

Appendix B: Correspondence Received from Participating Agencies

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Submission	Method	Attachment	Tracking ID
Huckelberry	Chuck	Pima County	<p>Good afternoon I-11 Tier 1 EIS Study Team, The attached communication is being submitted to you on behalf of Pima County Administrator, Chuck Huckelberry. Respectfully submitted, ~Monica Monica Perez Chief Assistant to Pima County</p> <p>Dear I-11 Tier 1 EIS Study Team: Pima County appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Interstate 11 Corridor Tier 1 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). We very much appreciate the agencies' consideration of the supplemental information regarding Pima County 4(f) properties that we submitted on December 6, 2019. We are very pleased the agencies have agreed to consider 9 of the 15 parks, recreation areas, and wildlife refuges that were submitted for consideration under Section 4(f), which are listed in Section 4.5.1.2 of the FEIS. We look forward to further consultation with FHWA and ADOT during Tier 2 studies regarding these properties as well as additional discussion regarding the reasons for omitting the other six properties from consideration. We also want to thank FHWA and ADOT for acknowledging Pima County's role in the management of the Tucson Mitigation Corridor (TMC) and the fact that "any development other than wildlife habitat improvements require agreement by Reclamation, Arizona Game and Fish Department, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Pima County." (FEIS Appendix H3, Response ID No. PA-11-4.) Should Tier 2 studies include the west option of the preferred alternative, we look forward to coordinating with FHWA and ADOT on those studies for the TMC, along with the other managing agencies. As you are aware, the Pima County Board of Supervisors in 2007 passed a resolution in opposition to "any new highways" that would effectively bypass Interstate 10, due to impacts that "could not be adequately mitigated". This resolution, however, supported continuation of studies to bring forth the "full costs of mitigation measures". The Pima County Board of Supervisors today passed a new resolution in opposition to the West Option of the Preferred Alternative due in part to the belief that impacts to the East Option (I-10 corridor) can in fact be mitigated (Attachment 1). This position and additional written comments are provided as Attachment 2 to this letter for the agencies' consideration as they move forward on the Tier 2 studies and draft environmental impact statement.</p>	email	Huckelberry_PimaCo_1846	1846
Huckelberry	Chuck	Pima County	<p>Dear I-11 Tier 1 EIS Study Team: Pima County appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Interstate 11 Corridor Tier 1 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). We very much appreciate the agencies' consideration of the supplemental information regarding Pima County 4(f) properties that we submitted on December 6, 2019. We are very pleased the agencies have agreed to consider 9 of the 15 parks, recreation areas, and wildlife refuges that were submitted for consideration under Section 4(f), which are listed in Section 4.5.1.2 of the FEIS. We look forward to further consultation with FHWA and ADOT during Tier 2 studies regarding these properties as well as additional discussion regarding the reasons for omitting the other six properties from consideration. We also want to thank FHWA and ADOT for acknowledging Pima County's role in the management of the Tucson Mitigation Corridor (TMC) and the fact that "any development other than wildlife habitat improvements require agreement by Reclamation, Arizona Game and Fish Department, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Pima County." (FEIS Appendix H3, Response ID No. PA-11-4.) Should Tier 2 studies include the west option of the preferred alternative, we look forward to coordinating with FHWA and ADOT on those studies for the TMC, along with the other managing agencies. As you are aware, the Pima County Board of Supervisors in 2007 passed a resolution in opposition to "any new highways" that would effectively bypass Interstate 10, due to impacts that "could not be adequately mitigated". This resolution, however, supported continuation of studies to bring forth the "full costs of mitigation measures". The Pima County Board of Supervisors today passed a new resolution in opposition to the West Option of the Preferred Alternative due in part to the belief that impacts to the East Option (-10 corridor) can in fact be mitigated (Attachment 1). This position and additional written comments are provided as Attachment 2 to this letter for the agencies' consideration as they move forward on the Tier 2 studies and draft environmental impact statement. Sincerely, C.H. Huckelberry County Administrator</p>	mail	Huckelberry_PimaCo_2588	2588
Lindstrom	Shane	San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District	<p>As SCIDD has referenced many times in the past, SCIDD has numerous open-channel canals, piped laterals and groundwater wells within the I-11 Corridor Study Area. Due to the 2,000 foot corridor, obviously specific impacts cannot be quantified at this time. Any crossing or impact to the SCIDD system will require engineering review to ensure SCIDD can properly operate and maintain the irrigation system. This could very likely result in the need for improvements to the irrigation system if the new I-11 roadway impacts our operations and/or maintenance activities. Additionally, construction oversight by SCIDD is mandated on any construction project that impacts our system. These impacts will require a negotiated resolution with all costs incurred by SCIDD to be compensated by the State. This includes, but is not limited to all SCIDD administrative, design, design review, and construction related expenses. Additionally, all crossings of the BIA-San Carlos Irrigation Project easement will require an encroachment permit from the BIA. Best Regards, Shane Lindstrom, General Manager San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District 120 S. 3rd Street Coolidge, AZ 85128 Office: 520-723-5408 ex 15 Cell: 520-251-1552</p>	Email		2549
Lorefice	Vince	Town of Wickenburg	<p>From: Tim Suan <tsuan@wickenburgaz.org> Date: Thu, Aug 5, 2021 at 1:25 PM Subject: WICKENBURG -COMMENT Tim Suan Deputy Town Manager Economic Development</p>	Email	Lorefice_Wickenburg_0893	893

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Submission	Method	Attachment	Tracking ID
			<p>155 N. Tegner St., Suite A Wickenburg, AZ 85390 928.668.0522 tsuan@wickenburgaz.org</p> <hr/> <p>August 2, 2021 Dallas Hammit State Engineer Arizona Department of Transportation 206 S 17th Ave MD 102A Phoenix, AZ 85007 RE: I-11 Final Tier 1 Environmental Impact Comment— Wickenburg, AZ</p> <p>Dear Mr. Hammit, The Wickenburg Mayor's I-11 Task Force met on May 30, 2019 to consider the different alternatives proposed by ADOT in the Draft Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement and Preliminary Section 4(f) Evaluation. The Task Force unanimously agreed that these alignments are not in the best interest of the Town of Wickenburg. As a result, they recommended to the Town Council that a new, preferred alternative be considered to ensure the best possible outcome for the Town of Wickenburg in regards to visibility, future economic development, ease of annexation, extension of public utilities and mitigation of sound pollution. On June 17, 2019, the Wickenburg Town Council deliberated and adopted Resolution No. 2229: a Resolution of the Common Council of the Town of Wickenburg, Arizona, Authorizing Official Support of a Preferred Alignment of Interstate 11. This resolution states: The Town of Wickenburg supports a preferred Interstate 11 alternative that connects at US60 at mile post 102 just West of Black Mountain that would connect near mile post 186 on SR93, as illustrated in exhibit A (attached). Please note that once the alignment connects at US60 the Town supports pushing the roadway towards the west to avoid sound/sight concerns with our residents and surrounding community members. The Town of Wickenburg kindly requests that this preferred Interstate 11 alternative be considered in future studies, assessments and analyses. Furthermore, the Town kindly requests that its desires be advocated for in regards to Interstate 11 in the general Wickenburg area. Thank you in advance for your attention to this important issue. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns. Sincerely, Vince Lorefice Town Manager</p> <hr/> <p>A RESOLUTION OF THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WICKENBURG, ARIZONA, AUTHORIZING OFFICIAL SUPPORT OF A PREFERRED ALIGNMENT OF INTERSTATE 11 WHEREAS, the Town of Wickenburg and the Arizona Department of Transportation have enjoyed a long and productive relationship in providing excellent public facilities for the benefit of Arizona residents; and WHEREAS, the United States Interstate 11 is located in the Northwest District of the Arizona Department of Transportation, which also includes the Town of Wickenburg; and WHEREAS, the final alignment of Interstate 11 is yet to be determined; and WHEREAS, the Town Council, on May 1, 2017, adopted a resolution supporting the I— 11 Design Report from the Sonoran Institute; and WHEREAS, in December, 2017, the Arizona Department of Transportation released its Alternatives Selection Report detailing different alignments of the proposed Interstate 11 to be located west of the Wickenburg Town Limits; and WHEREAS, the Mayor's I—11 Task Force convened on May 30, 2019 to consider the different alternatives and recommend a preferred alternative to the Wickenburg Town Council; and , WHEREAS, the Mayor's I-11 Task Force desires to ensure best possible outcomes for the Town of Wickenburg in regards to visibility, future economic development, ease of annexation, extension of public utilities, mitigation of sound pollution; and WHEREAS, the Mayor's I—11 Task Force recommended a preferred alternative that connects at US-60 at mile post 103.5 just East of Black Mountain that would connect near mile post 186 on SR-93, as illustrated in exhibit A (attached). Please note that once the alignment connects at US—60 the Town supports pushing the roadway towards the west to avoid sound/sight concerns with our residents and surrounding community members, as generally illustrated in exhibit A. NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND COMMON COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WICKENBURG, ARIZONA, AS FOLLOWS: SECTION 1. The Town of Wickenburg supports a preferred Interstate 11 alternative that intersection US—60 at mile post 102 and connects to SR—93 near mile post 186, as illustrated in exhibit A. SECTION 2. This resolution should be forwarded to all appropriate Federal, State and Local governmental and non-governmental agencies actively engaged in the Interstate 11 project. SECTION 3. The various Town officers and employees are authorized and directed to perform all acts necessary or desirable to give effect to this resolution. PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WICKENBURG, ARIZONA THIS 17th DAY OF JUNE 2019. APPROVED this 17th day of June 2019 Rui Pereira, Mayor [Signatures, Certification, and Map included with attachment.]</p>			
Marriotti	AC	Town of Sahuarita	<p>Good morning, Please see attached letter. This letter provides the Town's position on the Interstate 11 Final Tier 1 EIS. A hard copy of the letter is also being sent to your office.</p> <hr/> <p>This letter is being submitted to provide ADOT with the Town's position on the Interstate 11 Final Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as part of the EIS public review and comment period. The Sahuarita Town Council held a special meeting on August 10, 2021 to hear from the public and provide feedback on the EIS. The meeting was well attended—standing room only—by residents, many who have lived in the Town for decades. The Town submitted a letter to ADOT on July 3, 2019 to provide a public record and feedback as part of the Draft Tier 1 EIS public review and comment process. The letter expressed concerns about community impacts, neighborhood continuity, and the rural, desert feel of the community, especially as it pertained to the west alternative under consideration.</p>	email	Marriotti_Sahuarita_1374	1374

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Submission	Method	Attachment	Tracking ID
			In the Final Tier 1 EIS, the west preferred alternative connects to Interstate 19 in Sahuarita further north than what was reflected in the Draft Tier 1 EIS. Although this new western alignment is an improvement, it does not adequately alleviate the Town's concerns conveyed earlier. Public sentiment expressed during the aforementioned meeting was clear. Those attending were unified in their opposition to the proposed west alternative. Moreover, the Town Council Members unanimously voted (4-0) to express that the Town Council is "strongly opposed" to the proposed west alternative.			
Marriotti	A.C.	Town of Sahuarita	<p>Interstate 11 Tier 1 EIS Study Team c/o ADOT Communications 1655 W. Jackson Street, Mail Drop 126F Phoenix, Arizona 85007</p> <p>This letter is being submitted to provide ADOT with the Town's position on the Interstate 11 Final Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as part of the EIS public review and comment period. The Sahuarita Town Council held a special meeting on August 10, 2021 to hear from the public and provide feedback on the EIS. The meeting was well attended-standing room only-by residents, many who have lived in the Town for decades.</p> <p>The Town submitted a letter to ADOT on July 3, 2019 to provide a public record and feedback as part of the Draft Tier 1 EIS public review and comment process. The letter expressed concerns about community impacts, neighborhood continuity, and the rural, desert feel of the community, especially as it pertained to the west alternative under consideration.</p> <p>In the Final Tier 1 EIS, the west preferred alternative connects to Interstate 19 in Sahuarita further north than what was reflected in the Draft Tier 1 EIS. Although this new western alignment is an improvement, it does not adequately alleviate the Town's concerns conveyed earlier. Public sentiment expressed during the aforementioned meeting was clear. Those attending were unified in their opposition to the proposed west alternative. Moreover, the Town Council Members unanimously voted (4-0) to express that the Town Council is "strongly opposed" to the proposed west alternative.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, A.C. Marriotti Interim Town Manager Phone: (520) 822-8816 Email: amarriotti@SahuaritaAZ.gov</p>	mail	Marriotti_Sahuarita_2593	2593
Ortega	Michael	City of Tucson	<p>Please see the following email correspondence and attachment.</p> <p>Thank you, Andrea Mejia-Flores Management Assistant to: Michael J. Ortega, P.E. - City Manager Liana Perez – Deputy City Manager City Manager's Office City of Tucson 255 W. Alameda Tucson, AZ 85726-7210</p> <hr/> <p>Corridor Dear Ms. Petty,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity for the City of Tucson (City) to review and comment on the Final Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement and Preliminary 4(f) Evaluation for the Interstate 11 Corridor (Final Tier 1 E18). The City of Tucson would like to request a 90-day extension to the public review period to allow for additional community input on the Final Tier 1 EIS for the Interstate 11 (I 1) Corridor. City of Tucson Mayor Regina Romero will also be sending a letter in support of this 90-day extension.</p> <p>The Final Tier 1 EIS Preferred Corridor Alternative carries forward both a "West Option" and an "East Option" through Pima County. The City previously expressed strong opposition to the Draft Tier 1 EIS Green Alternative, which is similar to the "West Option" represented in the Final Tier 1 E18. On June 18, 2019, Tucson's Mayor and Council passed Resolution #23 051 strongly opposing the Draft Tier 1 E18 Green Alternative, which was included as an attachment in the letter dated July 1, 2019.</p> <p>The City continues its strong opposition to any I-11 alignment that travels through Avra Valley, such as the "West Option". On August 10, 2021, Mayor and Council unanimously passed Resolution #23386 reaffirming its strong opposition to the currently proposed "West Option" alignment of I-11, that would have the effect of bypassing the existing Interstate 10. Please find attached a copy of this resolution for inclusion in your Final Tier 1 EIS comments.</p> <p>Tucson's Mayor and City Council declared a Climate Emergency in September 2020 which prioritizes low-carbon transportation options and infrastructure investments. To that end, City of Tucson Mayor Romero, along with other Arizona mayors, recently expressed support for intercity passenger rail service that could meet much of the transportation demand currently utilizing I-10. Additionally, Arizona, and in particular Tucson, is a hub for research and innovation related to self-driving cars and trucks. Tucson recently helped facilitate the expansion of TuSimple and believes these emerging technologies will improve traffic flow and safety on major highways. These factors point to a decreased need for the I-11 highway project, especially as a facility separate from the existing I-10 alignment through Tucson. ADOT and regional planning organizations should continue to monitor these trends to ensure that this costly project is cost effective.</p> <p>According to ADOT's long-range transportation plan for 2040, there is a \$30.5 billion funding shortfall. The City's concern is that a new 50-mile section of interstate highway through Avra Valley will cost billions of dollars, taking away funding for maintenance and upgrades to the existing I-10 and I-19 corridors and other critical mobility enhancements within our region. The City of Tucson asks that ADOT invest in the existing facilities before building new stretches of interstate. As noted in previous comments, the "West Option" does not meet the Purpose and Need of the E18:</p> <p>0 In Population and Employment Growth, please note that connections to Marana and Sahuarita do not constitute connections to the Tucson metropolitan area which is growing at a pace not reflected in the inaccurate population projections provided by the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) for this study. Most of the future population growth is projected to occur in the Tucson urban area based on recent projection models.</p> <p>0 In System Linkages and Regional Mobility and Access to Economic Activity Centers, please note that this alignment bypasses the largest economic driver in Southern Arizona, the City of Tucson. The City requests that ADOT conduct a comprehensive Economic Impacts Analysis to estimate the financial impacts to the Tucson area when tourists and other motorists from Mexico bypass Tucson if this project moves forward. The stated purpose of supporting improved regional mobility for people, goods, and homeland security is specifically missing, and connections must be made to the City of Tucson, or this goal is not met.</p> <p>As mentioned in previous comments, the economic impact to the City of Tucson of the "West Option" is extreme:</p> <p>- This option would clearly draw economic activity away from the core business and industrial areas of Tucson, not only downtown, but also industrial parks around the airport, UA Tech Parks and the Port of Tucson and negates our infrastructure investment in the region.</p> <p>Developments such as the Port of Tucson, that are just beginning to build out as logistics and transportation hubs, will not readily benefit from a western alignment that completely bypasses this area.</p>	email	Ortega_Tucson_1856	1856

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Submission	Method	Attachment	Tracking ID
			<p>The recent momentum of the business and industrial development in the core of Tucson will erode with the construction along the recommended alignment, causing competing sites to draw economic activity away from areas just now working to establish themselves.</p> <p>The costs of bringing infrastructure to the proposed alignment will make it difficult to achieve successes in a timely manner, delaying Arizona's ability to deliver a freeway solution that begins moving goods and services in a fast, efficient manner which is in every jurisdiction's best interest.</p> <p>Also mentioned in previous comments, there are critical impacts to biological, water storage, 4(f), and cultural resources that require more in-depth study.</p> <p>The mitigation of impacts of the "West Option" to the main source of Tucson's regional water supplies has not been fully explored. This alternative severely impacts the Central and Southern Avra Valley Storage and Recovery Projects (CAVSARP/SAVSARP) facilities, which are the main water sources of the Tucson Active Management Area (AMA) and store water for the City of Phoenix, the Southern Nevada Water Authority, and the Arizona Water Banking Authority (AWBA). Further, the aquifer supported by CAVSARP and SAVSARP has yet to experience water quality impacts from the commercial, industrial, and transportation uses that would inevitably be associated with a major interstate highway through Avra Valley. This is a critical concern for Tucson, as we have lost access to about 20% of our potable water production capacity over the past 10 years due to aquifer contamination from per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and other chemicals of concern.</p> <p>The "West Option" will also impact wildlife migratory movements, sever existing habitats and territories, and affect natural areas and regional park viewsheds. The mitigation of these economic and environmental impacts has not been fully explored.</p> <p>As noted previously, the "West Option" negatively impacts the following list of areas that should be avoided with any alignment:</p> <p>National parks and monuments: The alignment is adjacent and through the viewsheds of the Ironwood Forest and National Monument and the Saguaro National Park.</p> <p>Wilderness areas: Most of the alignment is in natural desert that is currently wilderness.</p> <p>Roadless areas: Most of the alignment is in natural desert that is currently mostly roadless.</p> <p>Critical habitats: Much of the alignment is adjacent to and at least partly through critical habitat for birds and several varieties of important cactus. The environmental document admits the west alignment will increase mortality of Species of Economic and Recreational Importance.</p> <p>Section 4(f) properties: The alignment travels through Anza Park and the Bureau of Reclamation wildlife travel corridor.</p> <p>Tribal lands: The alignment is adjacent to and appears to infringe on the Tohono O'odham Nation land.</p> <p>100-year floodplains/floodways: The alignment appears to cross several floodplains, but more importantly, negatively impacts the CAVSARP/SAVSARP.</p> <p>Based on the concerns listed above, the City will not support the "West Option" as the preferred alignment.</p>			