



1 **3.3 Land Use and Section 6(f)**

2 **3.3.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS**

3 The Draft Tier 1 EIS examined the following existing land use, future/planned land use, and  
4 special designated lands within the I-11 Corridor Study Area (Study Area).

Existing/Planned Land Use:

- Residential
- Agriculture
- Tribal Lands
- Commercial
- Industrial
- Mixed Use
- Office
- Recreation/Open Space
- Public/Private Institutions
- Transportation/Parking
- Vacant
- Unclassified
- Waterbodies

Special Designated Lands:

- Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (Bureau of Land Management [BLM])
- National Monument (BLM)
- Roadless Area (US Forest Service [USFS])
- Deeded Lands (Reclamation)
- State Wildlife Area (Arizona Game and Fish Department [AGFD])
- Wilderness (BLM)
- Wilderness (National Park Service [NPS])
- Wilderness (USFS)

5  
6 FHWA and ADOT quantified existing and planned land uses within each of the 2,000-foot-wide  
7 corridors. Existing land uses were based on data (geographic information system [GIS]  
8 shapefiles) from the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), Pima Association of  
9 Governments (PAG), and Santa Cruz County general and comprehensive plans. Planned land  
10 uses were based on data from MAG, Pinal County, and Santa Cruz County. Yavapai County  
11 does not maintain existing or planned land use data. Land use categories are not consistent  
12 among these plans; therefore, ADOT grouped designations as shown in **Table 3.3-1** and **Table**  
13 **3.3-2**. The tables display how inconsistencies in land use designations were present between  
14 the different data sources and between existing and planned land use designations from the  
15 same source. Designations were grouped to provide a better overall picture of general land use  
16 categories.

17 All the Build Corridor Alternatives would impact land use and special designated lands. Impacts  
18 would include the conversion of existing land use to the transportation facility. The Project could  
19 result in an increase in development density near and in the vicinity of I-11 interchanges. The  
20 actual effects and their magnitude cannot be determined during the Tier 1 phase of the project.  
21 Additional factors such as the timing of future construction and overall urban development,  
22 identified and planned by local governments, within the Study Area would also impact changes  
23 to land use and special designated lands.

24 Section 6(f) properties were evaluated to ensure compliance with the Land and Water  
25 Conservation Fund Act (LWCFA) of 1965 (16 United States Code [U.S.C.] 4601-4 to 4601-11 et  
26 seq.). The Draft Tier 1 EIS summarized the impacts to Section 6(f) properties and concluded  
27 that the Green and Orange Alternatives would have similar impacts on Section 6(f) resources  
28 (Buckeye Hills Regional Park). The Purple Alternative would not affect Section 6(f) properties.



1

**Table 3.3-1. Draft Tier 1 EIS Existing Land Use Designations**

Existing Land Use Designation	Draft Tier 1 EIS Land Use Designation
<b>Maricopa Association of Governments</b>	
Single Family Medium Density – 1 to 4 dwelling units/acre	Residential
Agriculture	Agriculture
Commercial High – Community Retail/Regional Retail	Commercial
Industrial	Industrial
Mixed Use	Mixed Use
Business Park	Office
Passive/Restricted Open Space/Undevelopable	Recreation/Open Space
Public/Special Event/Military	Public/Private Institutions
Transportation	Transportation/Parking
Vacant	Vacant
Water	Waterbodies
<b>Pima Association of Governments</b>	
Residential	Residential
Agriculture	Agriculture
Commercial	Commercial
Industrial	Industrial
Miscellaneous <sup>a</sup>	
Vacant Land	Vacant
Miscellaneous <sup>a</sup>	Unclassified
Blank	
<b>Santa Cruz County</b>	
Residential	Residential
Agriculture	Agriculture
Commercial	Commercial
Industrial	Industrial
Vacant Land	Vacant
Miscellaneous	Unclassified
Blank	

2  
3

<sup>a</sup> Pima County Association of Governments' GIS shapefile data contain two Miscellaneous categories. One was designated in the Draft Tier 1 EIS as Industrial and the other as Unclassified.

1

**Table 3.3-2. Draft Tier 1 EIS Planned Land Use Designations**

Planned Land Use Designation	Draft Tier 1 EIS Land Use Designation
<b>Maricopa Association of Governments</b>	
Single Family Medium Density – 1 to 4 dwelling units/acre	Residential
Agriculture	Agriculture
Commercial High – Community Retail/Regional Retail	Commercial
Industrial	Industrial
Mixed Use	Mixed Use
Business Park	Office
Passive/Restricted Open Space/Undevelopable	Recreation/Open Space
Public/Special Event/Military	Public/Private Institutions
Transportation	Transportation/Parking
Vacant	Vacant
Water	Waterbodies
<b>Pima Association of Governments</b>	
Residential	Residential
Medium Intensity Rural/Low Intensity Rural	
Tribal	Tribal
Commercial	Unclassified
Industrial	Industrial
Resource Transition/Park	
Resource Extraction	
Neighborhood Activity Center/Community Activity Center	Public/Private Institutions
Public/Institutional	
Transportation	Transportation/Parking
<b>Pinal County</b>	
Residential	Residential
Commercial	Commercial
Employment	Office
Park	Recreation/Open Space
General Public Facilities/Services	Public/Private Institutions
Airport Reserve	Transportation/Parking
<b>Santa Cruz County</b>	
Residential	Residential
Agriculture	Agriculture
Commercial	Commercial
Industrial	Industrial

Planned Land Use Designation	Draft Tier 1 EIS Land Use Designation
Vacant Land	Vacant
Miscellaneous	Unclassified
Blank	

1 **3.3.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS**

2 **3.3.2.1 Land Use Plans**

3 Based on agency and public feedback on the Draft Tier 1 EIS, the Project Team reviewed  
 4 updated land use plans. Comprehensive and general plans provide broad guidelines as to a  
 5 community’s goals and aspirations in terms of growth and land development. The plans express  
 6 and regulate public policies on transportation, utilities, land use, recreation, and housing. Each  
 7 were subject to public review before a city or county could adopt. **Table 3.3-3** lists the land use  
 8 plans that the Project Team used to identify land use categories, including special designated  
 9 lands and Section 6(f) properties. Updates to those plans did not result in the need to update  
 10 information, methodology, or data presented in the Draft Tier 1 EIS, or used to complete  
 11 analyses for the Final Tier 1 EIS. Additional details are found in **Appendix E3** (Land Use and  
 12 Section 6(f) Technical Memorandum) of the Draft Tier 1 EIS.

13 Several resource agencies, including BLM and Reclamation, requested that the Tier 1 EIS  
 14 include a comprehensive list of federal, state, and local plans. The local and county  
 15 comprehensive and general land use plans reviewed for the Tier 1 EIS are listed in **Table 3.3-3**.  
 16 Many state, local, and regional transportation plans were reviewed during the alternatives  
 17 development process (Draft Tier 1 EIS **Chapter 1** [Purpose and Need] and **Chapter 2**  
 18 [Alternatives Considered]). Tier 2 will include a comprehensive review of applicable federal,  
 19 state, and local laws, policies, and plans and ADOT will coordinate with appropriate land-  
 20 managing agencies during Tier 2 analysis to identify applicable laws, policies, and plans. This  
 21 coordination may include a review of local resource management plans and modifications to  
 22 those plans.

23 **Table 3.3-3. Land Use Plans**

Plan	Year Adopted	Year Updated	I-11 Consistency with Plan	
			Recommended Alternative	Preferred Alternative
City of Buckeye General Plan	2008	2019	X <sup>a</sup>	X <sup>a</sup>
City of Casa Grande General Plan	2009	–	X	X
City of Eloy General Plan	2011	2019	X	X
City of Goodyear General Plan	2014	–	X	X
City of Nogales General Plan	2011	–	X	X
City of South Tucson Comprehensive Plan	2011	–	X	X
City of Tucson General and Sustainability Plan	2013	–	X	X
Maricopa County Comprehensive Plan	2016	–	X	X

Plan	Year Adopted	Year Updated	I-11 Consistency with Plan	
			Recommended Alternative	Preferred Alternative
MAG Interstate 10/Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study <sup>b</sup>	2007	–	–	–
MAG Interstate 8 and Interstate 10 Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study <sup>b</sup>	2009	–	X	X
Pima Prospers Comprehensive Plan	2015	–	X	X
Pinal County Comprehensive Plan	2009	2019	X	X
Santa Cruz County Comprehensive Plan	2016	–	X	X
Town of Gila Bend General Plan	2017	–	X	X
Town of Marana General Plan	2011	2019	– <sup>c</sup>	X <sup>c</sup>
Town of Sahuarita General Plan	2015	2019	–	X <sup>d</sup>
Town of Wickenburg General Plan	2013	–	X	X
Yavapai County Comprehensive Plan	2012	–	X	X

- 1 <sup>a</sup> “The City prefers a slightly modified version of the purple alternative, which is detailed further in the transportation master plan.”
- 2 (City of Buckeye General Plan)
- 3 <sup>b</sup> See discussion in **Section 6.4.5.1** (Western Maricopa County Area).
- 4 <sup>c</sup> Location of Preferred Alternative I-10 Connector is more compatible with Marana’s General Plan than the Recommended
- 5 Alternative I-10 Connector.
- 6 <sup>d</sup> East Option in Pima County

7 **3.3.2.2 Pima County Conservation Lands System**

8 Pima County, the US Department of the Interior (DOI), and the Coalition for Sonoran Desert  
 9 Protection requested that Pima County’s Conservation Lands System be considered an affected  
 10 resource. Pima County adds lands to this system by purchasing land outright, placing  
 11 easements upon, or zoning land for the purposes of conservation, floodplain protection, or open  
 12 space. Some lands are broad geographic areas with multiple parcels that are not all owned by  
 13 Pima County. The Conservation Lands System is a living, ever-changing tool because Pima  
 14 County is adding lands to this program on an ongoing basis. It has guided county land use  
 15 planning since first integrated into Pima County’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan in 2001, and it  
 16 has been included in each subsequent update.

17 **Section 3.14** (Biological Resources) of the Final Tier 1 EIS discusses potential impacts to Pima  
 18 County’s Conservation Lands System from the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives and  
 19 includes a Tier 2 commitment (T2-Biological Resources-6) to further analyze impacts as part of  
 20 Tier 2 studies.

21 Properties formally designated publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife  
 22 and waterfowl refuge of national, state, or local significance, or land of a historic site of national,  
 23 state, or local significance, meet the requirements for protection by Section 4(f), as discussed in  
 24 **Chapter 4** (Draft Preliminary Section 4(f) Evaluation). Lands within the Pima County  
 25 Conservation Lands System were not evaluated to determine whether the lands qualify as  
 26 Section 4(f) properties.



1 **3.3.2.3 Land Use Categories**

2 Following review of the Draft Tier 1 EIS, FHWA and ADOT grouped some land use designations  
3 differently than in the Draft Tier 1 EIS to provide a more streamlined comparison of uses across  
4 alternatives. The groupings for the Draft Tier 1 EIS are shown in **Table 3.3-1** and **Table 3.3-2**  
5 and the groupings for the Final Tier 1 EIS are shown in **Table 3.3-4**.

6 **Table 3.3-4. Changes to Existing and Planned Land Use Categories between the**  
7 **Draft and Final Tier 1 EIS**

Draft Tier 1 EIS Land Use Designation (Existing and Planned)	Final Tier 1 EIS Land Use Designation (Existing and Planned)
Residential	Residential
Agriculture	Agriculture
Tribal Lands	Tribal Lands
Industrial	Industrial
Commercial	Commercial
Mixed Use	
Office	
Recreation/Open Space	Recreation/Open Space
Public/Private Institutions	Public/Private Institutions
Vacant	Vacant
Transportation/Parking	Unclassified
Unclassified	
Waterbodies	

8 **3.3.3 No Build Alternative**

9 The No Build Alternative would not directly impact existing land uses, planned land uses, or  
10 special designated land within the Study Area. The No Build Alternative would include  
11 programmed improvements to the regional transportation system that are in ADOT’s federally  
12 approved State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Additionally, the No Build  
13 Alternative would not reflect the long-term land use plans in long-range planning documents  
14 (general and comprehensive plans) that are oriented around proposed new highway corridors,  
15 such as the West Pinal Freeway, Hassayampa Freeway, SR 303L extension, and SR 30  
16 extension (as discussed in **Section 3.3.1.3** [Affected Environment] of the Draft Tier 1 EIS). The  
17 No Build Alternative is not consistent with Study Area land use plans, nor would it address the  
18 need for additional roadway capacity to serve the projected increase in traffic from population  
19 and employment growth in and adjacent to the Study Area.

20 The No Build Alternative would not affect any outdoor recreational use of Section 6(f) property.

21 **3.3.4 Recommended Alternative**

22 This section provides a high-level overview of the Recommended Alternative and the impacts  
23 on existing and planned land use, land management, special designated lands, and Section 6(f)



1 properties. The acreage of each type of existing and planned land use is shown in **Table 3.3-5**  
2 and **Table 3.3-6**, respectively. The acreage of land management and special designated lands  
3 is shown in **Table 3.3-7**.

4 No portion of a Section 6(f) property falls within the Recommended Alternative. Therefore, no  
5 portions of a Section 6(f) property would be converted to uses other than for public outdoor  
6 recreation under the Recommended Alternative.

7 **3.3.5 Preferred Alternative**

8 This section provides a high-level overview of the Preferred Alternative and the impacts on  
9 existing and planned land use, land management, special designated lands, and Section 6(f)  
10 properties. The acreage of each type of existing and planned land use is shown in **Table 3.3-5**  
11 and **Table 3.3-6**, respectively. The acreage of land management and special designated lands  
12 is shown in **Table 3.3-7**.

13 **Table 3.3-5. Summary of Existing Land Use in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the**  
14 **Recommended and Preferred Alternatives**

Existing Land Use <sup>a</sup>	Recommended Alternative (acres)	Preferred Alternative with West Option in Pima County (acres)	Preferred Alternative with East Option in Pima County (acres)
Residential	3,776	3,206	2,602
Agriculture	6,024	3,308	3,239
Industrial	1,123	1,037	1,074
Commercial	1,518	1,481	2,743
Recreation/Open Space	1,076	5,477	5,477 <sup>b</sup>
Public/Private Institutions	51	23	23
Vacant	30,368	26,948	19,379
Unclassified	3,223	4,159	5,822

15 Source: Maricopa Association of Governments, Pima Association of Governments, Santa Cruz County, AECOM

16 NOTE: Pinal County and Yavapai County do not maintain existing land use data.

17 <sup>a</sup> The current alignment of I-19 bisects tribal land associated with the Tohono O’odham Nation and Pascua Yaqui tribal land located  
18 east of the I-10/I-19 system interchange. Tribes are sovereign nations that did not grant FHWA and ADOT permission to study  
19 transportation corridors on their land. Widening on I-19 in this area would occur in the median between existing travel lanes, as  
20 shown on the concept engineering drawings in **Appendix E1** (Conceptual Drawings) of the Draft Tier 1 EIS.

21 <sup>b</sup> The Pima Association of Governments dataset codes many parks (including Santa Cruz Park) as BLANK within their dataset.  
22 These parks are included in the Unclassified category.

23 **Table 3.3-6. Summary of Planned Land Use in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the**  
24 **Recommended and Preferred Alternatives**

Planned Land Use	Recommended Alternative (acres)	Preferred Alternative with West Option in Pima County (acres)	Preferred Alternative with East Option in Pima County (acres)
Residential	37,929	31,817	26,239
Agriculture	1,217	1,217	1,217
Tribal Lands	0	0	0 <sup>a</sup>

Planned Land Use	Recommended Alternative (acres)	Preferred Alternative with West Option in Pima County (acres)	Preferred Alternative with East Option in Pima County (acres)
Industrial	5,643	1,302	3,402
Commercial	7,072	8,275	9,332
Recreation/Open Space	6,510	15,013	11,622
Public/Private Institutions	478	817	1,122
Vacant <sup>b</sup>	1,481	1,481	1,481
Unclassified	3,707	4,408	6,092

1 Source: Maricopa Association of Governments, Pima Association of Governments, Pinal County, Santa Cruz County, AECOM  
 2 NOTE: Planned land uses are likely to evolve and change, depending on market demand and community needs. Acreages  
 3 calculated within the 2,000-foot-wide corridors are based on current general or comprehensive plans and may not reflect actual land  
 4 uses in the future. Yavapai County does not maintain planned land use data.

5 <sup>a</sup> The current alignment of I-19 bisects tribal land associated with the Tohono O’odham Nation and Pascua Yaqui tribal land located  
 6 east of the I-10/I-19 system interchange. Tribes are sovereign nations that did not grant FHWA and ADOT permission to study  
 7 transportation corridors on their land. Widening on I-19 in this area would occur in the median between existing travel lanes, as  
 8 shown on the concept engineering drawings in **Appendix E1** (Conceptual Drawings) of the Draft Tier 1 EIS.

9 <sup>b</sup> Per direction from Santa Cruz County, the same land uses are illustrated for existing and planned scenarios.

10 **Table 3.3-7. Summary of Land Management and Special Designated Lands in the**  
 11 **2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives**

Land Management	Recommended Alternative (acres)	Preferred Alternative with West Option in Pima County (acres)	Preferred Alternative with East Option in Pima County (acres)
<b>Ownership<sup>a</sup></b>			
BLM	6,415	10,861	10,323
National Forest	0	0	0
NPS	0	0	0
Military	0	0	0
Private Land	40,939	38,596	39,999
Reclamation <sup>a</sup>	12	12	0
State Trust Land	12,629	17,241	12,487
Tribal Land	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>59,995</b>	<b>66,710</b>	<b>62,809</b>
<b>Special Designated Lands</b>			
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (BLM)	852	1,084	1,084
National Monument (BLM)	0	0	0
Roadless Area (USFS)	0	0	0
Deeded Lands (Reclamation) <sup>a, b</sup>	566	566	0
State Wildlife Area (AGFD)	43	278	278
Wilderness (BLM)	0	0	0



Land Management	Recommended Alternative (acres)	Preferred Alternative with West Option in Pima County (acres)	Preferred Alternative with East Option in Pima County (acres)
Wilderness (NPS)	0	0	0
Wilderness (USFS)	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,461</b>	<b>1,928</b>	<b>1,362</b>

<sup>a</sup> Ownership acreages were calculated using the Ownership dataset from the Arizona State Land Department (2016), while Specially Designated Lands were calculated using source data provided by the individual agencies listed above; therefore, total Reclamation acres differ.

<sup>b</sup> Includes the Tucson Mitigation Corridor.

The east option in Pima County could impact four Section 6(f) properties. Approximately 131 acres of the Santa Cruz River Park, 0.9 acre of the Francisco Elias Esquer Park, 2 acres of the Rillito Vista Neighborhood Park, and 184 acres of the Buckeye Hills Regional Park fall within the 2,000-foot-wide corridor of the east option. Only 184 acres of the Buckeye Hills Regional Park fall within the 2,000-foot-wide corridor of the west option.

### 3.3.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis

#### 3.3.6.1 Tier 2 Analysis Commitments

FHWA and ADOT completed an initial level of analysis in this Final Tier 1 EIS to identify a 2,000-foot-wide preferred Build Corridor Alternative. Additional analysis in Tier 2 will inform (1) the selection of a specific alignment (approximately 400 feet wide) within the selected 2,000-foot-wide corridor and (2) the selection of the west option or east option in Pima County. Tier 2 analysis will also identify measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate land use impacts. Specifically, ADOT commits to carrying out the following analysis during the Tier 2 process:

- **T2-LandUse-1:** Conduct environmental studies to identify specific effects to property, zoning regulations, neighborhoods, or community facilities to determine needed acquisitions, easements, and displacements.
- **T2-LandUse-2:** Complete a Final Section 6(f) Evaluation to assess the ability of the Tier 2 Selected Alternative to avoid or minimize impacts to protected properties and identify specific mitigation measures to offset the remaining impacts.
- **T2-LandUse-3:** Plan the specific alignment and locations of traffic interchanges in coordination with local government entities and with public input to address transportation needs and to minimize the potential for land use conflicts. Also see MM-Section 4(f)-7.

#### 3.3.6.2 Mitigation Commitments

As required by NEPA, FHWA and ADOT considered measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate land use impacts from the Project (generally referred to as mitigation measures) during this Tier 1 process. Specific mitigation that ADOT is committing to implement if a Build Alternative is selected includes:



- 1 • **MM-LandUse-1:** Avoid or minimize impacts to Section 6(f) properties. Coordinate with  
2 agencies that have jurisdiction over Section 6(f) properties. If Section 6(f) properties cannot  
3 be avoided, ADOT will identify replacement land.

4 **3.3.6.3 Additional Mitigation to be Evaluated in Tier 2**

5 During the Tier 2 process, ADOT will evaluate mitigation measures in addition to those listed  
6 above, to include best practices, permit requirements, and/or other mitigation strategies  
7 suggested by agencies or the public. Examples of measures that ADOT may evaluate in Tier 2  
8 include:

- 9 • Be an active partner in a broader effort with Metropolitan Planning Organizations, local  
10 jurisdictions, resource agencies, and private stakeholders to cooperatively plan development  
11 in the I-11 Project Area.
- 12 • Coordinate planning for wildlife connectivity, local land use planning, and context-sensitive  
13 design. The White Tank Conservancy may be a model for this type of effort, which also  
14 could include coordination with Pima County on the implementation of the *Sonoran Desert*  
15 *Conservation Plan* (Pima County 2016b).
- 16 • Define alignments that do not use park properties.
- 17 • Incorporate refinement details, such as retaining walls, to minimize the I-11 footprint.
- 18 • If necessary, pursue an amendment to applicable resource management plans to grant  
19 right-of-way or otherwise permit construction of an interstate highway through BLM lands.  
20 The project would not use property designated as a national monument (Ironwood Forest  
21 National Monument or the Sonoran Desert National Monument).

22