fourth year we've done that. It's always a good time, talked to about 4 times the number of people at the BBQ than attended the public meeting. So that's a snapshot of what we've been up to since we met last.

The change to 59th Avenue as an alternative for this freeway we recognize could come as a bit of a surprise to folks in the community. 55th Avenue had been the Preliminary Preferred Alignment, so we took quite a bit of effort in trying to get people to the meeting in February, and beyond that, just letting people know that there had been an important change they needed to know about. So this gives an overview of the effort: 4500 postcards, newspaper notices, and the newsletter. We're trying to do what we can to make sure that folks realize there had been a change and that those who had previously had been in the right-of-way area were no longer there, and those who thought they were clear of the freeway no longer were. We needed to talk to some people and we've been pretty successful doing that so far.

So I think this is where we're supposed to have a break, should we continue?

SMCAT member: Will this be counted if we don't have a quorum?

Timothy Tait: Who's keeping score?

SMCAT member: There's no vote to be made.

Timothy Tait: The only purpose of a quorum is for voting, without a quorum there's really no option to take action, but that doesn't mean we can't continue to meet. The lack of a quorum is not going to stop me because I've already expended quite a bit of the State's money to hold this meeting. Was there action to be taken?

SMCAT member: I don't know, we don't have a quorum

SMCAT member: I was going to make a motion to endorse the no-build alternative, but since there is no quorum.

Tom Keller: Let's let Tim finish his presentation and go to the next steps and as you see in the next steps going forward, just because we don't have a quorum does not mean you can't discuss how you want to see things happen. Specifically if you want to take this information back to your constituents and provide a recommendation for build or no-build we can certainly have that discussion. And the rest of the folks will be given that same opportunity via e-mail. I guess it makes sense to get to the next steps part and we can decide how to move forward.

Timothy Tait: GRIC Coordination. I generally don't do this, but let me read to you the update on GRIC coordination. "Since our last meeting, members of the study team have had meetings with GRIC officials as part of the process to examine the potential alignment alternative south of Pecos Road. The meetings have been productive and positive. We are in the process of exchanging information on studies that have been completed that might identify a corridor of mutual interest. These are studies the Gila River Indian Community have undertaken for their own purposes that this data may help speed the identification of a reasonable alternative for the South Mountain Freeway alternative. GRIC and ADOT are working collaboratively to obtain right-of-way permits both from GRIC and BIA [Bureau of Indian Affairs]. This is a standard step for potential on the ground study, and as a reminder, GRIC's formal position of opposition to the freeway has not changed, but this effort extends our joint interest in exploring all potential alternatives."

The reason why I read that is because this has been reviewed by my bosses at ADOT and by officials at Gila River and this is what was agreed to as a public statement to our on-going efforts.

SMCAT member: Can we get a copy of that

Timothy Tait: We can include it as part of the notes. That's easy

SMCAT member: This is sort of where I'm getting confused in seeing the letters from the governor and the GRIC and this statement, and it would seem that we really don't know what's going on. All these meetings are happening in private, and given the past history, most likely where we're going, any realistic agreement between ADOT and GRIC is going to take some time, it's probably not going to happen over night, there's a lot of politics involved. Now in the past, ADOT has said that there is no intention of holding up the process while GRIC does consider options, but since the last meeting you mentioned we're heading for a draft this fall, it's not likely that we're going to have any realistic alternative by the fall. Which really raises the question, whether all this is just talk and we're going to hit the fall and the Feds will move ahead issuing a draft and say "oh, too bad" we're at draft point, GRIC hasn't made a decision and we're moving ahead with Pecos. So my question is, will ADOT slow up the process if there is still serious discussion? Will the Feds hold up on issuing the draft if there is some talk going on with GRIC?

Timothy Tait: That's a really good question and it does seem to be a bit of a paradox because there has been discussion about a new found sense of collaboration, but at the same time you are right, we've been pretty clear on our forward momentum that we are moving with all speed to get a draft on the street. You're right, we're not going to stop

and wait for GRIC to make a decision one way or another. In fact, the GRIC Governor was recently quoted in the newspaper saying he'd like to put it to a community vote. And that's a statement he's reiterated over the years. However, we have a lot of process ahead of us, and I'll talk about that in just a minute. When the initial draft hits the street, will there be an alternative south of Pecos Road? I don't know, but that might be a bit difficult. That doesn't mean that there won't be opportunities to change the draft. Or even, to make changes, even later in the process because there is so much process ahead of us, there are quite a few opportunities to make changes. Remember we have to study reasonable and prudent alternatives especially those that avoid 4(f) properties, the South Mountain Park in essence. Should an alternative become available even late in the process it will be studied and incorporated into the document, and there are a couple of ways that can be done, including an addendum.

The work doesn't stop with the issuance of the Draft EIS, that's just the second step in a pretty long process. An early step in a long process.

SMCAT member: Is that even a legal draft if you do it that way?

Timothy Tait: Yes, because at this point, it is not a reasonable and prudent alternative. The tribal council has past two resolutions in opposition to the South Mountain Freeway being constructed on tribal land. That is formal opposition. If members of the community support it, they need to talk to the representatives. We know that's happening. There are different constituencies south of Pecos Road and they are working with their district representatives.

SMCAT member: You do understand how they came to that, their whole way of life is very different then ours. I know that's how you may view it, and you like to use that as a reason for staying away from there, but do know that that is literally originated from a handful of individuals down there.

Timothy Tait: Regardless of how it originated or how it was approved, it's their government and their process. The people there need to make the decision that's in the best interest of the Community and right now that has been to oppose the freeway. Now again, they are talking to us, we are working on an exchange of information, but their formal position has not changed. As it stands right now, there's no reasonable and prudent alternative south of Pecos Road.

SMCAT member: The two propositions that have been submitted for review that I've seen, one speaks to the sanctity of South Mountain and their unwillingness to see it desecrated more than it speaks to the opposition of the freeway. The second is interpretive because at the very end of the proposition it says they leave it in the hands of the tribal council to make the decision. So the State is determining whether or not to approach them. Since you're already in conversation with them, clearly there is a statement, but not a conclusive position. They concluded the proposition, with saying that they were inclined to a no-build rather than an opposition to a southern route, and I think that's a distinction that needs to be brought out. We're interpreting what their intent is and I don't think that's a reasonable thing for us to do

Timothy Tait: The tribal council has said they oppose construction of the freeway, but the tribal council only has authority over tribal lands. It would be like City of Phoenix making a determination to build a local street in Chandler. Chandler would thank them for the input and move on. The tribal council has twice voted in opposition to a freeway and that has been their position. They also recognize that they have features of significance to them, that while they can oppose the freeway it might be in their benefit to work through the process to find an alternative that balances the harm. And that's a difficult proposal and we recognize that it's a difficult and sensitive issue for them. But that is in the letters that they sent to Governor Brewer, that's been the articulation, that in essence they are balancing the harms. They don't want to see harm done to South Mountain but they also recognize there is a good chance the freeway will be constructed.

SMCAT member: I was wondering if you notified the people who actually live in the apartment complexes and not just the owners of the complexes.

Timothy Tait: We did notifications in a couple of different ways. In English and Spanish, and we worked with the City of Phoenix on Section 8 housing too. That creates some additional challenges and concerns, we tried to work all of those angles. The apartment complexes were a big concern for us.

SMCAT member: Will you allow the engineers to give us heights, the profile along the E1?

Timothy Tait: Yes, if it's something that doesn't require a significant investment of time, then yeah, we can do that. That's one of the things we will talk about, there was a comment about the air quality report. The answer is going to be: not in advance of the EIS, when the Draft EIS hits the streets then the updates to that information will be in there. The reason is because when we prepared those technical report summaries that were provided to the group in the past, that requires a lot of effort and review both locally and in some cases nationally in order to release that information. We don't have time to do that anymore, because we're focused on making the revisions to the actual document itself and getting it through the revision itself. We are running out of time to be able to do some of those things, but I think the profile is something that can be done, because it doesn't require extensive reviews.

SMCAT member: For Freedom of Information Act requests, do they go through the agencies that are involved, or do they make it to one agency and it encompasses all agencies involved.

Timothy Tait: The Freedom of Information Act requests go to the federal government, I'm not sure what the rules are on the release of pre-decisional information on a study of this magnitude. Some of the information may not be subject to release until after the decision is made.

SMCAT member: So you go to FHWA and it trickles down to MAG?

Timothy Tait: I'm not sure what the process is, it's a federal study so if documents are requested through FHWA that they didn't already have, then I'm not sure what that process would be to obtain those.

SMCAT member: I'm just thinking of HDR or MAG, so all of that work is being done for FHWA so all of that work regardless of who does it, is all technically federal work?

Timothy Tait: Because this is a federal study, it's all being done on behalf of the FHWA.

SMCAT member: I appreciate you reading the statement about the Gila River Indian Community. I think that there has been a lot of trying to characterize where they are, and I appreciate the clarification of their official position. We often feel like a few people are making decisions about a lot of things, so I think that we need to respect where they are coming from and also let them characterize their own positions that involve their people. I appreciate that you read the official statement. It's very frustrating for us, we might think we know what's going on, but we look forward to hearing more as more becomes available, from what I can tell the only thing that has changed is their discussions.

Timothy Tait: I don't know if it's the only thing that's changed, but yes, there are discussions and there are things going on. It is difficult because there are different expectations for transparency when dealing with a sovereign nation, but probably the best I can say is that we are working diligently to move forward with that.

Tom Keller: Tim can you shift gears and tell us about next steps?

Timothy Tait: When I talked about a lot of process being ahead of us, this is what I mean, we are essentially, here. ADOT prepares the DEIS, that's all we've done. In fact, we have a draft then we took a couple steps back and were working on getting that draft revised. We had a draft predicated on 10 lanes, it's not 10 lanes anymore and we can't pretend that our analysis is still accurate. We have to go through and revise all of those elements that we've talked about that are part of an EIS. We have to revise all those elements back to an 8-lane configuration and we have to do that for the 59th Avenue Alternative, the W71 and the W101 Alternative with the options for the Loop 101 Alternative. And that's quite a bit of reassessing. It means that we have to go back and touch every data point and re-analyze it. So that's why we're still at the stage of preparing a Draft EIS. We are moving closer to the stage of getting it to FHWA locally for review.

Now, they are going to review it and like any good oversight agency, they are going to red line it. Of course, we work with them hand in hand throughout the process, but they are going to have comments. Some of the comments are quick to fix, some require some work, so we revise the draft to address the comments. Then it goes back to FHWA – they keep track of the comments they submitted, we have this really sophisticated system for keeping track of comments. They double check to make sure that the things they asked us to address we actually addressed. Once we have resolved the outstanding comments between ADOT and FHWA Arizona, the document goes out to the cooperating agencies for comment.

The cooperating agencies include Western Area Power Authority, BIA, and Corps of Engineers. They get to review the document, and you have to believe that they will have comments. We revise the document, the document goes for legal sufficiency, that's an FHWA process to ensure that we followed the legal process as outlined by NEPA, Council on Environmental Quality, and other things we have to follow. We've talked about them before in these meetings. So it goes for legal sufficiency and there is a review there and there will be comments, we address those comments it goes back and forth through the process to resolve the comments until the comments have been resolved and legal sufficiency has signed off on the document. Signed off does not mean they approved it, but it means they have cleared it for public release. So, at that point, we wrap everything up and release the Draft EIS to the public, which could happen maybe early 2011.

SMCAT member: The draft?

Timothy Tait: Yes, the draft. Maybe early 2011. Those who have been around for awhile know we have had one or two timeframe benchmarks that we missed when we thought we would release the document.

We will have it out for public review, during the public review process, and that's where we get the Draft EIS available for public review, notice that this is just for the Draft EIS, not the Final EIS. But when we get the Draft EIS out for public review, there is going to be a 90-day window for comment and review. Now, during that 90-day window there will be at least one public hearing, a formal public hearing, where there will be brief presentations on the project, there will be roll plots like the ones here tonight, or similar, and an opportunity for people to make comments about the project that are recorded as part of the formal project that will become part of the Final EIS. The purpose of the public comment period is to give the public a chance to comment on the document. Things like the air quality analysis in the Draft EIS, people can make comments, the agency can review those comments and make changes before the Final EIS; that's really a critical phase in the process. During that 90-day window, that's when this team needs to wrap up its business. This group can't exist beyond the public comment period for the Draft EIS, otherwise the recommendation wouldn't make it into the Final EIS. Of course, this team can also decide that it has enough information and can make a recommendation at any point once it has the information that it needs. And only the team can decide when it needs to do that. Our only end point is the 90-day period once the Draft is released.

A lot of process is ahead of us, and this is just for the draft, there is another series of reviewing comments, reviewing the document and updating the document that goes into creation of the Final EIS. And through all of this the Gila River Indian Community and any other alternatives can be injected into the process.

SMCAT member: Once the group makes its determination, is that it for this group?

Timothy Tait: Yes

SMCAT member: Thank you

SMCAT member: Are the FHWA representatives here, can they tell us where it goes after you. What they do with it?

Alan Hanson, FHWA: The public review will also result in comments, and then those comments will also have to be addressed in the environmental document.

Timothy Tait: It remains a joint process. The Final EIS will get to a point where it is submitted for a Record of Decision.

SMCAT member: So after the public comments are addressed then it gets sent to FHWA and then is there a decision locally or do you then send it to Washington and someone there makes a final decision?

Alan Hanson: The local division administrator makes the final decision. Bob Hollis, he's here locally.

Timothy Tait: There is another comment period as part of the Final EIS, a 60-day comment period. There are multiple stages for public comment and at each stage it's been expanded for this study.

SMCAT member: So after the Draft EIS is out and you've taken public comments and you discovered that there is something that wasn't addressed, do you come back with a supplemental EIS? I know it's different for different agencies and I'm just wondering about that process.

Alan Hanson: Actually, this is my first EIS, but the supplemental would be if we've already reached a Record of Decision then we'd do a supplemental EIS, but before that we wouldn't have to.

SMCAT member: So if you make substantial changes to the draft, you don't have to go back out for public comment.

Alan Hanson: That would be included in the 60-day comment window after the Final EIS.

SMCAT member: Within the Draft EIS there is a series of comments you address or redress those comments and it goes back for public review. The answer is obviously no, you address those then you determine the Record of Decision then it goes back out for the second comment period?

Alan Hanson: No, the Final EIS has a 60-day comment period before the Record of Decision is made. One point of clarification, the public review process also includes other interested agencies, not just the public but also the City of Phoenix or others have the chance to comment.

SMCAT member: Can you tell us how the EPA [Environmental Protection Agency] fits into this process?

Alan Hanson: EPA fits into the public review period.

SMCAT member: The government to government consultation with the tribe, do you do that? NEPA requires consultation with tribal entities.

Alan Hanson: The consultation with the GRIC?

Timothy Tait: Consultation for most matters has occurred or is on-going and is occurring for other issues, so consultation is an on-going part of the process, as issues develop or come up through environmental or engineering analysis, Section 106 consultations can and do occur.

SMCAT member: Does ADOT reach out?

Timothy Tait: Typically, FHWA is the lead on those issues and ADOT staff supports them. We have some highly regarded staff that work on those issues and do provide support and are involved in this project.

My support staff, also wanted me to remind you that there are newsletters in the back that go through the public review and comment process and might provide a little more detail and clarity for you.

Where do we go from here? Tonight we talked about W59 and E1 Alternatives and the updates to those. Coming up next, the air quality panel, we will talk about that a little more in a second. We decided some time back, that we would have a two air quality discussions, one before release of the draft and one after release of the draft. We have one general air quality panel without talking specifically about data that reflects this project. After the document is released we would have a second air quality discussion that would be project specific and we would also talk about some other things open for discussion on the DEIS, mitigation measures, action or no action alternatives, then we have the public hearing which is generally placed in the middle of the public comment window, or somewhere around the public comment window and then as we talked before the recommendation from the group sometime after the public hearing. Again, we're trying to arrange it so you have opportunity to review the document and hear what others in the community are saying and have an opportunity to hear what the groups you represent are saying and then we have the end of the public review period, which is subject to change.

That's the plan ahead, you'll notice one element missing from this chart, and that's the dates. Because the next discussion is focusing on air quality we didn't want to stage that too far in advance of the Draft EIS, we want to have it fresh in our minds before we have review of the document and then we will have the project specific air quality discussion. So we are we going to keep it loose with regard to when we schedule the air quality meeting, and that will let us continue working on identifying and preparing the panelists for both of the groups, of course those on the project specific group, we can't give them the data in advance, but we can help them be ready to receive the data.

We talked before and we actually talked a couple times about potential organizations or people or disciplines to include in an air quality discussion. We just wanted to sort of present it back to you to get any more input, any changes, any discussion before we

continue going out. Some of the people we've had some very introductory comments with but most we have not, so we wanted to get feedback before we reached out to folks and started trying to firm up our panels.

SMCAT member: Can you tell us who you have already reached out to?

Timothy Tait: No, because it's been a really long time. Of course the agencies we've had contact with, like EPA, we've contacted, and they've expressed interest so far. Most of the private organizations and ASU [Arizona State University] we haven't reached out to yet.

So if you come up with other folks and certainly no one has to take out their address book right now, but let us know in the next couple of weeks who we should be talking to. And as much as you can, if you have personal relationships with people in this area, help us to pave that road. Certainly we don't want a panel with 25 people on it, we want to have folks that are best aligned with the interests and needs of the group, any help you can offer would be good in getting a panel that would serve your needs.

SMCAT member: Would you take anyone from these agencies, not just any individual?

Timothy Tait: I think it's up to the agency to decide who the appropriate representative is.

SMCAT member: I was just wondering if there is someone who knows the Clean Air Act?

Timothy Tait: Someone other than EPA?

SMCAT member: I'm really curious if our PM₁₀ plan is denied, and sanctions are triggered what the impacts might be.

Timothy Tait: There are several agencies involved in that and we can work to try and identify them. Probably should be people who specifically can talk about that issue, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, since it's such a concern for the state.

SMCAT member: My concerns are more specific than PM₁₀.

Timothy Tait: We sort of have two camps: the MSATs, and PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} issues. That's a little distinct for us, there is certainly information on both of those, and at least for me, I'm interested too.

Tom Keller: I guess that brings us to a point where we were a year ago October, where there is a gap in time now in terms of this particular body being faced with new information and new issues. Tim, any insight you want to provide to us in terms of where we go from tonight until we meet again?

Timothy Tait: One of the commitments that we've always made is that we're not going to waste anyone's time and we're not going to meet just to meet. That's why we believe the gap is appropriate and necessary at this point. I would strongly encourage each of

you to continue researching and studying the proposal, there are lots of documents on the Web site. Talk with the organizations you represent so that once we get rolling again, my sense is that we're going to move and we're going to move quickly through what we have left. Unfortunately, we have this push/pull situation because, quite frankly, the team is quite consumed with preparation of the documents necessary to move this thing forward. We're kind of at that time, where the time for talk is just about over and we have to move. We have to do something with this. And there is several reasons for doing that and one of them is, we can only study something for so long, before you start running into problems, and so we've got to move on this. All of the efforts are going to that forward momentum, so you can help us with that by remaining engaged in the process and continuing to support your own fact finding. And of course, we're going to continue to do what we've been trying to do and give us feedback on that, and we're staying in regular contact with you, answering questions, and continue working with Fred and Tom even though we may not meet for awhile. And we will give you regular updates with what has been going on in the interim, just because we're not going to meet for awhile doesn't mean we won't be giving information.

SMCAT member: With that statement in mind, and you suggesting we continue to study and research, there's been some discussion with regard to how we get to the engineers, you want all communication to go to Fred and Tom, you don't want us talking to anyone outside of KCA?

Timothy Tait: The group established a centralized point of contact, part of that was in effort to ensure that everyone had access to the same information. If one question was asked, everyone got the answer, and part of that was because as a study team we were getting the same themed questions from three or four people and that's a lot of work. So we're trying to streamline the process and also make it much more consistent for everyone. So yes, keep working with Fred and Tom, if you don't think you're getting the response you need, let me know.

SMCAT member: That doesn't bar us from talking to other people on the team does it?

Timothy Tait: When you send the question to Fred and Tom, they are going to send the question to the people on the team, so instead of getting feedback from one person, you'll get a better response, and that's what you need. What we want to provide when you send us questions, we want to provide responses that we can defend. When you go through Fred and Tom you get an answer that goes through a couple of experts and get an answer that we can stand behind, you're not going to want my view you want the study team's view.

Tom Keller: One of the issues can be how quickly the information gets back to you, one of the things we are talking about is making sure we have no more than a 30-day cycle, now some of the questions may not get answered in 30-days, but that would have happened going through us or not.

SMCAT member: They can BCC so certainly you can deal with that, but that process, doesn't allow you to have a discussion, it stops information in my opinion. You tell me you have the teaching experience, but you learn from a dialogue a back and forth discussion. This system blocks that; it doesn't allow that back and forth communication.

Tom Keller: What you are talking about is different than a Q and A, you're talking about discussion boards and such. What we talked about a year ago was that we would follow the newsletter, 30-day Q and A, if that's no longer sufficient, we need to poll the group when we have a quorum. We still need cooperation of the various bodies to make the discussion valuable to you.

SMCAT member: There are limitations to that system, if we have some side conversations then so be it, I would hope that would be acceptable.

Tom Keller: Our position has always been that as a team we would have transparency, that's why we put the operating agreement together, obviously it's not the best situation but at least it's better than where we were a couple years back.

SMCAT member: Are you doing an evaluation today.

Tom Keller: The forms are not here tonight, however, we are going to get those to you electronically first thing in the morning.

At this point the team stays in place and I will read the questions provided to me so far, there are a number of questions from one individual so I'm going to skip around, when I read your question I'll ask you to raise your hand, the reason for this is so that I know what I'm reading is what you intended.

Public Comment: Back a few years ago you told many Ahwatukee residents at the Grace Inn their homes fell in the right-of-way for this proposed highway. Now I see that you will not be purchasing these homes. When do you plan on notifying these homeowners in Ahwatukee?

Timothy Tait: That issue is actually addressed in the parking lot. We have answer for you there, it will be on the web tonight or tomorrow morning.

Public Question: When will a decision be made on the proposed W59 interchange? Is there a representative for property owners south of the I-10 and 59th Avenue? How will value of property be determined for displaced homeowners?

Timothy Tait: Okay, there were a few questions there. Value of property is determined based on fair market value and we have our right-of-way staff and the property valuation staff in the field right now making those basic assessments for the affected properties on 59th Avenue or at least in that new right-of-way for 59th Avenue. You'd have to ask the group about representation, we can't answer that.

Public Question: The property values are not what they were two years ago. We lost \$100,000 since last year with devaluation. So are you going to give us fair property value by today's prices or by what it actually really was?

Timothy Tait: My understanding is that it's based on today's, the date of assessment, fair market value.

Public Comment: That's not right, because it's not our fault that you're putting in your freeway on our house. It's not our fault that the economy dropped out and we lost \$100,000. So you are going to pay me less than I actually paid for my house when I bought it 23 years ago?

Timothy Tait: That's a situation that we're seeing across the corridor. I don't know that we have options legally that are available to us to remedy that type of situation.

Public Question: Why is there a drainage basin in the SRP right-of-way at the end of the current Pecos Rd? How does SRP feel about this?

Ben Spargo: It's placed there to reroute the water as it comes across the freeway. We would consult with SRP and the landowners, because for the most part, SRP is in their easement. They don't own the land, otherwise they would work out an agreement with SRP to allow us to do that another way. That's something we will be in the process of determining.

Public Question: Can you give dates for completion of each process and review?

Timothy Tait: No, it's not going to happen over night, it's not going to happen this year, we won't have a decision this year.

Public Question: After Ahwatukee receives a 10-year storm, how many gallons of water will be caught in the reservoir? How long will this water be retained along homes? What type of mosquito control will be used during these water retention periods?

Timothy Tait: That's a good question, I think there is probably some interesting information we can share with the group. Let's put that in the parking lot so we can get our drainage engineer to give us a really good answer to that. Looking at the drainage from a map, you get a sense of how wide, how deep, how much water are we talking, that's a different matter.

Public Question: Is there an amount that you can release on GRIC land, because you could actually flood them.

Timothy Tait: The standard we have to meet is the same flows as today. We will have to look at why that is. We will have to look up where that requirement originates and what the genesis of that is. What it might come down to is fair play. If GRIC or any community has come to expect a certain flow of water and changes are made to disrupt that flow, fair play would dictate that the flows be maintained as they were, and not all of a sudden they are flooding out the land.

SMCAT member: But you wouldn't be flooding the land, that's where we're getting this wrong, because prior to development a particular amount of water flowed across. This place has been around for hundreds or thousands of years. This is not a new question, it comes up in land development, and you'll see the City of Phoenix has analysis done by Coe and Van Loo and they had to show post development authority, it's there. And that

standard has been established. So I think what you just described is very different than that, and to a degree almost rewriting.

Timothy Tait: We will research that and put it in the parking lot.

Public Question: The only remediation acceptable on the Pecos alignment to 51st Avenue and now to 59th Avenue and northwest to I-10 is that this be a limited-axle parkway. The only acceptable truck bypass I-10 West to I-10 Southeast, is I-10 to Route 85, to I-8 and to I-10 either west to east or visa-versa; this is the truck by-pass. Not through heavily populated community areas.

SMCAT member: Can I expand on that, one statement to the FHWA, would it be possible to determine if what was described is possible. Can we limit hazardous materials on that road, can we limit truck traffic, can we literally prohibit particular types of truck traffic along that road? And can we prohibit hazardous materials along that road?

Timothy Tait: Typically that is a State-level decision and generally restrictions of that nature are made based on features like tunnels, like hazardous materials can't go through the Deck Park tunnel, they have to use the Durango Curve. There are a few other areas such as the Loop 202 bridge over the Salt River because of the potential for environmental damage to the river below. So usually, it's looking at connections of that nature, but those are typically State-level decisions. This issue will be addressed in the EIS in an expanded form, but it's not something that is currently under consideration.

SMCAT member: Can ADOT make a decision for a federal road?

Timothy Tait: It's not a federal road, there is federal funding involved in the project, but it's not a federal road.

SMCAT member: Can FHWA make those types of decisions too? Can they say it's a limited-axle road or no hazardous material on that road?

Ken Davis, FHWA: That's a State decision.

Public Question: You mention that the profile slide doesn't affect the EIS decision. Doesn't the height of the highway and sound walls have an impact on the sound abatement study? What is the highest elevation of the proposed South Mountain Loop 202 along Ahwatukee. We were told years ago it was approximately 18 feet.

Ben Spargo: You're first statement was true that the profile is taken into account when they do the noise modeling and the air quality modeling and things like that. Profile is not a specific topic of the EIS, but it is taken into account in the analysis. We will cover the elevation and provide that in the parking lot, instead of me trying to generalize the conditions along the freeway. But it still is within that realm, as we go over some of the arterials, the minimum clearance is usually about 16.5 feet so when you add a structure on top of that you get into a freeway being in that 20 to 23 feet above the existing ground.

SMCAT member: Is that due to the three million cubic yards of soil, where is that soil going?

Ben Spargo: A lot of that soil will go to the area as we try and get up into the mountain, because we're not cutting through the bottom of the mountain, but it's mainly due to the drainage. The culvert that we're using to pass the water under the freeway, they have height to them, and you have to grade separate at the arterials. So again, you have to provide a certain elevation difference between the existing arterial and the freeway going over to allow that to safely occur.

Public Question: With Pecos Road being closed for construction of the proposed South Mountain Loop 202, how many years will this pathway be closed while this highway is under construction?

Timothy Tait: Construction for the entire project would be approximately five years. The segment across Pecos Road, I don't know but it's in the current parking lot. You can find that answer on-line on the parking lot. We have to maintain some level of access, we can't simply close all of Pecos Road. There has to be some way to keep traffic moving in the area. So that's part of the Implementation Plan, if a Record of Decision is issued and a build alternative is selected we go to the Implementation Plan and decide how we're going to execute, and traffic management is a big part of that.

Public Question: What person from the City of Phoenix is the one to sign away the land from South Mountain park? How many acres will be removed from the park to construct this proposed highway?

Timothy Tait: The City of Phoenix will not sign away the park, we will go through a condemnation process to acquire the necessary portion of South Mountain Park should that be necessary. About 30 acres of park would be required, which is .02 percent of the total park.

SMCAT member: When does this happen in the EIS process?

Timothy Tait: This comes after the final decision and that's the point when we go out and start purchasing property and we go through all those processes once we have the final decision.

SMCAT member: There is a small portion of land going through South Mountain, and it always seems that gets left out. There is a far larger bunch of private property to the south that ADOT never seems to talk about what's going to happen to that. There will be access questions and that will likely be one of the more sensitive issues than some of the area that you're taking out of the preserve. So I still think there are tons of open ended questions about what's going on there that has never been answered. I just wanted to get that on the record.

Timothy Tait: I think you're right, and we've always been upfront about the fact that we're not big fans of having to cut through any mountain. As part of NEPA and part of the EIS we have to pay special attention to the preserve area. The other parcels are private property and those could be developed; however, the private owner wants to

develop them. So we're not thrilled having to go through those portions, but the park preserve area that we are required to pay the most attention, and if feasible and reasonable we have to avoid.

SMCAT member: I understand, but there are still a lot of issues with private land that we tend to skip over.

SMCAT member: There is also that acreage that isn't huge, although it's important, and I assume it will be addressed in the Draft EIS, like all the indirect impacts on the much larger area.

Tom Keller: This concludes the Q and A session of the formal agenda, it is almost 8 o'clock and we're planning on adjourning anyway. As Tim suggested we appreciate continued communication both forward and backwards. If you provide information to us, we will make sure it gets to the appropriate folks. If something is time sensitive please let us know and we will do our very best to facilitate that moving forward. Normally, at this time I ask for a motion to adjourn, but tonight I don't have to do that, so thank you everyone we appreciate your time.

Meeting ended at 8:02PM