



FHWA / ADOT

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meetings

FINAL REPORT

Prepared by the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution

Joy Keller-Weidman, Senior Program Manager

Mitch Chrismer, Senior Program Associate

May 2018

Table of Contents

PURPOSE AND NEED	3
BACKGROUND / HISTORY	4
OVERALL PROCESS	6
INTERVIEW RESULTS	7
MEETINGS 1, 2 & 3 HIGHLIGHTS	9
MEETINGS 1 HIGHLIGHTS.....	9
MEETINGS 2 HIGHLIGHTS.....	10
MEETINGS 3 HIGHLIGHTS.....	11
SUMMARY / CONCLUSIONS	12
APPENDICES	17
Appendix A: Interview Themes and Summary.....	18
Appendix B: Group B Meeting #1 Highlights.....	25
Appendix C: Group C/D Meeting #1 Highlights	40
Appendix D: Group B Meeting #2 Highlights	57
Appendix E: Group C/D Meeting #2 Highlights	74
Appendix F: Group B Meeting #3 Highlights	93
Appendix G: Group C/D Meeting #3 Highlights	109

PURPOSE / NEED

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) invited the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute) to facilitate discussions regarding the Interstate 11 (I-11) Tier 1 Environmental Impact Study (EIS) in Pima County, Arizona, to augment the ongoing public input effort. The U.S. Institute took the lead by conducting an assessment and by facilitating two sets of stakeholder engagement meetings (Group B and Group C/D) with the objective of facilitating additional productive Pima County community conversations to inform the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor decision-making process.

The U.S. Institute was brought in to this process due to its expertise in providing independent and impartial services to address environmental disputes or conflicts. The U.S. Institute's focus as a federal agency is to help parties work together in building a shared understanding of issues, and to assist in finding ways to address concerns and develop strong outcomes. The organization focuses on a wide range of environmental, natural resources and public lands issues involving the federal government. The U.S. Institute was established by Congress in 1998 as a program of the Udall Foundation, which is an independent, nonpartisan federal agency of the Executive Branch, see www.udall.gov.

The U.S. Institute was asked to lead the design, facilitation, and documentation of two sets of stakeholder engagement meetings to identify more specific details and analysis regarding individual community concerns and preferences for the purpose of informing the technical analysis and planning required for the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study. The U.S. Institute was asked to assume this role because of its history of engagement as a neutral, third party agency that is impartial to all perspectives. Their role was to develop and facilitate a fair discussion process in which each participant was granted an equal opportunity to be heard, and where each voice had equal value.

Following the meetings, the results of the group discussions were summarized in a Report prepared by the U.S. Institute, which was provided to FHWA and ADOT for consideration in the I-11 Tier 1 EIS process. The final Report is intended to offer FHWA and ADOT a deeper analysis of the issues than can typically be achieved through the course of standard public meetings. Ultimately, the U.S. Institute's final Report will provide information that will assist FHWA and ADOT in making the decision regarding a Selected Alternative – whether it's a Build Corridor Alternative or a No-Build Alternative.

BACKGROUND / HISTORY

Interstate 11 is a critical piece of multimodal infrastructure that will support and connect the economies of Arizona and Nevada. It also could eventually be connected to a larger north-south transportation corridor, linking the United States to the Republic of Mexico and Canada. The purpose of I-11 is to provide a high-priority, high-capacity, access-controlled transportation corridor that has the potential to enhance movement of people and freight, facilitate regional connectivity, trade, communications and technology. If built, the I-11 Corridor would decrease transportation impacts from population and employment growth, reduce congestion and enhance travel time reliability, increase system linkages and regional interstate mobility, provide access to economic activity centers, and assist homeland security and national defense.

In March 2016, FHWA and ADOT initiated the environmental review process for a portion of the I-11 Corridor, specifically from Nogales to Wickenburg, Arizona. As part of this process, and in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), FHWA and ADOT are preparing a Tier 1 EIS for the I-11 Corridor between Nogales and Wickenburg, Arizona. The Tier 1 EIS will assess the potential social, economic and natural environmental impacts of a No Build Alternative and a reasonable range of Build Corridor Alternatives for a proposed transportation facility within the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study area. The Notice of Intent to prepare the I-11 Tier 1 EIS was issued in May 2016. Since then, FHWA and ADOT have conducted public and agency scoping meetings, outreach to tribes and stakeholders, and completed an alternatives development and screening process.

This effort builds upon the prior I-11 and Intermountain West Corridor Study (IWCS) that was completed in 2014, which was a multimodal planning effort led by ADOT and the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), in partnership with FHWA, Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), and other key stakeholders. The IWCS broadly defined the I-11 corridor from Arizona's border with Mexico through northern Nevada. In December 2015, the US Congress approved the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, a five-year legislation to improve the nation's surface transportation infrastructure, which formally designates I-11 throughout both states. Subsequent planning efforts, such as this Tier 1 EIS, will continue to advance corridor planning.

An Alternatives Selection Report (ASR) was also prepared to document this process and the outcomes regarding a range of Build Corridor Alternatives that will be carried forward into the I-11 Tier 1 EIS for further study. This report was completed and posted to the project website (www.i11study.com) in early December 2017.

The purpose and need for the I-11 project was based on key transportation-related problems and issues identified in the previous I-11 IWCS and through agency and public input received during the scoping process. The number of potential corridor alternatives will eventually be reduced and carried forward in the Draft Tier 1 EIS document. The Draft Tier 1 EIS document will also continue to assess the potential social, economic, and natural environmental impacts of the No-Build Alternative (the do-nothing option) and a reasonable range of corridor alternatives, including a broad based phased implementation plan.

The phased implementation plan may include smaller segments of a corridor alternative that may advance as separate, independent projects following completion of the Tier 1 EIS process. The draft Tier 1 EIS document also will identify a Recommended Alternative (expected to be 2000' wide). If a build alternative is identified, FHWA would then issue final decision documents known as a Final Tier 1 EIS and Record of Decision, which would identify the Preferred and then the Selected Corridor Alternative.

OVERALL PROCESS

The primary objective of this stakeholder group engagement process was to provide a method for productive Pima County community conversations to inform the I-11 Tier 1 EIS with more specifics regarding individual community concerns and preferences to enable technical analysis and planning. More specifically, this stakeholder engagement process sought to gain additional community input that could better inform the study regarding potential alternatives between I-19 west towards SR-86 and north towards Picacho, Arizona. This information is summarized in this report and provided to federal and state agency leaders to assist with their final decision regarding I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor alternatives.

The first step in the process was for the U.S. Institute, FHWA and ADOT to agree on the scope, purpose and schedule for the project. To achieve this, the U.S. Institute, led by the team of Joy Keller-Weidman (Senior Program Manager) and Mitch Chrismer (Senior Program Associate), reviewed background materials, consulted with FHWA and ADOT to refine the scope of work & budget, and finalized the project agreements, including the stakeholder group engagement process.

The U.S. Institute then facilitated a virtual meeting with the Interstate-11 Corridor Project Team to develop a plan for conducting stakeholder interviews. Community stakeholders were identified as organizations that had previously shown interest in the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study and were invited to participate in the stakeholder engagement meetings and interviews. Participants were asked to represent more than just themselves, with the expectation that they would share meeting information back and forth with their stakeholder organization. The identified organizations were also asked to recommend additional potential participants not affiliated with a specific stakeholder organization who would be interested in participating in the process. Ultimately, all community members that expressed interest in this process were invited to participate either in person at the meetings, or on the ADOT website designated for stakeholders' input.

After stakeholders self-selected their desired group (Group B or Group C/D), the U.S. Institute then scheduled and conducted twelve situation assessment interviews with members from each targeted community section. The U.S. Institute then prepared a high-level summary of findings that identified the themes from the interviews. Following this, the U.S. Institute then planned, facilitated, and documented a meeting to present and discuss the interview results and plan next steps with the Interstate 11 Project Team.

Using the results from the interviews, the U.S. Institute then designed the outcomes and agenda for a series of stakeholder engagement meetings with each community group. The first group meetings were held in March 2018, and the second and third meetings were held in April 2018. The U.S. Institute produced a Meeting Highlights summary for each of the meetings, for a total of six total summaries (three from each group).

After the conclusion of the stakeholder engagement meetings, The U.S. Institute developed this general report of the stakeholder engagement meetings' process and content, including summaries and conclusions. The U.S. Institute then used this report to highlight and summarize the results of the stakeholder engagement process.

INTERVIEW RESULTS

Joy Keller-Weidman, Senior Program Manager, and Mitch Chrismer, Senior Program Associate, of the U.S. Institute conducted a series of interviews with various stakeholders located in and around the Tucson area who had expressed interest in the proposed I-11 Corridor project. Twelve interviews in total were conducted, and the interviews took place between February 5 and February 13, 2018.

Interviewees were selected following outreach by FHWA and ADOT to determine local interest in the Tier 1 EIS for the proposed I-11 Corridor between Nogales and Wickenburg, AZ. Those that were interviewed showed interest in two different geographic areas: Group B interviewees had interest in the downtown / southern Tucson area, and Group C/D interviewees had interest in the Avra Valley region west of Tucson.

The U.S. Institute conducted individual phone interviews with twelve of the participating stakeholder organizations from groups B and C/D. Organizations that participated in the Group B phone interviews were: Sonoran Institute, Drachman Institute, and Menlo Park (Ward 1). Organizations that participated in the Group C/D phone interviews included: Freeport McMoRan, Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum, Marana Unified School District, Drachman Institute, Arizona Heritage Alliance, Sonoran Institute, Northwest Fire District, Altar Valley School District, and Caterpillar.

During the interviews, interviewees were each asked the same eight questions:

- 1) Tell us who you are, what stakeholder group/organization you represent and your role, and describe your reason for participating in these meetings.
- 2) How would you define your interest / perspective re: the I-11 Corridor?
- 3) What is your desired outcome for these meetings? What would you like to see accomplished?
- 4) What might be some barriers/obstacles to accomplishing your desired outcomes?
- 5) Do you have any concerns or questions related to these meetings?
- 6) Is there anything you think we should keep in mind as we design and facilitate these meetings?
- 7) Are there agenda items/topics that you feel are especially important to include?
- 8) Do you have other recommendations?

Throughout the interviews, a number of patterns emerged from the responses. The question of correlated economic development that would come from the development of the I-11 Corridor was an important topic to many. Many were interested in learning more about the proposed growth that would accompany this project, and how this could change the region. Others were interested in examining the overall costs and benefits, especially as pertains to the local communities.

Environmental concerns related to the development of a new freeway was also important to many interviewees. Affects to the viewsheds, noise pollution, light pollution, restriction of wildlife corridors,

and overall effects of the project on the desert landscape were very important issues to many that were interviewed.

Information gathering during the meetings was very important to many of those interviewed. The information that is currently available feels overwhelming to some, and incomplete to others. For example, some requested that maps with much greater detail be provided, while others asked that information currently on the I-11 Study website be condensed down for meeting participants. Interviewees also asked that a detailed project background be provided towards the beginning of the first meeting, so that all attendees can better understand the future vision and need for the project, funding available, proposed timelines, anticipated effect on sprawl, projected traffic models, decision-making processes, and general costs/benefit analyses of the proposed routes.

Many expressed a desire that the new corridor be as future-minded as possible, to include multi-modal aspects and be built with a more automated transportation future in mind. There was hope from some that the creation of this new corridor will allow for energy transmission along the same path. Others asked that creative solutions be considered, including high-speed rail, and the expansion of existing corridors.

Though there were some concerns about the location of the proposed corridors, impacts to the environment and effects of population growth and sprawl, most interviewees expressed a desire to work collaboratively and to keep an open mind about alternatives. Many expressed positivity and interest in this project, and generally interviewees hoped that the final product will be something that is both environmentally friendly and keeps the interests and values of local communities in mind.

MEETINGS 1, 2 & 3 HIGHLIGHTS

Meeting 1 Highlights

The first stakeholder engagement meetings were held on March 6 and 8, 2018, respectively. The Group B meeting (held on March 6, 2018) included representatives from the Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, Menlo Park, Sonoran Institute, I-10 Self Storage, Erickson Terrascape, Tucson Audubon Society, CAPLA, Sun Corridor Inc., and the Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation. The Group C/D meeting (held on March 8, 2018) included representatives from Avra Valley Coalition, National Parks Conservation Association, NW Fire District, Marana Unified Schools, Tucson Metro Chamber, Avra Water Co-op, Freeport McMoran, AZ Sonora Desert Museum, Sonoran Institute, Caterpillar, Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, Arizona Heritage Alliance, and Friends of Ironwood Forest. Staff members from FHWA and ADOT also attended the meetings, and the meetings were facilitated by Joy Keller-Weidman and Mitch Chrismer of the U.S. Institute.

The primary goals of these first meetings were to:

- Understand the most recently published I-11 Corridor project information as pertaining to the current proposed options
- Understand each stakeholder group's perspective on the I-11 Corridor options
- Understand the values, interests and characteristics most important to the two communities
- Identify some of the potential impacts and/or benefits (both environmental and economic) of proposed corridors
 - Further, to identify ways to mitigate and/or enhance the identified impacts / benefits
- Explore creative alternatives and options moving forward that address concerns
- Inform decision-makers about the issues that are most important to the stakeholder groups

To achieve these outcomes, the U.S. Institute designed an agenda for the meetings that first focused on reviewing the project vision, background, and current proposed options. A presentation was delivered by ADOT to discuss these topics, and a Q&A session was held after the presentation to allow participants the opportunity to interact with ADOT and FHWA representatives.

Following the presentation and Q&A session, stakeholders were asked to state their key perspective on the I-11 Corridor. From there, stakeholders were then asked to refine their key perspective into a guiding interest that broadly encompasses their stated position.

Meeting 2 Highlights

The second stakeholder engagement meetings were held on April 3 and 5, 2018, respectively. The Group B meeting (held on April 3, 2018) included representatives from Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, Menlo Park Neighborhood Association, Erickson Terrascape, Tucson Audubon Society, Friends of Ironwood Forest, CAPLA, Statistical Research Inc., and Sonoran Institute. The Group C/D meeting (held on April 5, 2018) included representatives from National Parks Conservation Association, Arizona Heritage Alliance, Avra Valley Coalition, Sonoran Institute, Northwest Fire Dept., Freeport McMoran, Caterpillar, Columbine Enterprises, Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum, Friends of Saguaro National Park, Tucson Metro Chamber, and Friends of Ironwood Forest. Staff members from FHWA and ADOT also attended the meetings, and the meetings were facilitated by Joy Keller-Weidman and Mitch Chrismer of the U.S. Institute.

The primary goals of the respective Meetings #2 were to:

- Understand each stakeholder group's perspectives on the different I-11 Corridor options
- Understand the values, interests and characteristics most important to the stakeholders
- Identify potential impacts/benefits of proposed corridors based on local knowledge within the stakeholder group
 - And further, to identify key interests that need to be considered when identifying ways to mitigate/enhance the potential impacts/benefits

To achieve these goals, the U.S. Institute designed an agenda that focused on reviewing the perspectives and interests identified at the previous Meetings #1. The group then worked collaboratively to identify the specifics that stakeholders believe are important to consider in decision making, and explore the pros and cons of those specifics. The group then explored ideas about how unique design options might work to provide solutions to any potential impacts identified during the discussions. Stakeholder participants were also asked to think about any additional information that might be needed to help inform potential I-11 Corridor options, and to identify any additional technical information that might be considered helpful.

In addition to the meeting agenda items described above, participants were given a chance to interact with staff from FHWA and ADOT. FHWA / ADOT provided written answers to outstanding questions in advance of the meeting, and meeting participants were allowed the opportunity to ask further identifying questions of the state and federal partners.

A homework item was given to participants at the end of the meetings: Meeting attendees were asked to come to the next meeting prepared to answer the question: *If your route (B or C/D option) were to be chosen: What would you want it to look like? Be specific about your vision and options to be considered.*

At the conclusion of this meeting, a few individuals from each group requested that the state and federal partners consider convening a fourth meeting that combines both B and C/D groups together.

Meeting 3 Highlights

The third and final stakeholder engagement meetings were held on April 24 and 26, 2018, respectively. The Group B meeting (held on April 24, 2018) included representatives from Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, Menlo Park Neighborhood Association, Erickson Terrascape, Tucson Audubon Society, Friends of Ironwood Forest, CAPLA, Statistical Research Inc., Sonoran Institute, and Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation. The Group C/D meeting (held on April 26, 2018) included representatives from Avra Water Co-op, Sonoran Institute, Friends of Saguaro National Park, Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, Arizona Heritage Alliance, Avra Valley Coalition, National Parks Conservation Association, Caterpillar, Freeport McMoran, Marana Unified School District, and AZ Sonoran Desert Museum. Staff members from FHWA and ADOT also attended the meetings, and the meetings were facilitated by Joy Keller-Weidman and Mitch Chrismer of the U.S. Institute.

The primary goals of these meetings were to:

- Understand the values, interests and characteristics most important to the stakeholders
- Identify potential impacts / benefits of proposed corridors based on local knowledge within the stakeholder group
 - Identify ways to mitigate and/or enhance the identified impacts / benefits
- Explore creative alternatives / options moving forward that address concerns
- Inform decision-makers about the issues that are most important to stakeholder groups

To achieve the goals of the meetings, the U.S. Institute designed an agenda that focused on having meeting participants discuss options related to identified key themes (i.e. Viewsheds, Wildlife Connectivity, Community cohesion, etc.). Stakeholders were then asked to provide pros and cons of each of the identified design options. To facilitate this discussion, stakeholders were asked to come to the meeting prepared to answer the question: “If your route (B or C/D option) were to be chosen: What would you want it to look like?” Further, meeting attendees were asked to identify potential opportunities and/or mitigation options for decision makers to consider if their specific route were to be selected.

Participants worked together in small groups to address the topics above, and then selected a spokesperson to report out to the larger group on their findings. Each participant was also asked to give a short two-minute briefing on what their preferred vision for an I-11 route would be.

Some meeting attendees again expressed interest in holding a 4th meeting to combine the participants of Groups B and C/D. State and federal partners responded to the request by explaining that an additional meeting would be outside of the scope and purpose of this stakeholder engagement process.

Meeting participants were allowed the opportunity to provide feedback to the U.S. Institute and FHWA/ADOT about their overall thoughts on this process. FHWA and ADOT staff concluded the meeting by thanking participants for their time and effort throughout this process.

SUMMARY / CONCLUSIONS

The I-11 Corridor Stakeholder Engagement process was developed and implemented with the underlying goal of allowing state and federal partners the opportunity to better understand the values, interests and characteristics most important to community stakeholders in the two separate route option areas (downtown / southern Tucson area (B option), and the Avra Valley region (C/D option) west of Tucson). Further goals were to identify potential impacts and/or benefits of proposed corridors based on local knowledge within the stakeholder group, to identify ways to mitigate and/or enhance those identified impacts / benefits, and then to explore some creative alternatives and design options that would serve to address community concerns. The overall goals were achieved throughout the course of a six-month process wherein community representatives in Southern Arizona were invited to participate in an opportunity to inform decision-makers about the issues that are most important to their communities, as related to the creation of a new Interstate in the region.

This stakeholder engagement process was designed with the intention of allowing state and federal partners the opportunity to more deeply examine the issues that matter most to community members. FHWA and ADOT sought to receive input from the public that went into more depth than is normally gathered throughout the standard public input process. To achieve this desired outcome, FHWA and ADOT enlisted the assistance of the U.S. Institute due to its expertise in neutral third-party collaborative engagement. To achieve the goals set out by FHWA and ADOT, the U.S. Institute designed an engagement process that included a stakeholder assessment and six public meetings. This process was designed with the intent to allow for diverse participation from a wide range of stakeholders, in order to ensure that a variety of ideas and feedback were allowed to be heard. Outreach to members of the different communities was widespread, and all who expressed an interest in this process were able to participate either in person at the meetings, or on the ADOT website designated for stakeholders' input. Ultimately, representatives from environmental organizations, business interests, public health and safety, neighborhood associations, and more were incorporated into the process and granted an equal opportunity to share their perspectives on the impacts of constructing a new Interstate in their area.

WHAT WE LEARNED

ASSESSMENT

When conducting the initial stakeholder interviews for the project assessment, a number of themes emerged. Primarily, we found that stakeholders were very interested in learning more about the potential I-11 project. Information available to the public was still limited at the time, and interviewees expressed an interest in having more detail made available to them.

Growth along the proposed corridor was an important topic to many, as the corresponding economic development that would accompany the creation of a new Interstate would have wide-ranging effects on both communities and the environment. Many expressed concern about the potential impact a new

Interstate would have on the surrounding environment – including impacts to wildlife migration, spread of invasive species, noise pollution, light pollution, smell, water table / flow, and other more specific impacts to various species in the Sonoran Desert region. Despite the wide range of potential concerns, however, we found throughout the course of the stakeholder assessment interviews that most expressed a strong interest in this process. There was a general hope that the new I-11 Corridor would be built in an environmentally friendly manner that keeps the interests and values of local communities in mind.

MEETINGS #1

The first stakeholder engagement meetings sought to first allow stakeholders to get to know one another, and to set guidelines for the series of meetings. These meetings also focused heavily on project background. State and federal partners were granted the opportunity to educate and inform community members about the history of the project, the intended goals of this Tier 1 EIS process, and the role that these meetings would play in informing the Tier 1 EIS process.

Following the introductory sections, stakeholders were asked to describe their key interests and perspectives as pertains to the creation of an I-11 Corridor. Responses to this question varied greatly. Stakeholders noted that the issues / concerns that mattered most to them included:

- Consider the effects on historic landscapes and historic / cultural resources
- Limit construction as much as possible
- Ensure the Corridor is as innovative as possible
- Do not separate East and West Tucson any further
- Design of new freeway should support the flow of goods
- Consider the effect construction would have on small businesses
- Construction of new interstate is needed to ensure the area remains economically competitive
- New Corridor should facilitate future employment opportunities
- Existing wildlife corridors should not be blocked
- Adequate study on effects of Corridor should be carried out prior to construction
- Mining interests in Corridor route area should be considered
- Consider the impacts to water, especially wells
- Ensure that public safety concerns are met
- Ensure the travel needs of schoolchildren are met
- Consider impacts to designated wilderness areas
- Build in a manner that does not promote additional sprawl
- Concerns that a Tier 1 is not a deep enough dive into the EIS process to make a decision

Following the first set of meetings, attendees expressed gratitude for the opportunity to participate in the process, and noted that it was a great learning experience for all and that the process represented a productive method for allowing the public to inform the Tier 1 EIS process.

MEETINGS #2

The second stakeholder meetings were designed with the intention of allowing stakeholders the opportunity to more deeply explore the specific issues that they feel should be considered in the decision-making process. Whereas the first meetings focused on the broader interests /needs, these meetings dived deeper into the specific details that could potentially be mitigated by different design options.

In these meetings, some of the key interests expressed by stakeholders included:

- Consider the viewshed from and to different historic districts and places of tribal interest
- Incorporate alternative means of transportation / modes into the design
- Embrace sustainability within the design as much as possible
- Avoid any destruction of tangible heritage, such as cultural and architectural resources
- Avoid disruption to river corridors, wildlife habitat, and migratory corridors
- Consider neighborhood connectivity and encroachment into existing neighborhoods
- Reduce congestion, potentially through innovative methods (car pool, pricing, tolls, etc.)
- Consider economic harm to local businesses both during and after construction
- Ensure that the route option selected meets population growth expectation needs
- Route should meet national security needs, future congestion needs, trade flow needs
- More information on potential Area of Potential Effect is needed
- Wildlife linkages should remain intact
- Consider potential environmental damages to Saguaro National Park and local area
- Consider impact to land owned by businesses in area
- Consider potential degradation of quality of life for people living in area
- Consider potential effect / benefits to emergency services
- Let any build decisions be known early so that school districts can plan for growth
- Models used should be as accurate as possible
- Building the C/D route makes more sense to the larger Southern Arizona community

Meetings #2 also concluded with generally positive feedback from stakeholders, who again expressed gratitude towards the facilitators, agency partners, and their fellow community members for contributing to a productive meeting and outcome.

MEETINGS #3

The third and final set of stakeholder engagement meetings provided stakeholders with an opportunity to discuss the issues that matter most to them in even greater detail. The focus of these meetings was to discuss potential design options related to previously identified key themes, including viewsheds, wildlife connectivity, and community cohesion. Prior to the meetings, stakeholders were asked to come prepared to answer the question: “Should your Corridor route (B or C/D) be selected, what would you want it to look like?” During the meetings, stakeholders worked together in small groups to create and discuss design options that would serve to mitigate potential concerns. Stakeholders were also asked to individually formulate short, high-level descriptions of what they would want a new I-11 Corridor to look like, should their specific group option be chosen.

In these meetings, stakeholders indicated that there were additional key mitigation themes that were very important to them, beyond viewsheds, wildlife connectivity, and community cohesion. Invasive species, water quality (including impact to washes and watersheds), air quality, economic impacts, promotion of alternative transportation and technology, cultural impacts, light pollution, and noise pollution were each identified as important themes to keep under consideration when exploring corridor design options.

When identifying key considerations for corridor design options, stakeholders were also asked to identify the pros and cons of the specific design options. While the pros varied greatly depending on the specific considerations, a general theme emerged among the cons that were developed – that overall project cost would have to be high in order to include the mitigating options that were desired. Some of the key design options and mitigation practices proposed by the stakeholders included:

- Fund ongoing maintenance to reduce spread of buffelgrass (invasive non-native plant species)
- Create both overpasses and underpasses for wildlife connectivity
- Protect the aquifer and City of Tucson’s CAVSARP and SAVSARP from oil runoff and potential hazmat spills
- Protect air quality by improving emissions
- Protect wells from runoff from flooding
- Avoid existing businesses and maintain existing open space
- Limit on/off ramps to minimize development around the highway
- Limit highway lighting to reduce light pollution
- Create a bike path that runs parallel with the freeway
- Use berms and depressions to protect viewsheds
- Consider burying the highway altogether
- Minimize effects to potential future mineral mining sites
- Avoid places of cultural significance and protect areas of potential new discoveries
- Consider choosing an alignment that pairs with existing infrastructure (i.e. CAP)
- Align with CAP and pair with existing wildlife crossings to reduce fragmentation
- Use access control (reduce number of entrance/exit ramps) to limit traffic where growth is not appropriate
- Design with intention to increase connectivity and allow easier access to public lands such as Saguaro National Park
- Recess the road or bore underground to protect viewsheds
- Consider need for microclimates and openness index when designing wildlife crossings
- Avoid changes to natural regime as much as possible
- Consider enclosing the freeway entirely
- Use art and screening to abate visual intrusion and noise
- Use construction as opportunity to focus on river restoration and improving the linear park along Santa Cruz river
- Protect historic neighborhoods by putting the freeway underground as much as possible

- Focus investment on intraregional transit, i.e. dedicated travel lanes, bus rapid transit, etc.
- Consider future changes to technology and plan appropriately, i.e. by implementing ramp meters, car pool lanes, dedicated through travel lanes, congestion pricing
- Consider building a capped highway with a tunnel for trains and trucks
- If create a capped highway, put parks and businesses on top of the tunnel
- Consider a suspended highway with an under area for pedestrians, bikes, businesses, etc.
- Either build above grade with good permeability or below grade with a deck park

Upon conclusion of these meetings (and the overall process), stakeholders again expressed their gratitude for being able to participate and contribute to the Tier 1 EIS process, and expressed an interest in having the group meet again in the future. FHWA and ADOT staff informed participants on how they could continue to provide input going forward.

SUMMARY OF LESSONS LEARNED

Throughout the course of this process, a number of key themes emerged that will serve to inform the Tier 1 EIS process. For example, it became clear that triple-decking I-10 is not a palatable option for these stakeholders. Many expressed interest that the corridor be built underground. Wildlife corridor crossing is an important consideration to many, as is keeping viewsheds intact. Stakeholders hope that any new design will contain features that reduce noise, light, and smell pollution. The largest con to many of the desired design options is cost. In addition, stakeholders feel it is important to consider cultural impacts and impacts to historical resources. Environmental justice is also important to many, and impacts to minority and low-income neighborhoods should be taken into account. Others feel that a silent majority of residents would prefer that the C/D route be built, and that the needs and interests of everyone in Tucson valley (and southern Arizona) should be taken into account, not just the needs and interests of residents of Avra Valley. Public safety is important to keep in mind when selecting a new corridor, and important to keep in mind when selecting design options for that corridor.

In terms of the overall process, most felt they were given ample opportunity to voice their points of view. Feedback indicated that many were happy with the diversity of voices and interests that were included in the process, though some felt that “minority” opinions (i.e. business interests) were somewhat drowned out by others in the room. Others wished they had more time to provide input, and expressed a feeling that the overall Tier 1 EIS process is happening too fast. A majority expressed overall satisfaction with the process and indicated that it was a good learning experience for all. Upon conclusion of the meetings, attendees expressed interest in having the group continue to meet in the future, and throughout the entirety of the overall Tier 1 EIS process.

Results from this stakeholder engagement process were presented to FHWA and ADOT for consideration in the I-11 Tier 1 EIS process. Both state and federal partners indicated that the process was useful and informative and that the meetings served their purpose of providing a “deeper dive” into the issues that matter most to the local communities for each of the potential Build areas.



APPENDICES

Appendix A: Interview Themes and Summary

Appendix B: Group B Meeting #1 Highlights

Appendix C: Group C/D Meeting #1 Highlights

Appendix D: Group B Meeting #2 Highlights

Appendix E: Group C/D Meeting #2 Highlights

Appendix F: Group B Meeting #3 Highlights

Appendix G: Group C/D Meeting #3 Highlights

Appendix A: Interview Themes and Summary

Joy Keller-Weidman / Mitch Chrismer

U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution

Udall Foundation

February 13, 2018

FHWA / ADOT I-11 Corridor Stakeholder Group Engagement Meetings

Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

Joy Keller-Weidman, Senior Program Manager, and Mitch Chrismer, Senior Program Associate, of the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute) conducted a series of interviews with various stakeholders located in and around the Tucson area who had expressed interest in the proposed I-11 Corridor project. Twelve interviews in total were conducted, and the interviews took place between February 5 and February 13, 2018.

Interviewees were selected following outreach by FHWA and ADOT to determine local interest in the Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed I-11 Corridor between Nogales and Wickenburg, AZ. Those that were interviewed represented two different geographic areas: Group B interviewees represented the downtown / southern Tucson area, and Group C/D interviewees represented the Avra Valley / Picture Rocks area west of Tucson.

The organizations participating in Stakeholder Group B meetings include:

- Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum
- Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection
- Drachman Institute
- Sonoran Institute
- Menlo Park (Ward 1)
- Northwest Fire District
- Friends of Ironwood Forest
- Sun Corridor Inc.
- Tucson Audubon Society
- Tucson Metro Chamber

The organizations participating in Group C/D meetings include:

- Marana Chamber of Commerce
- Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum
- Avra Water Co-Op
- Marana Unified School District
- Avra Valley Coalition
- Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection
- Friends of Ironwood Forest
- Friends of Saguaro National Park
- National Parks Conservation Association
- Caterpillar
- Drachman Institute
- Sonoran Institute
- Freeport McMoRan
- Northwest Fire District
- Altar Valley School District
- Arizona Heritage Alliance
- Tucson Metro Chamber

As mentioned, the U.S. Institute conducted individual phone interviews with twelve of the participating stakeholder organizations from groups B and C/D. Organizations that participated in the Group B phone interviews were: Sonoran Institute, Drachman Institute, Menlo Park (Ward 1). Organizations that participated in the Group C/D phone interviews included: Freeport McMoRan, Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum, Marana Unified School District, Drachman Institute, Arizona Heritage Alliance, Sonoran Institute, Northwest Fire District, Altar Valley School District, and Caterpillar.

During the interviews, interviewees were each asked the same eight questions:

- 1) Tell us who you are, what stakeholder group/organization you represent and your role, and describe your reason for participating in these meetings.
- 2) How would you define your interest / perspective re: the I-11 Corridor?
- 3) What is your desired outcome for these meetings? What would you like to see accomplished?
- 4) What might be some barriers/obstacles to accomplishing your desired outcomes?
- 5) Do you have any concerns or questions related to these meetings?
- 6) Is there anything you think we should keep in mind as we design and facilitate these meetings?
- 7) Are there agenda items/topics that you feel are especially important to include?
- 8) Do you have other recommendations?

General themes discovered during the interviews are outlined below, broken up by each question.

Interest/ Perspective re: I-11 Corridor:

- Economic development
 - What are the economic benefits to this project? What are the costs?
 - Impacts to tourism?
- Environmental concerns
 - Impacts to viewsheds, species connectivity, preserving natural landscapes
- Population sprawl / growth
 - Model predicted growth that would accompany the corridor
- Public safety / public planning
 - Impacts to emergency response, school district planning, government infrastructure
- Multi-modal transportation
 - How is this being considered?
- Impacts to locals along proposed routes
 - Increased traffic and access to rural areas
 - Traveler safety
- Long – term vision
 - Are models accurate?
 - How will increased automation factor in to the future of transportation?
- More info re: proposed corridors
 - Expressed desire to learn more about the proposed project
- Cost/funding
 - Who is funding the project?
 - Who will fund maintenance?
 - Will AZ taxpayers be affected?

Desired outcome for these meetings:

- Explore multi-use along corridor
- Identify impacts of building a new freeway
- Look at no-build alternatives (upgrade existing infrastructure)
 - Use existing corridors in way the doesn't increase pollution/ exhaust/ noise/ light pollution
- Share various points of view re: proposed corridor
 - Stakeholders voices heard and considered throughout process
 - Hope that outcome not already predetermined
- Get better understanding of what is being proposed
 - Timelines, maps, exact locations of proposed routes, scope
 - Look at design capabilities of mitigated impacts
- Find solution that works for everyone
- Move project forward
- Address doubts / concerns about creating a new corridor

- Better understand potential impact to future population to inform long-term planning

Barriers/obstacles to accomplishing desired outcomes:

- Concern that there is not enough time to review all material
- How detailed can meetings get in relation to broad-brush alternative routes?
- Strong pre-set firm positions /opinions held by some
 - Small determined group that opposes any type of construction
 - Remote property owners prefer to live away from congestion and industry
 - Group supports construction and economic development and may disregard environmental concerns
 - NIMBY-ism
- Not enough study on exact environmental impacts of corridor creation
- Include design early in the process

Concerns or questions related to these meetings:

- Hope that decision-makers take stakeholder input seriously
 - Outcomes of meetings should be absorbed into final decision making
- Decision will be driven by economics – what is simplest and cheapest
- Discussion will be viewed as a fight between rural and suburban interests
- Stakeholder input won't be used just as window-dressing
- Need more detail about the process
- Current maps not detailed enough
- Are future traffic projections accurate? How be sure?
 - What volume of traffic need to plan for?
 - What alternatives have been considered to accommodate these projections?
- Need to be able to protect natural spaces
 - Concern about negative impact to visitors and residents
 - Damage to natural beauties may be too high
- Why freeway and not rail?
- Concern about the development that would naturally occur/ be encouraged along corridor
- Are we planning for the future correctly? Need to be more creative

Considerations re: meeting design and facilitation:

- Design meetings so everyone stays engaged throughout
 - Keep meetings productive and effective
 - Use time wisely

- Gather input from stakeholders equally
- Focus on segments of proposed route individually
 - Include detailed economic impacts
 - Include updated base maps
 - Include clear information on projected models of future traffic

Agenda items/topics that you feel are especially important to include:

- Stakeholder engagement process
 - Purpose of process
 - Explanation on how stakeholders were contacted and notified
 - Interview process
 - Meeting design / outcomes / agenda / timeline
 - Agreements for participation
- Rationale for I-11
 - Include future vision / need
 - Project background
 - Clarify location of routes
 - Include updated base maps
 - Proposed timelines
 - Costs associated with proposed corridor
 - How will routes be financed?
 - Where will funding come from?
- Viability of proposed corridor
- Traffic projections and forecast
- Impacts on environment / wildlife / plant life
 - How maintain connectivity?
 - What are the water considerations?
- Stakeholders values and interests related to proposed corridor
- Clarify long and short-term impacts on communities along proposed routes
 - Identify benefits to communities that feel most at risk and have most to lose
- Explore alternatives and options
 - Ways to invest in existing infrastructure
- Economic cost-benefit analysis
 - Include environmental economics if possible
 - Economic impact from taking private land
 - Value off-set from earnings lost on land taken
- How will final decision be made?
 - Who will make final decision?

Other recommendations:

- Condense the documents for meeting participants
- Have data on hand specific to what group is discussing
- Include detailed cost/benefit analysis
- Ensure stakeholders kept apprised of decisions throughout process
- Transparency regarding what is / is not being considered
 - Be transparent about legalities and areas in need of negotiation
- Address concerns about putting the corridor in environmentally sensitive areas
- Design away concerns
- Include background on tribal involvement
 - How will tribal lands be impacted?
- Consider impact of national / international news on the project
- Provide clear next steps after meetings conclude

Summary of themes heard

Throughout the interviews, a number of patterns emerged from the responses. The question of correlated economic development that would come from the development of the I-11 Corridor was an important topic to many. Many were interested in learning more about the proposed growth that would accompany this project, and how this could change the region. Others were interested in examining the overall costs and benefits, especially as pertains to the local communities.

Environmental concerns related to the development of a new freeway was also important to many interviewees. Affects to the viewsheds, noise pollution, light pollution, restriction of wildlife corridors, and overall effects of the project on the desert landscape were very important issues to many that were interviewed.

Information gathering during the meetings was very important to many of those interviewed. The information that is currently available feels overwhelming to some, and incomplete to others. For example, some requested that maps with much greater detail be provided, while others asked that information currently on the I-11 Study website be condensed down for meeting participants. Interviewees also asked that a detailed project background be provided towards the beginning of the first meeting, so that all attendees can better understand the future vision and need for the project, funding available, proposed timelines, anticipated effect on sprawl, projected traffic models, decision-making processes, and general costs/benefit analyses of the proposed routes.

Many expressed a desire that the new corridor be as future-minded as possible, to include multi-modal aspects and be built with a more automated transportation future in mind. There was hope from some that the creation of this new corridor will allow for energy transmission along the same path. Others

asked that creative solutions be considered, including high-speed rail, and the expansion of existing corridors.

Though there were some concerns about the location of the proposed corridors, impacts to the environment and effects of population growth and sprawl, most interviewees expressed a desire to work collaboratively and to keep an open mind about alternatives. Many expressed positivity and interest in this project, and generally interviewees hope that the final product will be something that is both environmentally friendly and keeps the interests and values of local communities in mind.

[Appendix B: Group B Meeting #1 Highlights](#)

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B - March 6, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

BACKGROUND:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are preparing a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Interstate 11 (I-11) Corridor between Nogales and Wickenburg, Arizona. The Tier 1 EIS will assess the potential social, economic and natural environmental impacts of a No Build Alternative and a reasonable range of Build Corridor Alternatives for a proposed transportation facility within the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study area. The Notice of Intent to prepare the I-11 Tier 1 EIS was issued in May 2016. Since then, FHWA and ADOT have conducted public and agency scoping meetings, outreach to tribes and stakeholders, and completed an alternatives development and screening process.

FHWA and ADOT have invited the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute) to facilitate meetings with interested stakeholders regarding the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study in Pima County, to augment the ongoing public input effort. The objective of these stakeholder group meetings is to provide a method for additional productive Pima County community conversations to inform the Interstate 11 Corridor Environmental Impact study with more specifics regarding individual community concerns and preferences to enable technical analysis and planning.

This is the first of three meetings for the B Study Group, which includes stakeholders located in the urban I-10 Tucson geographical area.

AGENDA ITEMS & HIGHLIGHTS

TOPIC	DETAILS
WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS	The Udall Foundation’s US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution 3 rd party neutral facilitator, Joy Keller-Weidman, welcomed everyone. Introduced herself, as Senior Program Manager, Transportation Sector; and the Senior Program Associate, Mitch Chrismer, who will be co-facilitating and notetaking.

TOPIC	DETAILS
MEETING OVERVIEW	<p>Reviewed the Meeting Outcomes, Agenda Items & format</p> <p>OUTCOMES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the most recently published I-11 Corridor project info re: current proposed options • Understand each stakeholder group’s perspective re: I-11 Corridor options • Understand the values, interests and characteristics most important to the communities • Identify potential impacts/benefits (environmental and economic) of proposed corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify ways to mitigate/promote those • Explore creative alternatives/options moving forward that address concerns • Inform decision-makers re: what is most important to stakeholder groups <p>AGENDA ITEMS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting outcomes, agenda, format (15 min.) <input type="checkbox"/> Introduce the stakeholders, project team and facilitators (30 min.) <input type="checkbox"/> Collaboration and meeting participation agreements (20 min.) <input type="checkbox"/> BREAK (15 min.) <input type="checkbox"/> Review project vision, background and current proposed options (60 min.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1st presentation: project overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Background: project vision, purpose and need ○ 2nd presentation on where we are now w I-11 Corridor options and how we got there <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Include estimated time frame of Tier 1 process

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tucson corridor options: why, considerations, where are now, how we got there <input type="checkbox"/> Share perspectives and interests (45 min.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding questions for next meeting/meeting agenda items (15 min.) <input type="checkbox"/> Closing Comments and Meeting feedback (10 min.)
--	--

TOPIC	DETAILS																														
FORMAL INTRO-DUCTIONS	<p><i>Facilitator asked for everyone to share their name, stakeholder group, 1 key desire outcome and 1 key question for the meeting.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 25%;">ORG/ROLE</th> <th style="width: 35%;">Outcome</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Question</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection</td> <td>Understand values, interests most imp to community(ies)</td> <td>Fully understand that a true need has been determined (purpose and need)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Menlo Park</td> <td>Knowledge about I-11 Corridor</td> <td>How will the corridor address environmental concerns?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sonoran Institute</td> <td>Understand Tier-1 process</td> <td>What is the scope of the planning process- what options/ issues being considered?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I-10 Self Storage</td> <td>How will corridor affect her business / access to business</td> <td>How will construction impede access to my business? When? For how long?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Erickson Terrascape</td> <td>Concerned about communities that are part of historic resources / impacts from architecture to viewsapes</td> <td>What are the impacts on historic resources?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tucson Audubon Society</td> <td>Meet and learn from stakeholders</td> <td>How are we addressing current and long-term needs of wildlife habitat and open space?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CAPLA</td> <td>Meet, learn discuss w/ fellow stakeholders</td> <td>How can we shift away from auto centric view of transportation towards more sustainable options?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sun Corridor, Inc.</td> <td>Brings economic perspective to discussion</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tucson Historic Preservation</td> <td>Understand impacts of projects</td> <td>What historic / prehistoric resources will this impact? Explore creative alternative</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	ORG/ROLE	Outcome	Question	Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection	Understand values, interests most imp to community(ies)	Fully understand that a true need has been determined (purpose and need)	Menlo Park	Knowledge about I-11 Corridor	How will the corridor address environmental concerns?	Sonoran Institute	Understand Tier-1 process	What is the scope of the planning process- what options/ issues being considered?	I-10 Self Storage	How will corridor affect her business / access to business	How will construction impede access to my business? When? For how long?	Erickson Terrascape	Concerned about communities that are part of historic resources / impacts from architecture to viewsapes	What are the impacts on historic resources?	Tucson Audubon Society	Meet and learn from stakeholders	How are we addressing current and long-term needs of wildlife habitat and open space?	CAPLA	Meet, learn discuss w/ fellow stakeholders	How can we shift away from auto centric view of transportation towards more sustainable options?	Sun Corridor, Inc.	Brings economic perspective to discussion		Tucson Historic Preservation	Understand impacts of projects	What historic / prehistoric resources will this impact? Explore creative alternative
ORG/ROLE	Outcome	Question																													
Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection	Understand values, interests most imp to community(ies)	Fully understand that a true need has been determined (purpose and need)																													
Menlo Park	Knowledge about I-11 Corridor	How will the corridor address environmental concerns?																													
Sonoran Institute	Understand Tier-1 process	What is the scope of the planning process- what options/ issues being considered?																													
I-10 Self Storage	How will corridor affect her business / access to business	How will construction impede access to my business? When? For how long?																													
Erickson Terrascape	Concerned about communities that are part of historic resources / impacts from architecture to viewsapes	What are the impacts on historic resources?																													
Tucson Audubon Society	Meet and learn from stakeholders	How are we addressing current and long-term needs of wildlife habitat and open space?																													
CAPLA	Meet, learn discuss w/ fellow stakeholders	How can we shift away from auto centric view of transportation towards more sustainable options?																													
Sun Corridor, Inc.	Brings economic perspective to discussion																														
Tucson Historic Preservation	Understand impacts of projects	What historic / prehistoric resources will this impact? Explore creative alternative																													

	Foundation	options moving forward to address concerns re: specific cultural and heritage assets.
<i>FHWA AND ADOT/STAFF</i>		
	Jay Van Echo	ADOT
	Aryan Lirange	FHWA
	Laura Douglas	ADOT
	Jennifer Pine	AECOM
	CT Revere	Gordley Group
	Carlos Lopez	ADOT
	Lauren Krepitch	AECOM

TOPIC	DETAILS
COLLABORATION AND MEETING AGREEMENTS	<p>COLLABORATION OVERVIEW</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Facilitators reviewed key points regarding collaboration (see attached handout: <i>Introduction to Collaboration</i>) ◆ Meeting attendees reviewed and agreed to the following Meeting Agreements <p>Meeting Agreements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be prepared to participate, collaborate, and share pertinent information. 2. Engage in a respectful, thoughtful deliberation. 3. One person speaks at a time: Listen carefully when not speaking. 4. Be open to all perspectives. 5. Keep in mind the large picture (regional interests as they relate to larger needs and priorities), as well as your individual/stakeholder group viewpoint. 6. Turn off or mute all electronic devices, so there are no distractions. 7. No recording devices will be allowed during the meeting. 8. Show up on time, stick to agreed-upon speaking limits

TOPIC: ADOT PROJECT PRESENTATION: OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND + Q&A

History of I-11 Corridor (CANAMEX Corridor), federal legislation

Route will generally follow I-19 from Nogales to Tucson and I-10 from Tucson to Phoenix

I-11 Corridor study – 280 mile study area from Nogales to Wickenburg

**Q: What is length of study in southern area?

-Looking at from Nogales to Casa Grande

**Q: Who else is participating in this effort?

- 8 cooperating federal agencies + AZ Game and Fish

- 21 tribes outreached to

- 50+ participating local governments

**Q: Written comments from tribes received?

-Yes

**Q: Which tribes?

-Answer is in tribal outreach section of report

**Q: Cooperating agencies involved?

- Have had monthly meetings with agencies like BLM, EPA, AZ Game and Fish. They are kept apprised of technical process and deliberative nature of what ADOT/FHWA is doing.

Note: Purpose / Need for I-11 Corridor can be found in Fact Sheet

****Q:** What is difference between Tier 1 vs. Tier 2 EIS level of detail?

- Tier 1 -evaluates wide corridors in multiple locations at a program level within which a transportation facility could be located. Goal to select a single corridor within which an alignment would be identified in Tier 2. Specifically – is there a 2000ft wide pathway from Nogales to Wickenburg that could work to accommodate a future built facility in the future? A Tier 1 can occur before funding available.
- Tier 2- evaluates design concepts for specific alignments within the corridor such as 400ft for a typical freeway alignment. Goal to select an alignment and enable permitting for that alignment. Occurs after funding becomes available.

****Q:** Will there be continuous public outreach throughout the process?

- Yes, draft EIS public hearings in fall of 2018 is the next step
- All info available to date is on I-11 website

****Q:** Why no “A” committee?

- “A” route is I-19... no other routes in that area.

****Q:** Why not expand capacity of rail line?

- multimodal is part of the study, rail is being looked at
- looking at expansion of rail, rail is part of multi modal of this, didn't bubble to surface as huge issue or need to many people, talked to BNSF, Union Pacific and referenced previous ADOT passenger rail study re: freight/passenger

****Q:** Feels like primary rationale for this project is facilitating a flow of goods between Mexico and US. Other rationales seem minor / secondary compared to overarching need (transport of goods)

- I-5 is only other N-S corridor, that's why need another one, if something were to happen to I-5 then need a backup

****Q:** Can this group agree that there is a purpose/need for this project?

- CANAMEX Corridor has been in play since 1991, name recently changed to I-11 in 2015 Federal FAST Act

****Q:** Purpose / need developed for each section of I-11?

-No, purpose and need evaluated for entire project in AZ (Nogales to Wickenburg)

****Q:** Why need a new freeway starting at Mexican border?

- Mexico is AZ's #1 trading partner, Canada is #2

- Freight movement between Canada to Mexico, stop points all along

- Nothing really between I-5 and I-25 (I-15 kind of but not full north south – LA to Las Vegas to Salt Lake City)

- So yes, freight movement has a lot to do with this process

****Q:** How compare pros and cons of B vs. C/D? How put all that together when two separate processes?
Need compare things together

- That would be too big for step 1

- Can't ignore needs of C/D, OK to talk about it, but need deep dive of what B would look like, need specifics on impacts/benefits of exactly.

- This conversation is to discover / understand what different perspectives are related to this specific route.

****Q:** Where can we find the Alternative Selection Report?

- Available online at www.i11study.com/arizona

- Report says that from transportation standpoint, C is greater than B. But in terms of tribal impact, environmental impact, B is greater than C.

- Goal from ADOT is to find out- what did this Report miss? Hope that these meetings will inform that.

****Q:** Will there be some kind of subsequent gathering of people to look at B and C/D results and compare?

-Reminder – meeting notes from each group will be available online, participants are welcome to read these notes.

- This process isn't designed to finish with a "vote" from people in the room. Goal is to collect information, then let people make up mind. Not here to come to consensus on anything. Here to collect perspectives from all different sides. This isn't a decision-making body. Focus is collecting info, and realizing fed/state partners may or may not be able to act on some things. Currently no follow-up meetings planned, but FHWA/ADOT can consider it going forward.

****Q:** Is it possible to have dialogue between B and C/D rather than just read notes from other group?

- These meetings came about because of other meetings FHWA/ADOT had – wanted to do something different, more in depth. ADOT/FHWA will have conversation re: potentially holding additional meetings w both B & C/D. Goal remains to have final report by end of May or sooner.

Initial alternatives are identified based on prior studies, input from public, agencies and tribes, technical analysis.

Software Tool- GIS based software package is used by ADOT, they put data in (engineering inputs and avoid sensitive environmental resources, + tribal land, wetlands, private, cultural historic – everything goes in), software determines possibilities for corridor route.

ADOT takes alternatives, and ASR screening criteria comes out. Then options are made and map of reasonable range of corridor to be advanced in Tier1 study is created. ASR was published in Dec. 2017.

****Q:** What environmental justice issues considered when developing ASR? Has analysis been done to see how minority communities impacted?

- Used communication efforts to get input

- Will address in Tier 1 EIS

****Q:** Why are these meetings for just Routes B and C/D? Why not Route G? E? F?

- There was enough interest in this area to set up these specific meetings in Southern AZ

- No build also being considered, including environmental issues related to that. This means continuing as planned for next 5yrs (continue as is with program the state has developed)

****Q:** Can existing facilities accommodate potential transportation growth? Will additional lanes be required?

- Co-located interstates exist throughout the US so yes, we will be studying this

****Q:** Is widening a consideration? Double decking a possibility? Triple decking? Tunneling?

- This project is just looking at 2000ft wide possibilities, should funding become available; different

configurations will be looked at

****Q:** Will 2000ft be in addition to what is existing for I-10?

- No, existing I-10 will be included. I-10 represents center line, but can be asymmetrical. Very possible not totally exact center line in some places.

EIS analysis is in progress right now

- will consider air quality, biological resources, noise and vibration, economic impacts, parks and rec, geology soils and farmlands, socioeconomic and environmental justice, hazardous materials, transportation, visual and aesthetics, cultural resources – historic, archaeological and architectural, water resources, more.

****Q:** Do environmental impacts only look at fed lands? Will it look at lands that aren't federally protected such as City of Tucson property in Avra Valley dedicated to water uses?

-Yes, City of Tucson has submitted that

****Q:** Will Sec. 106 process be followed?

-Yes, NHPA process is going forward, 100+ consulting parties

TOPIC	DETAILS
REVIEW "TOPIC DISCUSSION STEPS"	Reviewed the steps below:

TOPIC DISCUSSION STEPS

STEP	LENGTH	CONTENT
------	--------	---------

#1 Everyone has a turn to briefly state their <u>one key</u> perspective re: the issue/topic, and explain the <u>one key</u> underlying reason/interest for their perspective.	1 minute each participant <i>(20 minutes)</i>	Chart #1: Name/Perspective/ Key Interest
#2 When it is not your turn, listen for new information; actively listen to understand other’s perspective and underlying reasons for their perspective.	Ongoing throughout the process	
#3 Review the perspectives/interests chart; and ask questions to clarify other’s underlying reasons; or add additional underlying reasons (not already listed).	5-10 minutes	Chart #1: Name/Key Perspective/ Key Interest
#4 Combine interests (key) where possible and as agreed upon by all participants. Transfer list of combined interests to Chart #2.	5-10 minutes	Charts #1- #2
#5 Everyone has a turn to briefly state their <u>one key</u> alternative/option that supports the listed key interests <i>(discuss and identify one at a time giving full respect, focus and consideration to each)</i> .	20 minutes (1 min. per participant)	Charts #2: Key interest/Key Alternative/Option
#6 Combine like alternatives/options where possible. Transfer list of combined alternative/options to Chart #3.	5 minutes	Charts #2-#3
#7 Everyone has a turn to briefly state the pros and/or cons for each alternative/option listed.	20 minutes <i>(1 min. per participant)</i>	Chart #3: Key alternative/Pros/Cons
#8 Review chart(s) and identify possible common ground <i>(related to an alternative, option, etc.)</i> .	5-20 minutes	

#9	10-15 minutes	
Identify Next Steps.		

TOPIC	DETAILS																								
STAKEHOLDERS PERSPECTIVES AND INTERESTS	<p>REVIEW CHART & DEVELOP BASED ON THE TOPIC:</p> <p><u>What is your perspective on the I-11 Corridor?</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Stakeholder Grp</th> <th>Key Perspective (1)</th> <th>letter</th> <th>Key Interests (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Erickson Terrascapes</td> <td>Need to consider historic landscapes – large-scale issue based on small-scale items.</td> <td></td> <td>Want to look at what’s affected geographically – intangible heritage of landscape</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Audubon Society</td> <td>Limit construction</td> <td></td> <td>Avoid negative impacts on habitats and wildlife connectivity</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CAPLA</td> <td>Opportunity to be innovative – get out of old transportation mindset, consider creative alternatives such as rail</td> <td></td> <td>Sustainability – should not be encouraging more people to drive personal vehicles. Encourage alternative means of transportation. Limit sprawl, build up not out. Development will accompany any new transportation facility.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation</td> <td>Consideration of historic and cultural resources</td> <td></td> <td>Avoiding demolition and negative impacts to historic neighborhoods, sites, archeological resources. Goal to avoid negative impacts to historic parts of city. Increase functionality while also taking into consideration historic/cultural resources</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection</td> <td>Not convinced that concerns can be met with co-location with I-10/ I-19</td> <td></td> <td>Disruption to river corridors (Santa Cruz and tributaries), disruption to habitat and migratory corridors, disruption to</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Stakeholder Grp	Key Perspective (1)	letter	Key Interests (1)	Erickson Terrascapes	Need to consider historic landscapes – large-scale issue based on small-scale items.		Want to look at what’s affected geographically – intangible heritage of landscape	Audubon Society	Limit construction		Avoid negative impacts on habitats and wildlife connectivity	CAPLA	Opportunity to be innovative – get out of old transportation mindset, consider creative alternatives such as rail		Sustainability – should not be encouraging more people to drive personal vehicles. Encourage alternative means of transportation. Limit sprawl, build up not out. Development will accompany any new transportation facility.	Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation	Consideration of historic and cultural resources		Avoiding demolition and negative impacts to historic neighborhoods, sites, archeological resources. Goal to avoid negative impacts to historic parts of city. Increase functionality while also taking into consideration historic/cultural resources	Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection	Not convinced that concerns can be met with co-location with I-10/ I-19		Disruption to river corridors (Santa Cruz and tributaries), disruption to habitat and migratory corridors, disruption to
Stakeholder Grp	Key Perspective (1)	letter	Key Interests (1)																						
Erickson Terrascapes	Need to consider historic landscapes – large-scale issue based on small-scale items.		Want to look at what’s affected geographically – intangible heritage of landscape																						
Audubon Society	Limit construction		Avoid negative impacts on habitats and wildlife connectivity																						
CAPLA	Opportunity to be innovative – get out of old transportation mindset, consider creative alternatives such as rail		Sustainability – should not be encouraging more people to drive personal vehicles. Encourage alternative means of transportation. Limit sprawl, build up not out. Development will accompany any new transportation facility.																						
Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation	Consideration of historic and cultural resources		Avoiding demolition and negative impacts to historic neighborhoods, sites, archeological resources. Goal to avoid negative impacts to historic parts of city. Increase functionality while also taking into consideration historic/cultural resources																						
Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection	Not convinced that concerns can be met with co-location with I-10/ I-19		Disruption to river corridors (Santa Cruz and tributaries), disruption to habitat and migratory corridors, disruption to																						

				wildlife, footprint, noise, dust, lights – impact on wildlife both nocturnal and diurnal. Also impacts to archaeological and cultural resources.
	Menlo Park Neighborhood Association	Concerned re: increased separation of west side from downtown		Impact of I-10 has already created a separation, some residents still bitter about separation of different barrios from downtown. Disrupts life / character of city. Walkability becomes affected, neighborhoods get more isolated. Hope to collaborate on the issues and reach consensus.
	Sonoran Institute	See a competitive argument to be made for I-11. Desire innovation in support of flow of the goods. If build something new need to know it will legitimately help flow of goods.		Do we really need another highway? Need to seriously evaluate new non-highway options before get to construction of a highway
	I-10 Self Storage	I-11 could overlay I-10 freeway – which could lead to widening of I-10. Business located on I-10 frontage road, if widened could take some of business property and affect business income.		Another widening could be detrimental to businesses located along I-10 frontage road (b/c of construction). Don't want to see I-10 widened more. Too harmful to small businesses located in "wrong place."
	Sun Corridor Inc.	Need I-11 to remain economically competitive and provide future employment opportunities		Sec. B doesn't resolve/ address the need as outlined in original study (population growth, defense, etc.)
TOPIC	DETAILS			
Review Parking Lot Items	<p>The following are items listed on the "Parking Lot" flipchart sheet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Consider bringing Groups B and C/D together to share and integrate perspectives and learn about the details of each potential route 			

--	--

TOPIC	DETAILS
NEXT MEETING PLANNING & SCHEDULING	<p>Next Stakeholder Engagement Meeting – scheduled April 3, 2018, 1:00-4:30pm</p> <p>Continue with Discussion Topic charts and stakeholders’ input</p>

TOPIC	DETAILS
CLOSING COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS	<p>Outstanding questions/comments:</p> <p>**Q: Concern re: absent attendees – will they be allowed to join other meetings?</p> <p>- USIECR will discuss, and if allowed they will have to prepare by reviewing everything covered during Meeting #1.</p> <p>**Q: Are stakeholder substitutes allowed at these meetings?</p> <p>- No</p> <p>**Q: Can anyone from Group B attend C/D meetings?</p> <p>- They can, but since they are not officially invited their ability to attend is limited by space available.</p> <p>**Q: Is there buy-in from ADOT/FHWA to honor the outcomes of these meetings?</p> <p>- Yes, ADOT welcomes information from the stakeholders during this process.</p>

	<p>All comments will be reviewed from all arenas.</p> <p>**Q: What is difference from process outcomes here vs. putting comments on website?</p> <p>--Hopefully the dialogue here will generate deep discussion on the reasons for/against the I-11 project. Trying to get more detail than just the one-liners that appear on the website.</p> <p>REMINDER: There is a new tab on the I-11 Corridor ADOT website that has summary of Udall interviews, and will have meeting highlights from these stakeholder meetings.</p> <p>Anyone can provide input on I-11 website.</p>
--	---

ACTION ITEMS

<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	BY WHEN
Read highlights from Meeting #1 Group C/D	Group B Stakeholders	Prior to Meeting #2 (April 3)
<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	BY WHEN
Develop and send Meeting #1 highlights to meeting participants	USIECR	March 18

<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	BY WHEN
Include time in Meeting #2 and #3 for stakeholders to consider innovative corridor options	USIECR	April 3

Attachments:

Introduction to Collaboration

ADOT I-11 Corridor presentation

I-11-Winter-2018-Fact-Sheet-English

Appendix C: Group C/D Meeting #1 Highlights

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting Notes

Group C/D - March 8, 2018

Picture Rocks Fire and Medical District Administration Building

12121 W. Picture Rocks Rd.

Tucson, AZ 85743

12:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

BACKGROUND:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are preparing a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Interstate 11 (I-11) Corridor between Nogales and Wickenburg, Arizona. The Tier 1 EIS will assess the potential social, economic and natural environmental impacts of a No Build Alternative and a reasonable range of Build Corridor Alternatives for a proposed transportation facility within the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study area. The Notice of Intent to prepare the I-11 Tier 1 EIS was issued in May 2016. Since then, FHWA and ADOT have conducted public and agency scoping meetings, outreach to tribes and stakeholders, and completed an alternatives development and screening process.

FHWA and ADOT have invited the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute) to facilitate meetings with interested stakeholders regarding the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study in Pima County, to augment the ongoing public input effort. The objective of these stakeholder group meetings is to provide a method for additional productive Pima County community conversations to inform the Interstate 11 Corridor Environmental Impact study with more specifics regarding individual community concerns and preferences to enable technical analysis and planning.

This is the first of three meetings for the C/D Study Group, which includes stakeholders located in the geographical area west and northwest of the Tucson mountains.

AGENDA ITEMS & HIGHLIGHTS

TOPIC	DETAILS
WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS	The Udall Foundation's US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution 3 rd party neutral facilitator, Joy Keller-Weidman, welcomed everyone. Introduced herself, as Senior Program Manager, Transportation Sector; and the Senior Program Associate, Mitch Chrismer, who will be co-facilitating and notetaking.

TOPIC	DETAILS
MEETING OVERVIEW	<p>Reviewed the Meeting Outcomes, Agenda Items & format</p> <p>OUTCOMES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the most recently published I-11 Corridor project info re: current proposed options • Understand each stakeholder group's perspective re: I-11 Corridor options • Understand the values, interests and characteristics most important to the communities • Identify potential impacts/benefits (environmental and economic) of proposed corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify ways to mitigate/promote those • Explore creative alternatives/options moving forward that address concerns • Inform decision-makers re: what is most important to stakeholder groups <p>AGENDA ITEMS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting outcomes, agenda, format (15 min.) <input type="checkbox"/> Introduce the stakeholders, project team and facilitators (30 min.) <input type="checkbox"/> Collaboration and meeting participation agreements (20 min.) <input type="checkbox"/> BREAK (15 min.) <input type="checkbox"/> Review project vision, background and current proposed options (60 min.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1st presentation: project overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Background: project vision, purpose and need ○ 2nd presentation on where we are now w I-11 Corridor options and how we got there <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Include estimated time frame of Tier 1 process

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tucson corridor options: why, considerations, where are now, how we got there <input type="checkbox"/> Share perspectives and interests (45 min.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding questions for next meeting/meeting agenda items (15 min.) <input type="checkbox"/> Closing Comments and Meeting feedback (10 min.)
--	--

TOPIC	DETAILS																					
FORMAL INTRODUCTIONS	<i>Facilitator asked for everyone to share their name, stakeholder group, 1 key desired outcome and 1 key question for the meeting.</i>																					
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">ORG</th> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">Outcome</th> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">Question</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Avra Valley Coalition</td> <td>Clarity</td> <td>Why are we discussing Avra Valley alternatives?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Avra Valley Coalition</td> <td>Understand better who stands to benefit from Avra Valley routes</td> <td>Why were all Avra Valley routes not already eliminated?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>National Parks Conservation Association</td> <td>Better understand why anyone would think Avra Valley freeway is needed</td> <td>Why Tier 1 and Tier 2 process being used here – why haven't environmental Studies already been done?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NW Fire District</td> <td>What are projected timelines? – info gathering, future planning</td> <td>What are the funding sources?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marana Unified Schools</td> <td>Learn timelines and route planning (info gathering, future planning)</td> <td>When would this start?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tucson Metro Chamber</td> <td>Get all participants on the same page / understand where I-11 is in the process and</td> <td>How does this process impact / influence the EIS formal process?</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	ORG	Outcome	Question	Avra Valley Coalition	Clarity	Why are we discussing Avra Valley alternatives?	Avra Valley Coalition	Understand better who stands to benefit from Avra Valley routes	Why were all Avra Valley routes not already eliminated?	National Parks Conservation Association	Better understand why anyone would think Avra Valley freeway is needed	Why Tier 1 and Tier 2 process being used here – why haven't environmental Studies already been done?	NW Fire District	What are projected timelines? – info gathering, future planning	What are the funding sources?	Marana Unified Schools	Learn timelines and route planning (info gathering, future planning)	When would this start?	Tucson Metro Chamber	Get all participants on the same page / understand where I-11 is in the process and	How does this process impact / influence the EIS formal process?
	ORG	Outcome	Question																			
	Avra Valley Coalition	Clarity	Why are we discussing Avra Valley alternatives?																			
	Avra Valley Coalition	Understand better who stands to benefit from Avra Valley routes	Why were all Avra Valley routes not already eliminated?																			
	National Parks Conservation Association	Better understand why anyone would think Avra Valley freeway is needed	Why Tier 1 and Tier 2 process being used here – why haven't environmental Studies already been done?																			
	NW Fire District	What are projected timelines? – info gathering, future planning	What are the funding sources?																			
	Marana Unified Schools	Learn timelines and route planning (info gathering, future planning)	When would this start?																			
Tucson Metro Chamber	Get all participants on the same page / understand where I-11 is in the process and	How does this process impact / influence the EIS formal process?																				

		how it got there	
	Avra Water Co-op	Better understand where corridor will run and why	How will it affect our co-op?
	Freeport McMoran	Better understand the process moving forward	How will route affect the Freeport mine site?
	AZ Sonora Desert Museum	What are the benefits of I-11 and how well has recent data developments matched projections	To include environmental costs and benefits up front and throughout the decision process
	Sonoran Institute	Awareness of the diversity of interests around the Avra Valley I-11 corridor	Is everyone in the room?
	Caterpillar	Will any proposed routes actually cross Caterpillar property?	What considerations have been made for future transportation and shipping? How does that affect corridor size?
	Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection	Avoid Avra Valley	What will FHWA/ADOT do with the input from these meetings?
	AZ Heritage Alliance	Preserve our natural and cultural heritage	How much of our natural heritage do we need to sacrifice to move more traffic?
	Friends of Ironwood Forest	Define scope of EIS	Is I-11 really needed?
	<i>FHWA AND ADOT/STAFF</i>		
	Aryan Lirange	FHWA	
	Tremaine Wilson	FHWA	
	CT Revere	Gordley	
	Jay Van Echo	ADOT	

	Jan Gordley	Gordley
	Laura Douglas	ADOT
	Carlos Lopez	ADOT
	Jennifer Pyne	AECOM

TOPIC	DETAILS
COLLABORATION AND MEETING AGREEMENTS	<p>COLLABORATION OVERVIEW</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Understand different perspectives ◆ Need feel that ADOT/FHWA part of the group too – in order for this to feel truly collaborative ◆ (see attached document <i>Introduction to Collaboration</i>) <p>Meeting Agreements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be prepared to participate, collaborate, and share pertinent information. 2. Engage in a respectful, thoughtful deliberation. 3. One person speaks at a time: Listen carefully when not speaking. 4. Be open to all perspectives. 5. Keep in mind the large picture (regional interests as they relate to larger needs and priorities), as well as your individual/stakeholder group viewpoint. 6. Turn off or mute all electronic devices, so there are no distractions. 7. No recording devices will be allowed during the meeting. <p><u>QUESTIONS ABOUT MEETING AGREEMENTS</u></p> <p>**Q: Why no recording devices allowed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Hope to keep stakeholders comfortable --Respect for other stakeholders <p>**Q: What is OK to share from this meeting?</p>

	<p>--Notes will be non-attributable, highlights of meeting will be made available online, comments can also be collected online</p>
--	---

TOPIC	DETAILS: OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND
<p>ADOT PROJECT PRESENTATION AND Q&A</p>	<p>CANAMEX corridor in AZ: Follows generally in the vicinity of: Nogales – I-19 – I-10 – I-93 – Wickenburg</p> <p>No funding for this project yet.</p> <p>Why here (C/D region)? Transportation Board saw need to identify potential purpose/need for new high capacity highway</p> <p>Initially started looking at corridor between Phoenix and Las Vegas, then went more broadly to include all of potential I-11 in AZ</p> <p>Two endpoints for I-11 set in AZ (Nogales + Wickenburg)</p> <p>2015 FAST Act changed name from CANAMEX corridor to I-11</p> <p>NEPA process will be adhered to – tribal engagement already underway, multiple cooperating agencies participating</p> <p>NHPA process will be adhered to also, agencies legally bound to address archaeological/ cultural impacts</p> <p>Purpose / need for project includes congestion relief, creation of evacuation routes, better access to economic centers, increased system linkage and regional interstate mobility, meet demands of expected population and employment</p>

	<p>growth, meet needs for homeland security and national defense.</p> <p>Tier 1 vs. Tier 2 criteria</p> <p>To qualify as a Tier 2 EIS, two important criteria must be met: Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) must be implemented, and reasonable source of funding must be identified.</p> <p>Tier 2 qualifications have <i>not</i> yet been met</p> <p>**Q: Why not do a full EIS before making a decision re: route?</p> <p>**Q: What studies are being done to inform a decision?</p> <p>--Right now, doing EIS for 2000 ft. wide corridor</p> <p>--Cultural, biological, viewsheds, noise, light pollution, all are being examined to inform a decision</p> <p>Tier1 covers multi-modal. Currently don't know what exactly going to build yet – that is determined in Tier 2 ... right now only looking at 2000 ft wide potential corridor for future build implementation (no-build also an option)</p> <p>**Q: What does “Access Control” mean?</p> <p>--can only get on/off freeway at specific points (exits) like currently exists on I-10</p> <p>**Q: will this be a toll road?</p> <p>--likely no due to political climate, but the report economic considerations will be looking at everything</p> <p>**Q: Why doesn't ADOT look at existing facilities?</p> <p>--they are</p>
--	--

****Q:** \$10B in trade w/ Mexico increasing to \$40B in 2040 – have traffic projections been done that incorporate this increase? What do projections say?

--Lots of data gathered re: levels of service (A-F). Existing facilities by year 2040 (if no-build) degrade to levels D, E and F if do (no build) nothing (meaning really bad traffic).

AZ state-wide model used for analysis of traffic, it is a peer-reviewed model that goes through a formal process of review

****Q:** What about the local resolution that says there will be no bypass in Avra Valley?

--This is not an I-10 bypass. This is an I-11 corridor (new freeway)

****Q:** Why studying Avra Valley? Has this section been examined before?

--No, hasn't been examined yet

--No environmental study yet performed at fine detail

--Shouldn't we want more study done in general?

--Biology is one of many criteria being examined (traffic, noise, etc.)

****Q:** What if there are mandatory restrictions to CAP water in AZ? What about population growth?

--Model projections are based on many things and provided by the State Demographer's Office. We expect growth, but not exponential growth. Nothing will be built until a full EIS is conducted.

****Q:** Are climate issues addressed in models?

--Looking back at how local jurisdictions are planning for the future – this informs ADOT's models

	<p>**Q: Projected timeframe for decision?</p> <p>--Don't know yet. Need to gather input, develop final EIS, develop preferred alternative, go through public comment period, selected alternative – takes a few years to do</p> <p>**Q: What is the purpose of these meetings?</p> <p>-- Get a deep dive into the issues, determine what look closer at – hard to get good interaction at public meetings w 200 people talking. Hope to understand values, interests behind positions.</p> <p>--Currently things are at program level - programmatic EIS (similar to BLM). Tier 1.</p> <p>**Q: Does this decision need more than a Tier1 EIS?</p> <p>--Will go as deep as needed until team can make an informed decision. For example, ADOT/FHWA held a 2.5hr meeting yesterday w/ BOR, FWS, AZG&F on the different biological data layers. No improvements will be made until a second tier (Tier 2) of environmental analysis is completed</p> <p>**Q: These meetings are seeking a deep dive into what?</p> <p>--Have good information on things like traffic models</p> <p>--Have a lot of data to work with</p> <p>--End of this study is to determine if and where I-11 will be</p> <p>--Will determine exits, width, etc. in Tier 2</p> <p>--Trying to get enough info to properly see benefits /impacts to all potential alternatives</p> <p>**Q: Has FHWA done study re: what accident of toxic materials would do to Tucson's water supply? Water security should deserve a "deeper dive"</p> <p>--Solutions to this can be implemented at the Tier 2 level</p> <p>--Working w/ Tucson City water currently on SAVSARP and CAVSARP facilities</p>
--	---

	<p>Tier1 vs. Tier2</p> <p>**Q: How are issues weighted?</p> <p>--See the DEIS to get full answer to this</p> <p>--EIS methodology document is available online, shows how each criteria looked out. All cooperating agencies agreed to this document.</p> <p>**Q: Why was route E eliminated?</p> <p>--Because of traffic, per the software tool model output</p> <p>Software tool planning model description</p> <p>--Avra Valley came up as reasonable alternative in model</p> <p>**Q: Why didn't right-of-way eliminate Avra Valley route in software tool? Why didn't sensitive environmental Issues eliminate Avra Valley?</p> <p>**Q: How can ADOT make people comfortable that enough study has been done? Both sides have pros and cons, folks in this room need know that things important to them have had enough study</p> <p>**Q: How can stakeholders be assured that info submitted is adequately considered? Any restrictions on what data can be shared?</p> <p>--No restrictions, stakeholders can send links to Udall Foundation for dissemination</p> <p>**Q: Has there been study on risks to CAVSARP/SAVSARP?</p> <p>Goal to get as much information as possible to make best informed decision possible in Tier1 ... want to fulfill NEPA requirements and make best decision possible</p>
--	---

TOPIC DISCUSSION STEPS

STEP	LENGTH	CONTENT
#1 Everyone has a turn to briefly state their <u>one key</u> perspective re: the issue/topic, and explain the <u>one key</u> underlying reason/interest for their perspective.	1 minute each participant <i>(20 minutes)</i>	Chart #1: Name/Perspective/ Key Interest
#2 When it is not your turn, listen for new information; actively listen to understand other's perspective and underlying reasons for their perspective.	Ongoing throughout the process	
#3 Review the perspectives/interests chart; and ask questions to clarify other's underlying reasons; or add additional underlying reasons (not already listed).	5-10 minutes	Chart #1: Name/Key Perspective/ Key Interest
#4 Combine interests (key) where possible and as agreed upon by all participants. Transfer list of combined interests to Chart #2.	5-10 minutes	Charts #1- #2
#5 Everyone has a turn to briefly state their <u>one key</u> alternative/option that supports the listed key interests <i>(discuss and identify one at a time giving full respect, focus and consideration to each).</i>	20 minutes (1 min. per participant)	Charts #2: Key interest/Key Alternative/Option
#6 Combine like alternatives/options where possible. Transfer list of combined alternative/options to Chart #3.	5 minutes	Charts #2-#3
#7 Everyone has a turn to briefly state the pros and/or cons for each alternative/option listed.	20 minutes (1 min. per participant)	Chart #3: Key alternative/Pros/ Cons

#8 Review chart(s) and identify possible common ground (related to an alternative, option, etc.).	5-20 minutes	
#9 Identify Next Steps.	10-15 minutes	

TOPIC	DETAILS																				
STAKEHOLDERS PERSPECTIVES AND INTERESTS	REVIEW CHART & DEVELOP BASED ON THE TOPIC: What is your perspective on the I-11 Corridor?																				
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Stakeholder Grp</th> <th>Key Perspective (1)</th> <th>letter</th> <th>Key Interests (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Friends of Ironwood Forest</td> <td>C/D Option would block wildlife corridors near Ironwood Forest</td> <td></td> <td>Wildlife linkages between Ironwood Forest and other areas</td> </tr> <tr> <td>AZ Heritage Alliance</td> <td>Need to re-think basic premises that drove us to I-11 decision (economic development)</td> <td></td> <td>I-11 would reap serious environmental damages on local area (Saguaro Nat'l Park and ASDM)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection</td> <td>Fear loss of cultural aspects / character of downtown + environmental issues if Tucson mountains isolated</td> <td></td> <td>Use current I-10/ I-19 alignment to meet all identified needs</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Why build</td> <td></td> <td>Concern proposed corridor could</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Stakeholder Grp	Key Perspective (1)	letter	Key Interests (1)	Friends of Ironwood Forest	C/D Option would block wildlife corridors near Ironwood Forest		Wildlife linkages between Ironwood Forest and other areas	AZ Heritage Alliance	Need to re-think basic premises that drove us to I-11 decision (economic development)		I-11 would reap serious environmental damages on local area (Saguaro Nat'l Park and ASDM)	Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection	Fear loss of cultural aspects / character of downtown + environmental issues if Tucson mountains isolated		Use current I-10/ I-19 alignment to meet all identified needs		Why build		Concern proposed corridor could
	Stakeholder Grp	Key Perspective (1)	letter	Key Interests (1)																	
	Friends of Ironwood Forest	C/D Option would block wildlife corridors near Ironwood Forest		Wildlife linkages between Ironwood Forest and other areas																	
	AZ Heritage Alliance	Need to re-think basic premises that drove us to I-11 decision (economic development)		I-11 would reap serious environmental damages on local area (Saguaro Nat'l Park and ASDM)																	
Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection	Fear loss of cultural aspects / character of downtown + environmental issues if Tucson mountains isolated		Use current I-10/ I-19 alignment to meet all identified needs																		
	Why build		Concern proposed corridor could																		

	Caterpillar	something antiquated?		cut across land purchased by Caterpillar that is designated for desert protection
	Sonoran Institute	Need adequate study to identify impacts – Environmental Justice, impacts to communities ... need appreciate all impacts under consideration		More corridors under consideration better than fewer
	AZ Sonoran Desert Museum	I-11 a bad idea		Degrade quality of life, for people that live and visit region. Find a way that doesn't impact environmental justice
	Freeport McMoran	Don't want to see anything that jeopardizes mining operation – big economic impact		How are maps fed into models? Private vs. Public lands – potential error in model?
	Avra Valley Water Co-op	Water biggest concern		Preserve wells
	Tucson Metro Chamber	Questions re: viability of corridor, accuracy of placement of the 2000 ft. corridor		Want to see all considerations weighted equally in process (neutrality important)
	Marana School District	School doesn't have choice, have to find classrooms for children – C/D vs. B – not sure one better than other.		Future school planning determined based on where Corridor route is planned
	Northwest Fire District	Serve community. Already service Route B.		More info re: how new traffic would impact emergency services / public safety
	National Park	Impact to		Oppose development b/c of

	Conservation Association	designated wilderness areas		environmental concerns. Need as much info as possible informing Tier 1 process
	Avra Valley Coalition	Opposed to C/D route b/c of sprawl impacts that can't be mitigated		Don't have confidence in models, especially re: the 80ft section
	Avra Valley Coalition	Need for C/D not yet proven		Public appear overwhelmingly against proposed C/D route (re: public comments thus far)
TOPIC		DETAILS		
Review Parking Lot Items		<p>The following are items listed on the "Parking Lot" flipchart sheet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Why two subgroups – I-10 and Avra Valley? ◆ Consider adding Meeting #4 to combine B and C/D Groups (Joy) 		

TOPIC	DETAILS
NEXT MEETING PLANNING & SCHEDULING	<p>ITEMS TO CONSIDER FOR NEXT MEETING AGENDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Who stands to benefit from new I-11 Corridor? ◆ Each stakeholder identifies what is important to them and should be studied in more depth ◆ Look at key questions – what still needs to be answered /can be answered? ◆ What are the stakeholder recommendations and what needs to happen next? ◆ Identify what is important to study and include in Tier 1 analysis. <p>The next Stakeholder Engagement Meeting scheduled for April 5, 2018 from</p>

	<p>12:30 to 4:00 pm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Updated maps ◆ Review unanswered questions ◆ Continue with Discussion Topic process charts
--	--

TOPIC	DETAILS
IDENTIFY ITEMS TO CONSIDER FOR NEXT MEETING AGENDA	<p>ITEMS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Answer: who stands to benefit from new I-11 Corridor? ◆ Each stakeholder identifies what is important to them and should be studied in more depth ◆ Look at key questions – what still needs to be answered /can be answered? ◆ What are the stakeholder recommendations and what needs to happen next? ◆ Identify what is important to study and include in Tier 1 analysis.

TOPIC	DETAILS
CLOSING COMMENTS (Stakeholders)	<p>Outstanding questions/comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Good to see staff members do literature review ◆ Who benefits from Avra Valley route? Want to know that info ◆ Excellent facilitation ◆ Thanks for engagement ◆ Thanks for dedicating time to this ◆ Learned a lot from everyone ◆ Hope to better understand process ◆ Thanks all ◆ Thanks all, hope this will be beneficial ◆ Can get copy of Jay’s presentation? (YES) ◆ Appreciate this opportunity, appreciate everyone’s time, good facilitation ◆ Thanks to facilitators, learned a lot today

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Excellent opportunity to provide perspectives on EIS, and how output of these meetings can inform EIS
Staff	Thanks, will try get commitment from missing folks and if they plan to attend subsequent meetings will catch them up to speed

ACTION ITEMS

<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	<u>BY WHEN</u>
Send links to Mitch and Joy to distribute along with meeting highlights	Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection	March 14
<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	<u>BY WHEN</u>
Distribute ADOT presentation along with notes	US Institute	March 16-19
<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	<u>BY WHEN</u>
Provide updated maps that show state ownership and private land	ADOT /FHWA	April 5
<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	<u>BY WHEN</u>
Complete a literature review	ADOT and FHWA staff	April 5

Attachments:

Introduction to Collaboration

ADOT I-11 Corridor presentation

I-11-Winter-2018-Fact-Sheet-English

[Appendix D: Group B Meeting #2 Highlights](#)

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 3, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

BACKGROUND:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are preparing a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Interstate 11 (I-11) Corridor between Nogales and Wickenburg, Arizona. The Tier 1 EIS will assess the potential social, economic and natural environmental impacts of a No Build Alternative and a reasonable range of Build Corridor Alternatives for a proposed transportation facility within the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study area. The Notice of Intent to prepare the I-11 Tier 1 EIS was issued in May 2016. Since then, FHWA and ADOT have conducted public and agency scoping meetings, outreach to tribes and stakeholders, and completed an alternatives development and screening process.

FHWA and ADOT have invited the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute) to facilitate meetings with interested stakeholders regarding the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study in Pima County, to augment the ongoing public input effort. The objective of these stakeholder group meetings is to provide a method for additional productive Pima County community conversations to inform the Interstate 11 Corridor Environmental Impact study with more specifics regarding individual community concerns and preferences to enable technical analysis and planning.

This is the second of three meetings for the B Study Group, which includes stakeholders located in the urban I-10 Tucson geographical area.

AGENDA ITEMS & HIGHLIGHTS

TOPIC	DETAILS
WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS	The US Institute's 3 rd party neutral facilitator, Joy Keller-Weidman, welcomed everyone. Introduced herself, as Senior Program Manager, Transportation Sector; and the Senior Program Associate, Mitch Chrismer, who will be co-facilitating and notetaking.

TOPIC	DETAILS
MEETING OVERVIEW	<p>Reviewed the Meeting#2 Outcomes & Agenda Items</p> <p><u>OUTCOMES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand each stakeholder's perspectives re: I-11 Corridor options • Understand the values, interests and characteristics most important to the stakeholders • Identify potential impacts/benefits of proposed corridors based on local knowledge within the stakeholder group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify ways to mitigate/promote those <p><u>AGENDA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting overview (Meeting outcomes, agenda & meeting agreements) (10 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Provide proposed corridor information, currently available to the public (20 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide study process information regarding current status ○ Review unanswered questions and the resources for answers <input type="checkbox"/> BREAK (10 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders' Input (120 minutes total) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review perspectives & interests (30 minutes) ○ Identify specifics that stakeholders believe are important to consider in decision making (40 minutes) ○ Explore pros and cons (30 minutes)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How might design options provide solutions (20 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> BREAK (10 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> List questions to answer during next meeting (10 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What information is needed re: I-11 Corridor options and what technical information would be helpful ○ What additional types of information can stakeholders identify to be considered in decision making <input type="checkbox"/> Next meeting agenda items (10 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Closing Comments and Meeting feedback (15 minutes)
--	---

TOPIC	DETAILS
INTRODUCTIONS	<p>Facilitator asked for everyone to share their name & stakeholder group</p> <p>Stakeholders present represented the following groups:</p> <p>Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection</p> <p>Menlo Park Neighborhood Association</p> <p>Erickson Terrascape</p> <p>Tucson Audubon Society</p> <p>Friends of Ironwood Forest</p> <p>CAPLA</p> <p>Statistical Research, Inc.</p> <p>Sonoran Institute</p> <p>In addition, 1 staff member was present from FHWA and 4 from ADOT/AECOM.</p> <p>Aryan Lirange, FHWA</p> <p>Jay Van Echo, ADOT</p>

	Dayna Wasley, AECOM Carlos Lopez, ADOT Laura Douglas, ADOT
--	--

TOPIC	DETAILS
MEETING AGREEMENTS	<p>The facilitator referred to the items below and asked for consensus on these meeting agreements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be prepared to participate, collaborate, and share pertinent information. 2. Engage in a respectful, thoughtful deliberation. 3. One person speaks at a time: Listen carefully when not speaking. 4. Be open to all perspectives. 5. Keep in mind the large picture (regional interests as they relate to larger needs and priorities), as well as your individual/stakeholder group viewpoint. 6. Turn off or mute all electronic devices, so there are no distractions. 7. No recording devices will be allowed during the meeting. 8. Show up on time 9. Stick to agreed-upon speaking limits

TOPIC	DETAILS
CURRENT PROJECT PROCESS INFORMATION	<p>ADOT shared the following information re: project process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ ADOT recently met with BOR, AZ Game and Fish, NPS, FWS ◆ ADOT also met with Tucson Water re: facilities and operations ◆ ADOT continuing to meet with federal, state, regional partners ◆ ADOT continuing to work on dEIS (Tier 1) – currently just working on one EIS, which will be roadmap for any Tier 2 EIS

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Section 106 consultation is ongoing with tribal partners and other agencies involved in consultation
--	--

TOPIC	DETAILS
OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS	ADOT reviewed the following prepared Questions/Answers:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:
<p><input type="checkbox"/> How can I fully understand that a true need has been determined (purpose and need)?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A: A document outlining the purpose and need for the project has been prepared, and is available online at http://www.i11study.com/Arizona/Documents.asp. In addition, the I-11 Intermountain West Corridor Study (also at this link) establishes the starting point for the Tier 1 EIS Study regarding the need.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> How will the corridor address environmental concerns?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A: The Tier 1 EIS will provide an assessment of the potential environmental impacts of the corridor alternatives for the I-11 Corridor Study area as well as a No Build Alternative. In addition, strategies for mitigating adverse impacts including continued coordination with stakeholders will be identified. Additional environmental review (referred to as Tier 2) would be required for any project that is a piece of the selected I-11 corridor alternative after the Tier 1 EIS is complete. The Tier 2 studies would include more detailed design and environmental analysis.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> What is the scope of the planning process- what options/ issues being considered?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A: FHWA and ADOT conducted an 18-month phase of the process (May 2016</p>

through December 2017) to identify the key issues that need to be addressed and the corridor alternatives to be studied in the Tier 1 EIS. The Alternatives Selection Report (ASR) and other documents regarding this phase of the process are available online at <http://www.i11study.com/Arizona/Documents.asp>. The Tier 1 EIS will study the following areas:

Transportation, Land use, Recreation resources, Environmental justice, Economic impacts, Historic, archaeological, and cultural resources, Noise, Visual resources and aesthetic quality, Air quality, Hazardous materials, Geology, soils, and prime farmlands, Water resources, Biological resources, Resources afforded protections under Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation (USDOT) Act of 1966, and Indirect and cumulative effects

- How will construction impede access to my business? When? For how long?

A: The result of the Tier 1 EIS process will be the selection of a 2000-foot-wide corridor within which I-11 would be located or the determination that nothing will be built. Specific property impacts and right-of-way needs would be identified during the Tier 2 process, and would be accompanied by more detailed design and environmental study. Exact impacts and commitments for avoidance, minimization and mitigation will not be developed until the Tier 2 process.

- What are the impacts on historic resources?

A: This is being considered as part of the Tier 1 EIS. Properties that are designated as historic or could be eligible to be designated as historic, and that could be affected by the I-11 corridor alternatives, would be identified and the potential for impacts assessed, and general mitigation strategies developed. The Draft Tier 1 EIS will document the assessment of impacts to historic resources and will be available for public review in Fall 2018. Exact impacts and strategies for avoidance, minimization and mitigation will not be developed until the Tier 2 process.

- How are we addressing current and long-term needs of wildlife habitat and open space?

A: This is being considered as part of the Tier 1 EIS. The potential for impacts on wildlife habitat, wildlife movement corridors, and recreation areas will be assessed, and general mitigation strategies developed. The Draft Tier 1 EIS will document the assessment of impacts to wildlife habitat and will be available for

public review in Fall 2018. Exact impacts and strategies for avoidance, minimization and mitigation will not be developed until the Tier 2 process.

- How can we shift away from auto centric view of transportation towards more sustainable options?

A: ADOT's mission is to provide transportation resources that respond to travel demand needs and support local and regional land uses and plans. The I-11 Corridor is considered to be a future corridor and may be defined by state and local partners in the future to accommodate new technologies or realities.

- What historic / prehistoric resources will this impact? Explore creative alternative options moving forward to address concerns re: specific cultural and heritage assets.

A: See response above regarding historic resources. FHWA and ADOT are interested in any input provided on cultural and heritage assets that should be considered, and suggested mitigation strategies.

- Will there be any compensation for property taken from business owners if widened?

A: Exact right-of-way needs will be developed during the Tier 2 development process. Properties required for the project will be acquired in compliance with the Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 - commonly referred to as the "Uniform Act." The Uniform Act procedures require land owners and tenants be properly compensated and relocated, be treated fairly, equitably and receive relocation assistance.

- What are some game changes/disruptive events that could change scenarios that could be evaluated in Tier 2?

A: Changes in technologies or growth patterns would be monitored over time and could affect the definition of projects or implementation of I-11, if a Build Corridor is selected at the conclusion of the Tier 1 process.

- What will be the impact of B on historic and cultural resources?

A: See response above regarding historic resources. Cultural/archaeological resources are also being inventoried and potential for impacts will be considered

in the Tier 1 EIS.

- How are existing studies being included in Tier 1?

A: Prior studies and plans were considered in developing the corridor alternatives to be considered; see the I-11 Intermountain West Corridor Study (IMWC) and Alternatives Selection Report (ASR) for more information, which is available online at <http://www.i11study.com/Arizona/Documents.asp>. Please provide FHWA and ADOT input regarding any specific studies that should be considered as the Tier 1 EIS is prepared.

Additional Responses to questions asked at meeting

Q: What has been identified as Section 4(f) Properties?

A: Section 4(f) properties are publicly owned parks, recreation and other specific types of properties (such as Ironwood, Nat'l Monument, Tucson Mountain Park, city/state/federal park). FHWA must avoid all Section 4(f) properties, which will be itemized in the dEIS, if no options are available, FHWA must evaluate prudent and feasible corridor alternatives that minimize or mitigate impacts, and possibly do least overall harm analysis (including cultural and historic properties as qualified under NHPA).

The main web page with FHWA information is here:
<https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/legislation/section4f.aspx>

Alternatives vs. Options?

Q: Need / scope – is need based on traffic outlook?

A: The Tier 1 Draft EIS transportation model uses the state-wide population model that takes into account growth patterns, marries with Maricopa and Pima Association of Governments, and other MPOs, outputs. The Tier 1 Draft EIS then produces a state-wide transportation model of future traffic to enable corridor alternative comparisons.

Q: Bring B / CD groups together for a Meeting #4?

A: If stakeholders interested in options B and C/D were offered an in-person opportunity to

discuss these options with each other, the same opportunity would need to be extended to all stakeholders interested in all options. And of course, the funding and time for that are not available. If stakeholders are interested in understanding the other group’s perspective, interests and options, the notes from all meetings are available on the website.

Q: 2000 ft corridor – does EIS look outside those 2000ft?

A: Yes, look at indirect and cumulative effects beyond those 2000ft

TOPIC	DETAILS
DISCUSSION STEPS	Facilitator review the Discussion Steps below:

TOPIC DISCUSSION STEPS

STEP	LENGTH	CONTENT
#1: Everyone has a turn to briefly state their <u>one key</u> perspective re: the issue/topic, and explain the <u>one key</u> underlying reason/interest for their perspective.	1 minute each participant <i>(20 minutes)</i>	Chart #1: Name/Perspective/ Key Interest
#2: When it is not your turn, listen for new information; actively listen to understand other’s perspective and underlying reasons for their perspective.	Ongoing throughout the process	
#3: Review the perspectives/interests chart; and ask questions to clarify other’s underlying reasons; or add additional underlying reasons (not already listed).	5-10 minutes	Chart #1: Name/Key Perspective/ Key Interest
#4: Combine interests (key) where possible and as agreed upon by all participants. Transfer list of combined interests to Chart #2.	5-10 minutes	Charts #1- #2
#5: Everyone has a turn to briefly state their <u>one key</u> alternative/option that supports the listed key interests	20 minutes (1 min. per	Charts #2: Key interest/Key

<i>(discuss and identify one at a time giving full respect, focus and consideration to each).</i>	participant)	Alternative/Option
#6: Combine like alternatives/options where possible. Transfer list of combined alternative/options to Chart #3.	5 minutes	Charts #2-#3
#7: Everyone has a turn to briefly state the pros and/or cons for each alternative/option listed.	20 minutes (1 min. per participant)	Chart #3: Key alternative; and Pros/Cons
#8: Review chart(s) and identify possible common ground <i>(related to an alternative, option, etc.)</i> .	5-20 minutes	
#9: Identify Next Steps.	10-15 minutes	

TOPIC	DETAILS
STAKEHOLDERS INPUT	Review stakeholders' perspectives & interests; combine interests where possible, and identify options for each: See Chart #1 Below:

CHART #1

TOPIC:		
What is your perspective on the I-11 Corridor?		
Key Perspective (1)	letter	Key Interests (1)
Need to consider historic landscapes – large-scale issue based on small-scale items.		Want to look at what's affected geographically – intangible heritage of landscape
Limit construction		Avoid negative impacts on habitats and wildlife connectivity
Opportunity to be innovative – get out of old transportation mindset, consider creative alternatives such as rail		Sustainability – should not be encouraging more people to drive personal vehicles. Encourage alternative means of transportation. Limit sprawl, build up not out. Development will accompany any new transportation facility.
Consideration of historic and cultural resources		Avoiding demolition and negative impacts to historic neighborhoods, sites, archeological resources. Goal to avoid negative impacts to historic parts of city. Increase functionality while also taking into consideration

		historic/cultural resources
Not convinced that concerns can be met with co-location with I-10/ I-19		Disruption to river corridors (Santa Cruz and tributaries), disruption to habitat and migratory corridors, disruption to wildlife, footprint, noise, dust, lights – impact on wildlife both nocturnal and diurnal. Also impacts to archaeological and cultural resources.
Concerned re: increased separation of west side from downtown		Impact of I-10 has already created a separation, some residents still bitter about separation of different barrios from downtown. Disrupts life / character of city. Walkability becomes affected, neighborhoods get more isolated. Hope to collaborate on the issues and reach consensus.
See a competitive argument to be made for I-11. Desire innovation in support of flow of the goods. If build something new need to know it will legitimately help flow of goods.		Do we really need another highway? Need to seriously evaluate new non-highway options before get to construction of a highway
I-11 could overlay I-10 freeway – which could lead to widening of I-10. Business located on I-10 frontage road, if widened could take some of business property and affect business income.		Another widening could be detrimental to businesses located along I-10 frontage road (b/c of construction). Don't want to see I-10 widened more. Too harmful to small businesses located in "wrong place."
Need I-11 to remain economically competitive and provide future employment opportunities		Sec. B doesn't resolve/ address the need as outlined in original study (population growth, defense, etc.)
Understand the APE and details of construction for Alignment B to better evaluate impacts on the community, particularly in terms of all types of historic resources		How will what is being planned impact historic resources and connectivity of the community?

TOPIC	DETAILS
STAKEHOLDERS INPUT	Review options and combine where possible, and letter; and then identify the pros and cons of each: See Chart#2 Below:

Chart #2: (combine, where possible)

letter	Key Interests	Key Alternatives – Options – Mitigation Opportunities / Solutions (Avoid, Minimize, Mitigate)
A	Want to look at what’s affected geographically – intangible heritage of landscape	<p>Look at viewshed, from and to historic districts / neighborhoods / river / mountains / places of tribal interest.</p> <p>Consider Tucson’s origins and cultural practices of all time periods and cultures. Review criteria used in Santa Cruz River Heritage Area document, Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan document, and Pima County Multi-Species Conservation Plan.</p>
B	Incorporate alternative means of transportation / modes / technology into design package	
C	<p>Embrace sustainability within realms of Economic, Environmental, Social, Climate Change mitigation</p> <p>i.e. – should not be encouraging more people to drive personal vehicles.</p>	
D	Protect tangible heritage (cultural resources, i.e. archaeological / architectural resources). Avoid destruction of tangible heritage (i.e. avoid demolition and destruction). Consider known and unknown resources.	Refer to City of Tucson website, reports on archeologically sensitive zones, consult with SHPO & City and County Preservation Office, Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation – get more info on protection of tangible heritage, identify historic districts, location of individual historic properties/resources, information on previously evaluated properties and their significance, issues like vibration, drainage, character-defining features of historic districts
E	<p>Avoid disruption to river corridors (Santa Cruz and tributaries), habitat, and migratory corridors, wildlife.</p> <p>Footprint, noise, dust, lights- all impact wildlife, both nocturnal and diurnal.</p>	
F	Impact of I-10 has already created a separation, some residents still bitter about separation of different barrios from downtown. Disrupts life / character of city. Walkability, bike-ability, connectivity becomes	

	<p>affected, neighborhoods get more isolated.</p> <p>Encroachment into neighborhoods important to consider – neighborhoods can become more separated from city</p>	
G	Evaluate new non-highway options to reduce congestion and assess the cumulative impacts	<p><i>Reference John's email</i></p> <p>Consider range of activities / programs / technologies / other proposed highways that cumulatively could address congestion issues (at least in near term)</p> <p>Look at management / design of existing highways (I-10 & I-19) – i.e. ramp metering, etc.</p> <p>Programmatic efforts to reduce congestion – pricing, tolls, bus/shuttle systems, rapid rail system between Tucson/Phoenix</p> <p>Set of technologies that improve traffic flow – intelligent transportation systems (ITS)</p> <p>Enhancements to existing rail system to accommodate increased freight</p> <p>Proposed new highways within our region that could relieve congestion along corridor, consider extension of Aviation corridor through downtown (I-210)</p> <p>Goal: relieve/address congestion in near term, put off construction / funding of [bypass] or other major enhancements to I-10 (i.e. tunneling, triple decking, etc.) Revisit in 10-15 years, maybe new technologies will be available then that could further reduce congestion. Look at more near-term traffic modeling rather than 2040 projections. What could local plans better reflect? What more information is needed to better inform near-term planning/modeling? Are all possibilities being considered in current models?</p>
H	Consider economic harm to (small) businesses located along future widened corridor during planning, construction, and after, particularly along I-10 frontage roads	

I	Option B doesn't address the needs for projected population growth, congestion, national security considerations, trade flows, etc.		
J	For all interests – need information on full APE (Area of Potential Effect) to make informed comments.		

TOPIC	DETAILS
ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION	<p>Comments re: APE (Area of Potential Effect):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APE could be beyond 2000ft potential corridor, must be considered in Tier 1 and Tier 2 EIS process – broad, qualitative data considered during Tier 1 (i.e. noise), Tier 2 addresses specific quantitative data (i.e. exact decibel reading of noise) • APE applies to Sec. 106 considerations (as part of National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)) -similar evaluation/assessment of impact areas need be applied to environmental, etc. issues • Public involvement in all three phases: Scoping > dEIS > final EIS

TOPIC	DETAILS
Review Parking Lot Items	<p>The following are items listed on the “Parking Lot” flipchart sheet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ What additional actions beyond those included in area 5-year plans can be considered as an alternative (“B”?) in the Tier 2 process? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Planning processes requires that a given Tier 1 type of study utilize existing funded construction plans (the State Transportation Improvement Plan - STIP). Other unfunded transportation projects in various long-range plans are not included, however, once those projects begin their development they must consider the existing transportation landscape and make a determination if those improvements are required, can be delayed or deleted. ◆ How should we present these options for consideration? I.e. tolls,

	<p>rapid shuttle, ITS, ramp metering?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o All of the items provided by John are in the typical toolbox for ADOT, MPOs, Counties and Towns. They can be implemented through the normal transportation planning process. While these strategies can alleviate some congestion in the near term, they would not eliminate congestion in the long term. <p><i>For more detail on action items, please see Action Item chart at the end of the report.</i></p>
--	--

TOPIC	DETAILS
NEXT MEETING PLANNING & SCHEDULING	<p>April 24, 2018</p> <p>Recommended Agenda Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Complete Interest/Options/alternatives Chart #2 (2) Focus discussion of options related to key themes; and stakeholders provide pros and cons of each: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Viewsheds 2. Connectivity 3. Community cohesion <p>Note: Include the environmental, economic (macro and micro), and technical feasibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (3) Stakeholders explore: What are opportunities and/or mitigation options for decision makers to consider if Option B was selected? If Option B was selected, what do you want it to look like?

TOPIC	DETAILS
CLOSING	Outstanding questions/comments:

COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Thanks ◆ We've done it! ◆ Covered a lot of ground -but still have a lot of open items. How to move things along faster? ◆ Good group, good conversations. Want be sure that chart is completed. Consider sending chart to the group so that they can complete it before the next meeting (as homework) ◆ Interaction with ADOT staff very helpful, hope for more next meeting ◆ FHWA comment to stakeholders: please do homework on issues that you say would like explore alternatives on, i.e. look at studies on connectivity (urban and wildlife) from NAU. This will help FHWA/ADOT the most ◆ Please bring Helen's maps to next meeting so don't have to print again
----------	--

ACTION ITEMS

<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	<u>BY WHEN</u>
Produce maps with 2000 ft view	Helen and Carolyn	4/24
<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	<u>BY WHEN</u>
Identify design options re: mitigation consideration so group can narrow in on pros and cons of design alternatives	FHWA/ADOT	4/24
<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	<u>BY WHEN</u>
Complete the Interests/Options chart	Stakeholders	4/24

<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	BY WHEN
Bring maps (private) back to meeting	All stakeholders	4/24

<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	BY WHEN
<p>Review Chart #2 in the meeting notes: <u>Please focus on at least the lettered interest that you authored during the first meeting; and come prepared to share your ideas for options/alternatives.</u></p> <p>Review the lettered key interest items and identify ideas to include in the Key Alternatives – Options column. (solutions that Avoid, Minimize, Mitigate); and bring those with ideas with you.</p>	All stakeholders	Before the next meeting

[Appendix E: Group C/D Meeting #2 Highlights](#)

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting Notes

Group C/D – April 5, 2018

Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum (ASDM)

The Education Annex, Classrooms 1-2

2021 N Kinney Road

Tucson, AZ 85743

12:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

BACKGROUND:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are preparing a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Interstate 11 (I-11) Corridor between Nogales and Wickenburg, Arizona. The Tier 1 EIS will assess the potential social, economic and natural environmental impacts of a No Build Alternative and a reasonable range of Build Corridor Alternatives for a proposed transportation facility within the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study area. The Notice of Intent to prepare the I-11 Tier 1 EIS was issued in May 2016. Since then, FHWA and ADOT have conducted public and agency scoping meetings, outreach to tribes and stakeholders, and completed an alternatives development and screening process.

FHWA and ADOT have invited the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute) to facilitate meetings with interested stakeholders regarding the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study in Pima County, to augment the ongoing public input effort. The objective of these stakeholder group meetings is to provide a method for additional productive Pima County community conversations to inform the Interstate 11 Corridor Environmental Impact study with more specifics regarding individual community concerns and preferences to enable technical analysis and planning.

This is the second of three meetings for the C/D Study Group, which includes stakeholders located in the geographical area west and northwest of the Tucson mountains.

AGENDA ITEMS & HIGHLIGHTS

TOPIC	DETAILS
WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS	The US Institute's 3 rd party neutral facilitator, Joy Keller-Weidman, welcomed everyone. Introduced herself, as Senior Program Manager, Transportation Sector; and the senior program associate, Mitch Chrismar, who will be co-facilitating and notetaking.

TOPIC	DETAILS
MEETING OVERVIEW	<p>Reviewed the Meeting#2 Outcomes & Agenda Items</p> <p><u>OUTCOMES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand each stakeholder's perspectives re: I-11 Corridor options • Understand the values, interests and characteristics most important to the stakeholders • Identify potential impacts/benefits of proposed corridors based on local knowledge within the stakeholder group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify ways to mitigate/promote those <p><u>AGENDA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Meeting overview (Meeting outcomes, agenda & meeting agreements) (10 minutes) □ Provide proposed corridor information, currently available to the public (20 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide study process information regarding current status ○ Review unanswered questions and the resources for answers □ BREAK (10 minutes) □ Stakeholders' Input (120 minutes total) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review perspectives & interests (30 minutes) ○ Identify specifics that stakeholders believe are important to consider in decision making (40 minutes) ○ Explore pros and cons (30 minutes) ○ How might design options provide solutions (20 minutes) □ BREAK (10 minutes) □ List questions to answer during next meeting (10 minutes)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What information is needed re: I-11 Corridor options and what technical information would be helpful ○ What additional types of information can stakeholders identify to be considered in decision making <input type="checkbox"/> Next meeting agenda items (10 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Closing Comments and Meeting feedback (15 minutes)
--	--

TOPIC	DETAILS
INTRODUCTIONS	<p>Facilitator asked for everyone to share their name & stakeholder group</p> <p>Stakeholders present represented the following groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● National Parks Conservation Association ● Arizona Heritage Alliance ● Avra Valley Coalition ● Avra Valley Coalition ● Sonoran Institute ● Northwest Fire Dept. ● Freeport McMoran ● Caterpillar ● Columbine Enterprises ● Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection ● Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum ● Friends of Saguaro National Park ● Tucson Metro Chamber ● Friends of Ironwood Forest <p>In addition, four staff members were present from FHWA and ADOT staff.</p> <p>Dayna Wasley, AECOM</p> <p>Carlos Lopez, ADOT</p> <p>Jay Van Echo, ADOT</p> <p>Aryan Lirange, FHWA</p>

TOPIC	DETAILS
MEETING AGREEMENTS	<p>The facilitator referred to the items below and asked for consensus on these meeting agreements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be prepared to participate, collaborate, and share pertinent information. 2. Engage in a respectful, thoughtful deliberation. 3. One person speaks at a time: Listen carefully when not speaking. 4. Be open to all perspectives. 5. Keep in mind the large picture (regional interests as they relate to larger needs and priorities), as well as your individual/stakeholder group viewpoint. 6. Turn off or mute all electronic devices, so there are no distractions. 7. No recording devices will be allowed during the meeting.

TOPIC	DETAILS
CURRENT PROJECT PROCESS INFORMATION	<p>ADOT shared the following information re: project process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Working on dEIS ◆ Continuation of scoping ◆ First draft almost ready to share with cooperating partners (late May) ◆ Info gathered at these meetings will be included in dEIS ◆ ADOT/ FHWA recently met with BOR, FWS, NPS, AZ Game and Fish, Pima County, City of Tucson (Tucson Water - CAPSTAR) ◆ Met with Tucson Water re: facilities

TOPIC	DETAILS
-------	---------

OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	SEE LIST BELOW:
-----------------------------------	-----------------

OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

- Why are we discussing Avra Valley alternatives?

A: ADOT and FHWA conducted an 18-month phase of the process (May 2016 through December 2017) to identify the key issues that need to be addressed and the corridor alternatives to be studied in the Tier 1 EIS. The I-11 Intermountain West Corridor Study, Alternatives Selection Report (ASR), and other documents regarding this phase of the process are available online at <http://www.i11study.com/Arizona/Documents.asp>. The C, D, and F alternatives are the result of suggestions from various sources (agency, public, and technical analysis) during the Tier 1 EIS scoping and ASR phases.

- What will FHWA/ADOT do with the input from these meetings?

A: All input received from project stakeholders, including members of the public participating in the Udall Foundation lead outreach, will be given the same consideration/weight as part of the FHWA and ADOT decision-making process documented in the I-11 Tier 1 EIS. These meetings were designed to provide the project team with an additional opportunity to hear and record in the stakeholders' own words what is important. Often, written or formalized submittals do not convey a level of detail these conversations produce. We are hopeful that at the end of the Udall meetings, we will receive a higher level of understanding of the concerns and opportunities for each Corridor Alternative and be able to better address them in the Tier 1 EIS document.

- What considerations have been made for future transportation and shipping? How does that affect corridor size?

A: FHWA and ADOT have conducted modeling to assess future travel demand, including for freight, and considered local plans and initiatives regarding the shipping industry. The specific built facility size would be identified the Tier 2 stage and would include more specific design and modeling to determine a particular width and configuration that meets the need and will be based on the most current modeling projections at that time.

- Why were all Avra Valley routes not already eliminated?

A: See response to first question. Note that the goal of the alternatives development and screening process was not to select preferred alternatives, but rather to identify a reasonable

range of alternatives to be considered in the Tier 1 EIS. Heightened concerns in a particular area may lead to more options in those sensitive areas.

- Why Tier 1 and Tier 2 process being used here – why haven't environmental Studies already been done?

A: Prior studies have been focused on general locations for a high-capacity corridor in the intermountain west (beyond the state of Arizona). Each step in the process drills down a little deeper. This Tier 1 EIS is appropriate because specific funding is not yet identified, and this study is intended to provide a programmatic level review of the corridor alternatives to determine the best option to advance, or determine not to implement the corridor from Nogales to Wickenburg, AZ. If a build corridor is selected to advance, the Tier 2 processes would develop more detailed facility design within the 2000 foot corridor that was selected and the accompanying environmental review would also be more detailed, i.e. at the site-specific level rather than the Tier 1 programmatic level.

- What are the funding sources?

A: The State Transportation Board approved the funding for this Tier 1 EIS Study, but funding sources for future Tier 2 projects are not identified at this time.

- When would this start?

A: It depends on the funding and programming of any Tier 2 projects that come out of the Tier 1 process.

- How does this process impact / influence the EIS formal process?

A: The Udall Foundation will prepare a report documenting the input received, and FHWA and ADOT will consider it similarly to other input received from the public as the Draft Tier 1 EIS is prepared. There will be additional opportunities for public input once the Draft Tier 1 EIS is released.

- How will it affect our co-op?

A: Wells and water resources will be inventoried in the study area as part of the Tier 1 EIS, and the potential for impacts considered. Exact impacts and strategies for avoidance, minimization and mitigation will not be developed until the Tier 2 process.

- How will route affect the Freeport mine site?

A: The Tier 1 EIS will consider a variety of resource areas (see list above). The Draft Tier 1 EIS will be available for public review in Fall 2018 to enable specific property owners or businesses to understand the potential for impacts, and provide additional comment if desired. If a 2000-foot-wide build corridor alternative does overlay on a mine, exact impacts and strategies for avoidance, minimization and mitigation will not be developed until the Tier 2 process.

- Can you include environmental costs and benefits up front and throughout the decision process?

A: The Tier 1 EIS will consider a variety of resource areas (see list above). The purpose of the EIS is to provide information for decision-making including the environmental costs and benefits.

- Is everyone in the room?

A: Invitations to participate in these sessions were sent to organizations that have previously expressed an interest in I-11. All organizations who responded with interest were included.

- Who came up with the idea for these engagement meetings?

A: FHWA had the idea of a third-party-facilitated session to solicit additional information on the issues and concerns to be addressed in the Tier 1 EIS, and engaged the Udall Foundation.

- I would like to see a map of owners of private property along corridor- and alongside, maybe ½ mile on the other side.

A: The Tier 1 EIS is a more programmatic environmental review, and will be looking at programmatic level impacts rather than specific property impacts. Specific property impacts cannot be determined since the Tier 1 EIS is considering a broad corridor (2,000 ft. wide) rather than a specific design for a transportation facility (usually in the 400-ft. range). The more detailed analysis would occur during Tier 2 for any project that occurs as part of the I-11 corridor after the Tier 1 EIS is complete.

- Who benefits from an Avra Valley route? (options C/D). Who are the landowners and stakeholders who will benefit?

A: The corridor alternatives carried forward into the Draft Tier 1 EIS satisfy the EIS Purpose and Need, therefore, the needs outlined in that document may answer your question as to whom will benefit (<http://www.i11study.com/Arizona/Documents.asp>). The Tier 1 EIS will consider economic impacts and land use impacts, which may also provide insight into the potential benefits of options C or D. The Draft Tier 1 EIS will be available for public review in Fall 2018 to enable stakeholders to understand the potential impacts, and provide additional comment if desired.

- How will C/D affect wildlife movement. How will C/D affect night sky impacts on Kitt Peak?

A: These topics are being considered as part of the Tier 1 EIS. The potential for impacts on wildlife habitat and wildlife movement corridors will be assessed and documented in the Biological Resources section. The potential for changes with regard to dark skies will be considered as part of the Visual and Aesthetic Resources analysis. Exact impacts and strategies for avoidance, minimization and mitigation will not be developed until the Tier 2 process. The Draft Tier 1 EIS will be available for public review in Fall 2018.

- Timeframe for this should allow for joint meeting of both groups (I-10/AV). Why have you not already found out your maps are 14,000 AC off? Why no RISK analysis re: water yet?

A: If stakeholders interested in options B and C/D were offered an in-person opportunity to discuss these options with each another, the same opportunity would need to be extended to all stakeholders interested in all options. And of course, the funding and time for that are not available. If stakeholders are interested in understanding the other group's perspective, interests and options, the notes from all the meetings are available on the website."

If there is a specific comment on the map, please provide a more detailed written comment for FHWA and ADOT to consider. Water resources are being considered as part of the Tier 1 EIS process; please provide additional information on what is meant by a risk analysis.

- Please provide a schedule when reviews are scheduled to be public and when written comments will be accepted.

A: Dates will be established for a formal public review period once the Draft Tier 1 EIS is released in Fall 2018. Typically, once the Draft Tier 1 EIS is released, there is a 45-day public comment period including a series of public hearings, providing ample opportunity for review and comment.

- How can the group build trust in the process?

Focus on the purpose of the meeting: To provide the project team with an additional opportunity to hear and record in the stakeholders' own words what is important. Often, written or formalized submittals do not convey a level of detail these conversations produce. We are hopeful that at the end of these stakeholder engagement meetings, we will receive a higher level of understanding of the concerns and opportunities for each Corridor Alternative and be able to better address them in the Tier 1 EIS document.

And remember the published agreement: "All input received from project stakeholders, including members of the public participating in the Udall Foundation lead outreach, will be given the same consideration/weight as part of the FHWA and ADOT decision-making process documented in the I-11 Tier 1 EIS."

- What factors are being considered in the EIS? What other factors are considered in other studies? Who are the decision-makers?

A: The Tier 1 EIS will consider a variety of resource areas (see list above) and previous studies (<http://www.i11study.com/Arizona/Documents.asp>). FHWA is responsible for the decision at the conclusion of the Tier 1 EIS process for the selection of a preferred corridor alternative, or the No Build alternative. ADOT, as the project proponent, will make a recommendation to FHWA prior to the selection. This decision will be made after consideration of all the analysis completed and the stakeholder input received during the Tier 1 EIS process. The stakeholders include Cooperating and Participating Agencies, Tribes and the public.

TOPIC	DETAILS
ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS	<p>Q: Please provide further clarification on joint-meeting with both groups – why is this not being allowed? This will be a binary decision, either / or corridor. Why rush this process? Why have these meetings right before dEIS is completed? Why not take more time?</p> <p>A: Couldn't even make it through agenda of Group B Meeting #2. Have been planning these meetings for a long time and timelines would provide the desired feedback in time for the scheduled delivery of the dEIS to cooperating agencies. Reminder that this is for a Tier 1 EIS – will dive into much greater detail during Tier 2. A meeting of both teams will not help ADOT team as much as the detail gathered from the pre-planned Meeting #3. FHWA/ADOT will get the info they need from these three meetings, that's why only scheduled three meetings. These meetings are a continuation of scoping from Notice of Intent, May 2016. Public meetings will continue, all the way up until a Record of Decision is signed. Must have funding before Tier 2 can even start. These three meetings are just another part of scoping. Very early in the process. For additional information on other group – notes will be available on I-11 website.</p> <p>Q: What mitigations needed for Tier 2 study? Caterpillar purchased a lot of land to test products. How identify items to be in list of consideration? Caterpillar owns 6000 acres, can only disturb 900. What happens if 1000 additional acres are taken away from Caterpillar? Pima Pineapple Cactus – protected, possibly on Caterpillar land. Look at maps to see where Pima Pineapple Cactus located, will impact what lands can be taken / redistributed as compensation.</p> <p>A: Have a map of all property owned there, map is being analyzed re: what statutory requirements must be followed if a federal action is taken on the land. 4(f) vs. non-4(f) property determines amount of protection Caterpillar might have. 4(f) properties include public parks, recreation areas.</p> <p>Note: The main web page with FHWA information is here https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/legislation/section4f.aspx</p>

	<p><i>This includes the following description of protected properties: “publicly owned park and recreation areas that are open to the general public, publicly owned wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and public or privately owned historic sites.”</i></p> <p>Q: How mitigate copper mine? Probably not possible.</p> <p>A: The Tier 1 Draft EIS team have located corridor alternatives to avoid existing mining operations. If there are future plans for mine expansion that is not known, please share with project team.</p> <p>Q: Why ADOT/FHWA modeling based on 5yr plans, and not taking into consideration any long-term plans from Pima/ Pinal Counties? Seems weird that those are not included and only 5year plan considered.</p> <p>A: Planning processes requires that a given Tier 1 type of study utilize existing funded construction plans (the State Transportation Improvement Plan - STIP). Other unfunded projects in various long range plans are not included, however, once those projects begin their development they must consider the existing transportation landscape and make a determination if those improvements are required, can be delayed or deleted.</p>
--	---

TOPIC	DETAILS
DISCUSSION STEPS	Facilitator review the Discussion Steps below:

TOPIC DISCUSSION STEPS

STEP	LENGTH	CONTENT
#1: Everyone has a turn to briefly state their <u>one key</u> perspective re: the issue/topic, and explain the <u>one key</u> underlying reason/interest for their perspective.	1 minute each participant <i>(20 minutes)</i>	Chart #1: Name/Perspective/ Key Interest
#2: When it is not your turn, listen for new information; actively listen to understand other's perspective and underlying reasons for their perspective.	Ongoing throughout the process	
#3: Review the perspectives/interests chart; and ask questions to clarify other's underlying reasons; or add additional underlying reasons (not already listed).	5-10 minutes	Chart #1: Name/Key Perspective/ Key Interest
#4: Combine interests (key) where possible and as agreed upon by all participants. Transfer list of combined interests to Chart #2.	5-10 minutes	Charts #1- #2
#5: Everyone has a turn to briefly state their <u>one key</u> alternative/option that supports the listed key interests <i>(discuss and identify one at a time giving full respect, focus and consideration to each)</i> .	20 minutes (1 min. per participant)	Charts #2: Key interest/Key Alternative/Option
#6: Combine like alternatives/options where possible. Transfer list of combined alternative/options to Chart #3.	5 minutes	Charts #2-#3
#7: Everyone has a turn to briefly state the pro's and/or cons for each alternative/option listed.	20 minutes (1 min. per participant)	Chart #3: Key alternative; and Pro's/Con's
#8: Review chart(s) and identify possible common ground <i>(related to an alternative, option, etc.)</i> .	5-20 minutes	
#9: Identify Next Steps.	10-15 minutes	

TOPIC	DETAILS
STAKEHOLDERS INPUT	Review stakeholders' interests; and identify options for each: See Chart#2 below

Chart #2: (combine, where possible)

Key Interests	Key Alternatives/Options
Wildlife linkages between Ironwood Forest and other areas	<p>Need more information. Central Arizona Project already interfering with Ironwood Forest / Tucson Mountain Park / Saguaro National Park. Wildlife crossings, pipelines – which is which? Need more study on wildlife usage in region, current information not sufficient.</p> <p>Consider impacts to entire Tucson basin.</p> <p>Bighorn Sheep sightings recently, chance came from Ironwood Forest.</p> <p>Impacts to Monument would be studied in Tier 2, including access, traffic, impacts to Bighorn</p>
I-11 would inflict serious environmental damages on local area (Saguaro Nat'l Park and ASDM)	
Use current I-10/ I-19 alignment to meet all identified needs	
Concern proposed corridor could cut across land purchased by Caterpillar that is designated for environmental protection, Pima County disturbance regulations, and economic impact	
More corridors under consideration better than fewer. Corridors should be thoroughly evaluated.	<p>Transportation issues are always difficult. The more alternatives the better. I-10 could have potentially been designed better when originally implemented, might have been able to avoid the SunZia Project conflict. How transition infrastructure to be more forward-thinking? How do things to avoid/minimize/mitigate future impacts? What are other ways to address future of congestion (and potentially avoid need for I-11)? With enough information, can be able to avoid/minimize/mitigate future problems. Should challenge FHWA/ADOT to ensure have all information necessary to create a fully informed Tier 1 EIS.</p> <p>Put vision on the table first. Ask what want the future to be.</p>

	<p>Then have discussion on how to get to that future.</p> <p>Goal is to have a Tucson basin that is socially/environmentally/economically sustainable – while being resilient to constant unpredictable change. How achieve that vision? What is the big picture we have for our region? How have a discussion on achieving that big picture? We don't know what future holds, lots of potential variables that could potentially be disruptive. How can this corridor make us more resilient to the uncertainty of the future? Future (2040) corridor likely needs to be multi-model, not just a road.</p> <p>**note Ian share (on Dropbox) info re: Wickenburg process, info re: mitigating congestion without constructing I-11</p> <p>**note: FHWA required to come up with one alternative (in Tier 1)</p> <p>Q: ASR – 2000ft recommended corridor as produced by model analysis. Created potential routes. Tier 1 narrows this down. Still able to shift routes? How avoid privately owned (Freeport /Caterpillar/ etc.) land? A: Yes, can still shift potential 2000ft corridor route if DEIS Corridor Alternatives are found to impact protected areas, but that would be unexpected.</p>
<p>Degrade quality of life, for people that live and visit region. Find a way that doesn't impact environmental justice.</p>	<p>People come to this area to live, visit, escape urbanity. If lose that, lose a big aspect of what it means to live in Tucson, and that is the ability to quickly/easily visit places that maintain wild character. Don't want to lose places that are currently preserved (in terms of wild character). Light, noise, air quality, wildlife. Benefits to both people and wildlife.</p>
<p>How are maps fed into models? Private vs. Public lands – potential error in model?</p>	<p>Q: Accuracy of maps A: ADOT continues to build their model based on GIS info available. Model looks at 4(f) properties, TCPs, public lands. Unless land is protected in some way, a federal roadway can go from Point A to Point B and evaluate as needed. Developing maps at a “Google Earth” aerial imagery level at this time.</p> <p>Q: Private lands affected A: Protected species/buildings/locations avoidance is the first option, mitigation second option, depends on consultation with USFWS or appropriate Agency.</p> <p>Area near Freeport land is very inhospitable. Also a lot of cultural considerations in that area. Plus effect on the open-pit copper mine. Mineral interests, raw land cost – need be considered when making decision. What happens when transportation infrastructure comes so close to a mining</p>

	<p>operation? Need more info/discussion on effects of this.</p> <p>Current route would not go over open-pit mine – but could go over adjacent land that Freeport could potentially expand to in the future.</p>
<p>Preserve wells</p>	<p>Not enough water for future growth – already looking at potential caps in the near future.</p> <p>Some new developments in Pinal County (14) have been denied because state cannot issue an assured 100yr water supply. **info on this will be posted on DropBox for stakeholders to access if desired</p>
<p>Want to see all considerations weighted equally in process (neutrality important)</p>	<p>What happens if C/D is actually built? Need all information and facts possible – instead of solely focusing on opposition to new build. Goal of these meetings should be focused on information gathering rather than simple opposition. The more input the better.</p> <p>Design options are possible. For example, I-8 has no exits in Gila Bend area. Can we build a road similar to this? Should be discussing mitigation strategies. I.e. creation of overpass wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Hope to see mitigation options along corridors, up to specific counties / municipalities along route. Hope to see a plan set aside that says (i.e.) “absolutely no growth in this area.” Let local municipalities contribute to design options.</p> <p>Q: How does limited access affect emergency services? A: There are access options that are limited to EMS services only.</p> <p>Q: Eminent domain an option? A: If fed govt decides to take, can do it when there is a public need for a right-of-way. This would happen at Tier 2 level. Tier 1 influences mitigation options explored in Tier 2. I.e. Tier 1 says “need to do more studies on X,” then in Tier 2 those studies are conducted. Right of way action is performed under the Uniform Relocation Act.</p> <p>ADOT has recently gotten creative with right-of-way, mitigation options.</p> <p>Q: What about additional data needed? Will ADOT pay for the studies? Will ADOT pay for mitigation options as prescribed? A: Yes, if deemed necessary.</p>
<p>Future school planning determined</p>	

<p>based on where Corridor route is planned</p>	
<p>More info re: how new traffic would impact emergency services / public safety</p>	<p>Regional impacts from traffic – only one freeway through Tucson – can make things difficult, hard to re-route traffic when there is an incident on I-10. Alternate corridor would allow for less congestion and fewer negative outcomes. Hope to mitigate incidents. Re-routing traffic preferential to stopping traffic. More accidents occur on side-roads / surface streets when traffic is shut down on freeway and traffic diverted.</p> <p>Also, need consider what would happen in event of mass evacuation. Another corridor would facilitate evacuation in event of disaster.</p> <p>Connection corridors important when there is a traffic bottleneck. Risk management an important consideration. The more options the better (in terms of public safety)</p> <p>For how fast Tucson is growing, the lack of corridors is disturbing. I-10 and I-19 can't solve all our problems. People's lives are at stake. Need think about broader picture. Urbanization continues to creep. Need think about the future. Public safety /emergency vehicle access is important.</p> <p>Picture Rocks / Avra Valley / Northwest -all fire departments would be affected by a new corridor.</p>
<p>Oppose development because of environmental concerns. Need as much info as possible informing Tier 1 process</p>	
<p>Don't have confidence in models, especially re: the 80ft right-of-way</p>	<p>Additional concerns:</p> <p>I-11 could take land from major industry (Caterpillar, Freeport). If can do that can also take land from small homeowners. Environmental Justice should be considered. Impacts to community if property/land taken from homeowners.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts. This area has been under development for many years. Tucson Water, Central Arizona Project -have already experienced environmental impacts from other projects, hope to avoid additional impacts going forward.</p> <p>Consider totality of all residents, don't pit Avra vs. Tucson (e.g.). Big picture thinking needed. Why should entire burden fall on City of Tucson? Need think about infrastructure needs, effects</p>

	<p>/benefits to Southern Arizona. Same argument re: social effects on people in Avra can be made for people in Tucson.</p> <p>Where is the tipping point? Growth is continuous in this area. Need plan for it – better to have a plan than not have a plan. May not need a freeway here today – but probably will in 2040.</p> <p>Interstate freeway through a picturesque, unique area ... people come here because of what is currently offered, don't want to see this devastated (noise pollution, light pollution, viewsheds, soundscapes, tourism).</p> <p>--Tier 1 will evaluate at a qualitative level impacts, noise pollution, light pollution, social/environmental impacts, etc.</p>
<p>Public are overwhelmingly against proposed C/D route (re: public comments thus far)</p>	<p>Public comments – majority spoke in opposition to I-11. Mitigation / design options – should be careful not to argue for a new corridor solely because it is possible to design things that help mitigation.</p>
<p>With all the previous research and steadfast opposition, why is building I-11 in the Avra Valley an option?</p>	<p>Protect Saguaro National Park. Increasing people will benefit protection (in terms of donations), but need to consider all impacts. All impacts considered can be overwhelming. How help increase transportation / public safety? Does a second freeway have to be constructed? Need talk more about other no-build possibilities.</p> <p>For the next stage, there are a lot of reports that have been created that address impacts – ensure that all this research is taken into consideration. Ensure end-result meets the needs. **note add studies to Dropbox for others to read</p>
<p>It is completely feasible and practical that I-11 is placed in Avra valley. Much of the route in Avra valley is creosote land except for a portion that is environmentally sensitive. Issues through these areas can be mitigated with proper design implementation.</p>	<p>Tucson growing very quickly. Freeways aren't solution to all problems, but are a necessary evil. Considering the current size of Tucson, asinine that don't have another freeway. Would rather see a freeway built than watch another mine destroy a mountainside.</p> <p>Support I-11 C/D route, concerned about environmental impacts, if this option does proceed, need work together to minimize impact.</p> <p>Double-stacking I-10/I-19 would be a huge economic disruption to the downtown.</p> <p>Think about everyone in this region holistically, consider the big picture.</p> <p>Silent majority – often in these processes a vocal opposition has high visibility</p>

	Tucson is 33 rd largest city in US. Population steadily increased in the valley. Development keeps accumulated. Hope to see practical/reasonable traffic alternatives.
--	---

TOPIC	DETAILS
NEXT MEETING PLANNING & SCHEDULING	<p>April 26, 2018</p> <p>Agenda Items:</p> <p>HOMEWORK – If C/D Option chosen, what would you want it to look like? What design options? Next meeting will dive deep, go around room, listen to everyone’s thoughts on what an I-11 corridor C/D option would look like.</p>

TOPIC	DETAILS
CLOSING COMMENTS	<p>Outstanding questions/comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Next meeting -still need to find a venue. Saguaro National Park? Picture Rocks Community Center? ◆ Question to FHWA/ADOT – what information + level of detail is desired at this time? A: Remember that Tier 2 is re: very small segments, specific areas. Tier 1 is broad. Tier 1 will not collect data to be able to locate a (i.e.) wildlife crossing at a specific X milepost at this time. Tier 1 is the roadmap for Tier 2. Tier 2 goes into a deeper dive / quantitative analysis. ◆ Q: Get sense that this group could benefit from more time. Would it be possible if rest of the I-11 corridor goes forward with their process, while C/D & B takes more time to discuss? I.e. Maricopa County is ready to go with this, but this area needs more time. A: Jay can ask, above his paygrade ◆ Request: Next time there is a public comment section – can ADOT lump C/D and B together, rather than ask for info on each proposed route individually. A: Future DEIS public engagement process will allow for all types of comments (general, specific corridor alternative, location specific). ◆ Learned a lot, thanks ◆ FHWA: next meeting – will dive into solutions. Wildlife crossings is

	<p>nothing new to FHWA and ADOT. What are other solutions to other resource areas (visual, noise)? There is a lot we already know, but need specifics. I.e. we already understand that bighorn sheep don't like to go under a road, will only go over. Some Interstates go many miles without any exits, which could address some of the Key Interests previously discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Agencies are looking for options right now – anything and everything can be considered. Next meeting, bring info that you want to be considered if this option is selected. Be as creative as possible. ◆ Q: Next meeting – can ADOT AND FHWA collect a list of what is / is not mitigatable? ◆ A: This is a very broad question and each resource area has different ways to mitigate impacts to those resources, a simple list is not possible.
--	--

NEXT STEPS:

<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	BY WHEN
Homework assignment: If C/D option was chosen: What would you want it to look like? Be specific about your vision and options to be considered.	All stakeholders	4/26
<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	BY WHEN
Explore how to mitigate Caterpillar impacts (consider prior agreement) and provide an update.	FHWA/ADOT	Next meeting
<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	BY WHEN
Research and update the stakeholders re: the definition of 4(f) Property as it relates to private lands & easement/agreement	Aryan	In Meeting Highlights
<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	BY WHEN
Copper mine – consider mitigation strategies	Agencies	future

<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	<u>BY WHEN</u>
Provide contact for meeting Venue – April – Picture Rocks Community Center and send to Mitch	Ross	ASAP
<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	<u>BY WHEN</u>
Upload items into DropBox	Stakeholders	As needed
<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	<u>BY WHEN</u>
Consider joining C/D and B in public comment process	FHWA/ADOT	future
<u>WHAT</u>	<u>BY WHOM</u>	<u>BY WHEN</u>
Consider extending C/D & B (Tucson) stakeholder discussions past this period, and provide an update	FHWA/ADOT	Next meeting

Appendix F: Group B Meeting #3 Highlights

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

BACKGROUND:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are preparing a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Interstate 11 (I-11) Corridor between Nogales and Wickenburg, Arizona. The Tier 1 EIS will assess the potential social, economic and natural environmental impacts of a No Build Alternative and a reasonable range of Build Corridor Alternatives for a proposed transportation facility within the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study area. The Notice of Intent to prepare the I-11 Tier 1 EIS was issued in May 2016. Since then, FHWA and ADOT have conducted public and agency scoping meetings, outreach to tribes and stakeholders, and completed an alternatives development and screening process.

FHWA and ADOT have invited the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute) to facilitate meetings with interested stakeholders regarding the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study in Pima County, to augment the ongoing public input effort. The objective of these stakeholder group meetings is to provide a method for additional productive Pima County community conversations to inform the Interstate 11 Corridor Environmental Impact study with more specifics regarding individual community concerns and preferences to enable technical analysis and planning.

This is the last of three meetings for the B Study Group, which includes stakeholders located in the urban I-10 Tucson geographical area.

AGENDA ITEMS & HIGHLIGHTS

TOPIC	DETAILS
WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS	The US Institute's 3 rd party neutral facilitator, Joy Keller-Weidman, welcomed everyone. Introduced herself, as Senior Program Manager, Transportation Sector; and the Senior Program Associate, Mitch Chrismer, who will be co-facilitating and notetaking.

TOPIC	DETAILS
MEETING OVERVIEW	<p>Reviewed the Meeting#3 Outcomes & Agenda Items</p> <p><u>OUTCOMES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the values, interests and characteristics most important to the stakeholders • Identify potential impacts/benefits of proposed corridors based on local knowledge within the stakeholder group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify ways to mitigate/promote those • Explore creative alternatives/options moving forward that address concerns • Inform decision-makers re: what is most important to stakeholder groups <p style="text-align: center;"><u>AGENDA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting overview (Meeting outcomes, agenda & meeting agreements) (10 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders' Input (20 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Complete chart#2: last column: identify options related to the interests (HOMEWORK) <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders' Input (50 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Focus discussion of options related to key themes (<i>i.e. Viewsheds, Wildlife Connectivity, Community cohesion, etc.</i>); and stakeholders provide pros and cons of each (small groups) <input type="checkbox"/> BREAK (10 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders' Input (60 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If option B were selected, what would you want it to look like? ○ <i>What are opportunities and/or mitigation options for decision makers to consider if Option B was selected?</i>

	<p><i>(design features?)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> BREAK <i>(10 minutes)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders' Input <i>(30 minutes)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o What are the most important aspects for the decision makers to consider going forward? <input type="checkbox"/> Future Public Involvement <i>(5 minutes)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Closing Comments and Meeting feedback <i>(15 minutes)</i>
--	---

TOPIC	DETAILS
INTRODUCTIONS	<p>Facilitator asked for everyone to share their name & stakeholder group</p> <p>Stakeholders present represented the following groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection ◆ Menlo Park Neighborhood Association ◆ Erickson Terrascape ◆ Tucson Audubon Society ◆ Friends of Ironwood Forest ◆ CAPLA ◆ Statistical Research, Inc. ◆ Sonoran Institute ◆ Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation <p>In addition, members present from FHWA and ADOT staff included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Aryan Lirange, FHWA ◆ Jay Van Echo, ADOT ◆ Dayna Wasley, AECOM ◆ Carlos Lopez, ADOT ◆ Laura Douglas, ADOT

TOPIC	DETAILS
MEETING AGREEMENTS	<p>The facilitator referred to the items below and asked for consensus on these meeting agreements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be prepared to participate, collaborate, and share pertinent

	<p>information.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Engage in a respectful, thoughtful deliberation. 3. One person speaks at a time: Listen carefully when not speaking. 4. Be open to all perspectives. 5. Keep in mind the large picture (regional interests as they relate to larger needs and priorities), as well as your individual/stakeholder group viewpoint. 6. Turn off or mute all electronic devices, so there are no distractions. 7. No recording devices will be allowed during the meeting. 8. Show up on time 9. Stick to agreed-upon speaking limits
--	---

TOPIC	DETAILS
STAKEHOLDERS' INPUT	Complete chart#2- last column: Identify options related to the interests (HOMEWORK)- see below

CHART #2: STAKEHOLDERS' KEY INTERESTS/ KEY ALTERNATIVES-OPTIONS

letter	Key Interests	Key Alternatives – Options – Mitigation Opportunities / Solutions (Avoid, Minimize, Mitigate)
A	Want to look at what's affected geographically – intangible heritage of landscape	<p>Look at viewshed, from and to historic districts / neighborhoods / river / mountains / places of tribal interest.</p> <p>Consider Tucson's origins and cultural practices of all time periods and cultures. Review criteria used in Santa Cruz River Heritage Area document, Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan document, and Pima County Multi-Species Conservation Plan.</p>
B	Incorporate alternative means of	Increase efforts to expand transit, rail, and other forms of

	transportation / modes / technology into design package		transit options between Tucson and Phoenix.
C	Embrace sustainability within realms of Economic, Environmental, Social, Climate Change mitigation I.e. – should not be encouraging more people to drive personal vehicles.		Refer to NACTO (National Association of City Transportation Officials) for interfaces with urban streets, and collaborate with PAG and local DOTs to reduce freeway usage from intown trips.
D	Protect tangible heritage (cultural resources, i.e. archaeological / architectural resources). Avoid destruction of tangible heritage (i.e. avoid demolition and destruction). Consider known and unknown resources.		Refer to City of Tucson website, reports on archeologically sensitive zones, consult with SHPO & City and County Preservation Office, Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation – get more info on protection of tangible heritage, identify historic districts, location of individual historic properties/resources, information on previously evaluated properties and their significance, issues like vibration, drainage, character-defining features of historic districts. Look at complete surveys before completing a comprehensive assessment. Minimum 264 historical properties would potentially be affected (that are currently surveyed and listed) within the 2000ft potential corridor of impacts (study area) (with center line of I-10). Also need consider social justice impacts to affected neighborhoods.
E	Avoid disruption to river corridors (Santa Cruz and tributaries), habitat, and migratory corridors, wildlife. Footprint, noise, dust, lights- all impact wildlife, both nocturnal and diurnal.		Avoid disruption before, during and after construction. Avoid any new building as the first step. See studies on light, noise and dust and incorporate suggested mitigation into any plans. This could include tunnel construction, wildlife bridges, sound barriers and many other suggestions. Reference existing studies, regional plans and documentation on Sonoran Desert and Santa Cruz conservation. All of this should be completed on the front end of any I -11 planning.
F	Impact of I-10 has already created a separation, some residents still bitter about separation of different barrios from downtown. Disrupts life / character of city. Walkability, bike-ability, connectivity becomes affected, neighborhoods get more isolated. Encroachment into neighborhoods important to consider – neighborhoods can become more separated from city		

G	Evaluate new non-highway options to reduce congestion and assess the cumulative impacts	<p>Consider range of activities / programs / technologies / other proposed highways that cumulatively could address congestion issues (at least in near term)</p> <p>Look at management / design of existing highways (I-10 & I-19) – i.e. ramp metering, etc.</p> <p>Programmatic efforts to reduce congestion – pricing, tolls, bus/shuttle systems, rapid rail system between Tucson/Phoenix.</p> <p>Set of technologies that improve traffic flow – intelligent transportation systems (ITS).</p> <p>Enhancements to existing rail system to accommodate increased freight.</p> <p>Proposed new highways within our region that could relieve congestion along corridor, consider extension of Aviation corridor through downtown (I-210).</p> <p>Goal: relieve/address congestion in near term, put off construction / funding of [bypass] or other major enhancements to I-10 (i.e. tunneling, triple decking, etc.) Revisit in 10-15 years, maybe new technologies will be available then that could further reduce congestion. Look at more near-term traffic modeling rather than 2040 projections. What could local plans better reflect? What more information is needed to better inform near-term planning/modeling? Are all possibilities being considered in current models?</p>
H	Consider economic harm to (small) businesses located along future widened corridor during planning, construction, and after, particularly along I-10 frontage roads	
I	Option B doesn't address the needs for projected population growth, congestion, national security considerations, trade flows, etc.	
J	For all interests – need information on full APE (Area of Potential Effect) to make informed comments.	

TOPIC	DETAILS
-------	---------

<p>Create key crossings</p> <p>OPTION#2</p> <p>River restoration, focusing on linear park -increase effort to improve existing linear park along Santa Cruz, other parks downtown</p> <p>OPTION #3</p> <p>Protect and enhance viewsheds from San Xavier del Bac and sacred lands</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>I-19 is located along a transportation easement.</p>	<p>Maintain natural migration patterns</p> <p>Giant park, create healthy communities, beneficial to small businesses (cafes, etc.)</p>	<p>Cost, initial funding, use-ability of a park located next to freeway</p>
<p><u>COMMUNITY COHESION</u></p> <p>OPTION #1</p> <p>Put freeway underground from Grant to I-19 to protect historic neighborhoods</p> <p>OPTION#2</p> <p>Focus investment on intraregional transit – dedicated travel lanes, bus rapid transit, rail on arterial roads</p>	<p>Viewsheds, community connectivity, protect historic properties, increase property values, attract businesses</p> <p>Lower traffic on I-10, increase community access</p>	<p>Cost, hydrology</p> <p>Construction time, funding costs</p>
<p><u>ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION AND TECHNOLOGY</u></p> <p>OPTION #1</p> <p>Technology changes – ramp meters, tolls, HOV lanes, dedicated through travel lanes, congestion pricing</p>	<p>Helping remove vehicles</p>	<p>Increase cost of using I-10,</p>

<p>COMMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Change work schedules- potentially reduce traffic by 12% 	<p>(push off to other transportation options)</p>	<p>increase traffic on surface streets, impacts on lower income families</p>
--	---	--

GROUP 2: KEY CONSIDERATIONS RE: CORRIDOR DESIGN OPTIONS	PROs	CONS
<p><u>VIEWSHEDS:</u> OPTION #1</p> <p>Put corridor underground in selected areas</p> <p>OPTION#2</p> <p>Minimize lighting impacts</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>Tunneling under historic properties risks damaging properties (vibration etc.)</p>	<p>Preserve historic neighborhoods, no need for decorated walls</p> <p>Maintain dark skies for people and wildlife</p>	<p>Cost, disruption to traffic, hydrology, archaeological concerns, safety concerns</p> <p>Safety</p>
<p><u>WILDLIFE CONNECTIVITY</u> OPTION #1</p> <p>Build wildlife crossing infrastructure (bridges or tunnels) S of Canoa ranch, N of Santa Cruz county, Tucson to Tortolita Mountains, Ironwood Forest National Monument to Picacho Mountains, plus more</p> <p>Increase crossings in specific areas Ironwood forest - Picacho mountains</p>	<p>Reconnect large habitat blocks, reduce wildlife/vehicle collisions</p>	<p>Cost, private property acquisitions through eminent domain</p>

engineering standpoint, and public has to pay for it. Decision to put underground would be a local decision.		
--	--	--

GROUP 3: KEY CONSIDERATIONS RE: CORRIDOR DESIGN OPTIONS	PROs	CONs
<p><u>VIEWSHEDS + WILDLIFE CONNECTIVITY + COMMUNITY COHESION:</u></p> <p>OPTION #1</p> <p>Capped highway with a tunnel (trains /trucks in tunnel, cars enter/exit the cap). Parks / business on top of tunnel. Train goes to Phoenix.</p> <p>OPTION#2</p> <p>Suspended highway (raised road bed). Under area is pedestrians, bikes, businesses, etc. Suspended area for traffic. No walls</p>	<p>Improve cohesion, economic, reduce air / sound pollution, better views, open space, less light pollution</p> <p>Reduce pollution (noise light etc.). No walls</p>	<p>Construction disruption, safety, lower traffic flexibility</p> <p>Potential engineering first, cost</p>

TOPIC	DETAILS
STAKEHOLDERS' INPUT	<p>If option B were selected, what would you want it to look like?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Corridor should be hidden (and permeable -allowing people and animals to cross through) as much as possible. Park deck idea (below grade with a deck, on same level as streets are currently) – where traffic goes under – between downtown and west side, a park deck with open space / development on top of it, would make downtown a bigger area. That “deck” could become quite valuable in terms of how it enhances the city. Would grant Tucson a good reputation if this were achieved. Reconnects the grid. Grant ability to go through to other side, see other side. ◆ If has to be above ground, then get rid of “wall” / impermeability –

	<p>options could include a suspended highway and closure of some of the arterial streets to create greater connectivity. For example, certain places under I-10 would be just for bikes (i.e. dangerous undercrossing like Speedway).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Either go above grade, with permeability and visual “invisibility”, or go below grade with deck park. Either go up, or go down, either with bridges or tunnels. ◆ <u>Co-location: I-11 would be combined with I-10/I-19. Not adding a new freeway alongside existing.</u> ◆ Need make enhancements where congestion will be most likely to occur. Expansions don’t have to occur along entire way from Nogales – Phoenix. Break down into specific areas to see what traffic needs will be. ◆ Ground level continuum important – for wildlife, bicyclists, etc. ◆ Bridges / tunnels in key locations – need include options for wildlife connectivity. Need improve access for wildlife. ◆ Option B would not look like what it looks like today. I-10 currently a blight. ◆ Pull city back together through tunneling etc. <p>Note: hard to discuss these options b/c only in Tier 1, will know more about potential specific impacts when enter Tier 2 process.</p> <p>Note: ADOT is criticized when come too late with information, purpose of this exercise is to look at all potential options and let these conversations inform the next stage.</p> <p>Q: How can we be become a consulting party in Sec. 106 process?</p> <p>A: FHWA sent THPF an invite on April 11th. FHWA asks that THPF let them know if this invite was not received.</p>
--	--

TOPIC	DETAILS
STAKEHOLDERS' INPUT	<p><i>What are opportunities and/or mitigation options for decision makers to consider if Option B was selected? (design features?)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Stakeholders should be involved early, and at every step of the way until the end. Continue to check in and listen to stakeholders. <p>A: Who are the decision-makers?</p> <p>Q: ADOT -Transportation Board funded the Tier 1 EIS Study. Team will make recommendations to FHWA AZ Division Administrator Karla Petty. Will look at trade-offs, pros and cons of different options, then make decision based on all the information collected, including impacts, cost and benefits.</p>

TOPIC	DETAILS
STAKEHOLDERS' DISCUSSION	<p>What are the most important aspects for the decision makers to consider going forward?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Group wants ground-level re-connectivity, and full consideration of: Viewsheds, wildlife corridors, historic properties, walkability– (include all group Post-it information gathered earlier.) No walls – at grade. Eliminate all other walls. Ground level pedestrian / wildlife / non-motorized connectivity is desired. ◆ Project should improve quality of life of this city. ◆ Project should reflect vision of Tucson community as represented by Stakeholder Group B, and Stakeholder Group B should be involved throughout the project life. ◆ Project should reflect the community's Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan. ◆ We embrace innovation to consider future transportation needs of our region. ◆ Identify and respect historic properties / resources. ◆ Empower stakeholders to be decision makers. ◆ Project should address future areas of congestion – need be identified more specifically.

	<p>Note: public hearings will be next time for public input. Public comments accepted any time until ROD is signed (late 2019).</p> <p>Q: When is the cut-off date for documents to be considered for draft EIS? A: Just to be in the DEIS and considered in the decision, would be early August. For the input to be seen by the Cooperating Agencies during their review, then needs to be by early May.</p>
--	--

TOPIC	DETAILS
<p>FUTURE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES DISCUSSION</p>	<p>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:</p> <p>Q: When can stakeholders make comments on document?</p> <p>A: Once the DEIS is released, the public and other stakeholders have 45 days to review and document and provide any comments. During that 45 days, ADOT and FHWA will hold public hearings throughout the study area and the project website will contain additional avenues to comment. The current schedule is for all of this to occur before the end of the year.</p> <p>Q: Who takes the lead on cultural impacts?</p> <p>A: Linda Davis, ADOT Major Projects Historic Preservation Specialist</p> <p>Comment: Could have started this process by looking at current existing design of the road and critiquing the current layout.</p> <p>Note: Could have started with potential effects of specific impacts, would have made more progress if started there. Could have moved into discussions earlier – Meeting #3 more effective than previous meetings.</p> <p>ADOT/FHWA could have taken ASR document, condensed it down for meeting participants, then guided conversation on specific points. A lot to dig through for these meetings. Could have stated where impact corridor would be, would have accelerated these meetings. For future, attempt to</p>

	<p>provide greater focus / specific maps for stakeholders.</p> <p>A: FHWA/ADOT was challenged to share requested maps, because they could not create anything special for these groups.</p> <p>Comment: Would have been beneficial to have better maps.</p> <p>Q: Were these stakeholder meetings value added?</p> <p>A: FHWA/ADOT learned a lot, i.e. that double decking I-10 isn't really a palatable solution. Also understand that it is important to choose options that will promote a far greater unified Tucson metro area.</p> <p>Q: Why didn't we have greater than 50% participation from the original stakeholder groups in this process – was it possibly a reflection on design / process of these meetings?</p> <p>A: Nine out of original seventeen interest groups participated. Two of the stakeholder representatives had business and personal issues arise that prevented them from participating. It was a considerable time commitment to participate.</p> <p>DISCUSSION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ We worry about artificial separation between options – issues being discussed are all-encompassing, not limited to option B vs. Option C/D. ◆ Discussing getting B and C/D groups together to hold a separate meeting, keep going and look at these issues together. Additional maps will be added to Dropbox before next C/D meeting, then stakeholders will discuss getting the two groups together. ◆ Tenor of 1st meeting was very different from 3rd meeting. Stakeholders with business interests may have been more interested in this type of conversation vs. Meeting #1. ◆ Support idea of this corridor, so long as impacts are mitigated (compared to C/D option)
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Need to address congestion, facilitate freight, expand economic opportunities. ◆ Could have started by talking about what is wrong with current I-10/ I-19 set up. That would have given the group a good focal point on which to start conversation.
--	--

TOPIC	DETAILS
CLOSING COMMENTS	<p>Closing comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ ADOT – this process has been very helpful. Recognize value public brings to projects like this. Good to hear from community re: “what did we miss?” Want science/technology to look at impacts, embrace impacts. Helps ADOT know if did deep enough dive into alternatives. Thanks for everyone’s hard work and input. ◆ FHWA – Genesis of these meetings was derived from the ASR public outreach process. Helped gather more substantive information/concerns than gathered previously from comments. Will be thinking about how everything discussed gets incorporated into a Tier 1 Draft EIS document. Appreciate everyone’s time and the ideas that came up. Look forward to Nov. Dec. when the next public review opportunity come around. ◆ Participants thanked federal and state agency representatives for the time and effort required for all the meetings ◆ Participants thanked the US Institute for time, energy and resources to conduct these meetings.

Appendix G: Group C/D Meeting #3 Highlights

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting Notes
Group C/D – April 26, 2018

Wheeler Taft Abbett Sr. Library
7800 N. Schisler Drive
Tucson, AZ 85743
12:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

BACKGROUND:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are preparing a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Interstate 11 (I-11) Corridor between Nogales and Wickenburg, Arizona. The Tier 1 EIS will assess the potential social, economic and natural environmental impacts of a No Build Alternative and a reasonable range of Build Corridor Alternatives for a proposed transportation facility within the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study area. The Notice of Intent to prepare the I-11 Tier 1 EIS was issued in May 2016. Since then, FHWA and ADOT have conducted public and agency scoping meetings, outreach to tribes and stakeholders, and completed an alternatives development and screening process.

FHWA and ADOT have invited the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute) to facilitate meetings with interested stakeholders regarding the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study in Pima County, to augment the ongoing public input effort. The objective of these stakeholder group meetings is to provide a method for additional productive Pima County community conversations to inform the Interstate 11 Corridor Environmental Impact study with more specifics regarding individual community concerns and preferences to enable technical analysis and planning.

This is the last of three meetings for the C/D Study Group, which includes stakeholders located in the geographical area west and northwest of the Tucson mountains.

AGENDA ITEMS & HIGHLIGHTS

TOPIC	DETAILS
WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS	The US Institute's 3 rd party neutral facilitator, Joy Keller-Weidman, welcomed everyone. Introduced herself, as Senior Program Manager, Transportation Sector; and the Senior Program Associate, Mitch Chrismar, who will be co-facilitating and notetaking.

TOPIC	DETAILS
MEETING OVERVIEW	<p>Reviewed the Meeting#3 Outcomes & Agenda Items</p> <p><u>OUTCOMES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the values, interests and characteristics most important to the stakeholders • Identify potential impacts/benefits of proposed corridors based on local knowledge within the stakeholder group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify ways to mitigate/promote those • Explore creative alternatives/options moving forward that address concerns • Inform decision-makers re: what is most important to stakeholder groups <p><u>AGENDA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting overview (Meeting outcomes, agenda & meeting agreements) (10 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders' Input (50 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Focus discussion of options related to identified key themes (<i>i.e. Viewsheds, Wildlife Connectivity, Community cohesion, etc.</i>); and stakeholders provide pros and cons of each (small groups) <input type="checkbox"/> BREAK (10 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders' Input (80 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If option C/D were selected, what would you want it to look like? ○ <i>What are opportunities and/or mitigation options for decision makers to consider if Option C/D was selected? (design features?)</i>

	<input type="checkbox"/> BREAK (10 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders' Input (30 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the most important aspects for the decision makers to consider going forward? <input type="checkbox"/> Future Public Involvement (5 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Closing Comments and Meeting feedback (15 minutes)
--	---

TOPIC	DETAILS
INTRODUCTIONS	<p>Facilitator asked for everyone to share their name & stakeholder group</p> <p>Stakeholders present represented the following groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avra Water Co-op • Sonoran Institute • Friends of Saguaro National Park • Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection • Arizona Heritage Alliance • Avra Valley Coalition • National Parks Conservation Association • Caterpillar • Freeport McMoran • Marana Unified School District • AZ Sonoran Desert Museum <p>In addition, 1 staff member was present from FHWA and 4 from ADOT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aryan Lirange – FHWA • Laura Douglas – ADOT • Carlos Lopez– ADOT • Jay Van Echo– ADOT • Kim Noetzel– ADOT

TOPIC	DETAILS
MEETING AGREEMENTS	<p>The facilitator referred to the items below and asked for consensus on these meeting agreements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be prepared to participate, collaborate, and share pertinent information. 2. Engage in a respectful, thoughtful deliberation. 3. One person speaks at a time: Listen carefully when not speaking. 4. Be open to all perspectives. 5. Keep in mind the large picture (regional interests as they relate to larger needs and priorities), as well as your individual/stakeholder group viewpoint. 6. Turn off or mute all electronic devices, so there are no distractions. 7. No recording devices will be allowed during the meeting.

TOPIC	DETAILS
STAKEHOLDERS' INPUT	<p>Focus discussion of options related to identified key themes (<i>i.e. Viewsheds, Wildlife Connectivity, Community cohesion, etc.</i>); and stakeholders provide pros and cons of each, working in small groups, and using the <u>Chart below:</u></p>

GROUP 1 KEY CONSIDERATIONS RE: CORRIDOR DESIGN OPTIONS	PROs	CONs
<p><u>Invasive Species:</u></p> <p>OPTION #1</p> <p>Source of ongoing maintenance funding needed – buffelgrass will spread inevitably, will require ongoing</p>	<p>If have funding will</p>	<p>Cost, also in future may</p>

<p>maintenance to restrict spread from roadside.</p> <p>OPTION#2</p>	<p>reduce spread of invasive species. Treat roadsides continuously</p>	<p>need worry about additional invasive species</p>
<p><u>WILDLIFE CONNECTIVITY</u> OPTION #1</p> <p>Passes: overpasses /underpasses -both will be needed, exact locations TBD</p>	<p>Connectivity for wildlife (but still limits it), fewer vehicle/wildlife traffic accidents</p>	<p>Current studies on endangered species may not be relevant in future / when project is actually implemented. Don't have enough data to say where crossings are needed, or what kind.</p>
<p><u>Water and air quality</u> OPTION #1</p> <p>Design should protect the aquifer and protect air quality through any means available</p> <p>OPTION 2 Protect aquifer/wells from runoff from flooding</p>	<p>Protect from oil runoff from roadways, protect from potential hazmat situations on roadways, improve emissions for air quality</p> <p>Protect aquifer, protect property</p>	
<p><u>Economic impact of highway</u></p>		

	bikes from cars	(such as water). Increases cost
<u>Viewsheds</u>		
Option 1 Berms, depressions	Protect viewsheds from parks	Potential flooding issues – changes in landscapes will change where water goes and impact neighborhoods

GROUP 2 KEY CONSIDERATIONS RE: CORRIDOR DESIGN OPTIONS	PROs	CONs
<p><u>VIEWSHEDS:</u> OPTION #1</p> <p>Possibly bury highway altogether? Depends if road built with intent to improve access to areas or just move freight through area – “cut and cover” method of building freeway, use natural materials to camouflage. Depress highway below grade or screened with vegetation and earth to absorb sound.</p>	Blend into natural landscape, control light / sound. Lower sound and visual impact, lower light pollution.	Cost, may not mitigate all impacts. May not be possible to do with right of way constraints.
<p><u>Economic impacts:</u> OPTION #1</p> <p>Mineral potential beyond actual current mining sites - avoid impacting where future mining activities could occur. Maintain a 1000ft buffer around areas where mining could occur to avoid disrupting areas of mineralization – don’t want to limit mining operations and potentially lose mineral interests.</p> <p>OPTION#2</p> <p>Saguaro NP visitor experience could deteriorate, tourism to park could go down.</p>	Easier access to park	Tax park resources,

<p>OPTION 3</p> <p>Depress freeway near park</p>	<p>Visual impact reduced, lower sound, noise</p>	<p>degrade visitor experience</p> <p>Cost, may not mitigate all impacts</p>
<p><u>Invasives:</u> OPTION #1</p> <p>Buffelgrass issue could be exacerbated if new freeway built – will need long-term commitment to control / mitigate / monitor spread of buffelgrass. No way to avoid - all disturbance will impact this issue. To minimize impact, use best practices in construction. To mitigate impact, will require an intensive program to monitor and remove plant incursion.</p>	<p>Reduce net gain of expansion of buffelgrass – create a loss goal</p>	<p>Costly, may not mitigate all impacts</p>
<p><u>Cultural impact:</u> OPTION #1</p> <p>Concerns about impacts to McGee(ville?) Ranch community – and other places with historical/cultural significance to landscape – need to avoid impact as much as possible. Also avoid Indian lands, Saguaro NP, Ironwood, BLM parcels, TMC, CAP, etc. Protect current sites and potential new discoveries.</p>		
<p><u>WILDLIFE CONNECTIVITY</u> OPTION #1</p> <p>Pick a good alignment – pair path with existing infrastructure (i.e. immediately downstream of CAP where water flow is already reduced) - would help avoid impacts</p> <p>OPTION#2</p> <p>Wildlife crossings – build on existing areas of connectivity that exist in CAP. Could also cross CAP where needed as net benefit to fragmentation.</p>	<p>Improve existing connectivity</p>	<p>May not fully mitigate impacts, costly, additional study may be necessary</p> <p>May not be lower</p>



<p>OPTION #3</p> <p>Locate next to CAP</p>	<p>May minimize impact, crossings well defined by CAP</p>	<p>impact due to other considerations</p>
<p><u>COMMUNITY COHESION</u></p>		
<p>OPTION #1</p> <p>Access control – access creates traffic issues, wildcat development. Place corridor in places where growth wanted / merited. Local govts control growth – access on I-11 should correlate with growth plans for the region. No access to corridor where growth is not appropriate. Add improvements to connectivity where merited (i.e. access to SNP).</p> <p>OPTION#2</p> <p>Improvements to connectivity where merited (i.e. allow for easier access to Saguaro NP)</p> <p>NOTE: Interstate will be built in increments, not all at once.</p>	<p>Highway should not contribute to unintended growth, communities that need access can get it</p>	<p>Possible can't fully control access. Political change could remove agreements. Easement along highway corridor (i.e. 1ft no access easement along highway restricts building) – durable agreement that acts as solution</p>

GROUP 3 KEY CONSIDERATIONS RE: CORRIDOR DESIGN OPTIONS	PROs	CONs
<p><u>VIEWSHEDS:</u></p> <p>OPTION #1</p> <p>Bury or recess the road – address concerns related to 30ft Palo Verde canopy. i.e. depress Sandario road for local access, or bore under</p> <p>OPTION#2</p>	<p>Minimize all impacts, create opportunities for wildlife bridges at grade. Maintain natural/cultural /rural landscape, dark skies, mitigate noise/ light</p>	<p>Cost; 80ft right of way would require building 5 tiers below ground (to meet 400ft requirement of road). Access for local school buses, EMS, areas like Tucson MP, Olde Tucson,</p>



		etc. would be impacted
<p><u>WILDLIFE CONNECTIVITY</u> OPTION #1</p> <p>Some species prefer habitat at high slope (i.e. bighorn). Historical migration patterns for bighorn vast and well known. Bighorn would prefer a bridge; would need huge openness index if going under a structure. Other species require shelter for a crossing. Microclimates needed for other species (i.e. smaller species). Openness index is critical for underpasses.</p> <p>OPTION#2</p> <p>Linear features isolate Tucson mountains, lead to gene pool stagnation. Need un-isolate Tucson mountains. Wildlife bridges needed (Avra Valley Road at I-10). Other bridges will require land purchases (i.e. N and S of BOR corridor, near Ironwood, near Saguaro NP, Southern Pinal per NAU / AZGFD, etc.). Linkage across I-10 near Pinal county needed. Need address E/W crossing issues in Avra valley.</p>	<p>Avoid extinction, reduce threats to rare species, promote gene exchange, avoid vehicle/wildlife collisions, ecosystem benefits to humans</p>	<p>Cost</p>
<p><u>COMMUNITY COHESION</u> OPTION #1</p> <p>Burying. Allow access for local traffic, maintain existing access to Tucson MP, Old Tucson, Desert Museum, etc. Whole valley is cultural landscape for native Americans. Gunsight and other identified National Historic Registry eligible sites. Avoid all cultural sites.</p>	<p>Maintain quality of life, maintain viewsheds</p>	
<p><u>Invasive species</u> OPTION #1</p> <p>Buffelgrass, other invasives have already impacted large areas of Sonoran Desert. Spraying alone not</p>	<p>Burying roadway is a</p>	

completely effective at reducing spread. Spread easily after fire. Can be lit easily during fire season (i.e. from a spark from a chain on a vehicle).	useful design option for fire prevention	
<u>Wash integrity</u> OPTION #1 Avoid changes in natural regime. Widely distributed channel system – may require freeway elevation. High likelihood of challenges with 10,000 CFS flows along Brawley /Los Robles system. Elevate roadway as in FL, LA, etc.	Maintain watershed integrity, avoid changes in natural regime. Avoid floodplain.	Elevation would adversely impact wildlife connectivity, viewsheds
<u>Cultural</u> OPTION #1 Area important to Tohono O’odham. Number of identified areas of cultural importance, including the gun site – known to SHPO already, potential route could infringe. Important to avoid cultural sites		

Stakeholder comment: Many other issues not covered in above discussion, need more study on many other items.

TOPIC	DETAILS
STAKEHOLDERS’ INPUT	<p>If option C/D were selected, what would you want it to look like?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No-build preferred. • Design should serve all key stakeholders and meet environmental demands with no negative impacts to any stakeholder (especially environmental). Low impact, reduce visibility, good accessibility -all important aspects to consider. Serve needs of school children in area. • Meet pedestrian, bicycle, and local traffic needs in the corridor while moving express traffic through as well. • Prefer to protect open space – greater need to do that than increasing the number of visitors to Desert Museum / Saguaro NP. • Prefer highway be invisible from Tucson mountains. Sound, noise, etc. • No impact on connectivity for wildlife – easy for all wildlife to migrate through. • Keep open space agreements already in place, control development that could occur on/near on ramps etc. i.e. control over where gas stations

	<p>go.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land acquisition along development, connectivity, open space preservation, crossing for all wildlife (no impact on connectivity). • Ongoing revenue for invasive species control – constant stream of funding for maintenance / protection from invasives. • Serve local and inter-state needs – i.e. keep roads in place that already provide access to Saguaro NP, desert museum, etc. • The I-11 in Avra Valley avoids impacts to environmental, cultural, and economic assets while minimizing impacts by a screened or below grade design. Ecological connectivity is improved from the current conditions with well-placed wildlife crossings that cross the CAP along with the I-11. The highway is invisible from the Tucson mountains and cannot be heard or smelled from nearby communities. Access is fully controlled and permanently limited in areas of high sensitivity. • Enclosed freeway – but minimization of ground disturbance also important to avoid impacts from invasives. Entry point, bored, 2-tiered to keep truck traffic separate from car traffic, light rail. Use top to address wildlife corridors, parks, trails. This design would proactively address light, sound, fire concerns, flood control, odor, air pollution, dust (minimize Valley fever spread), and viewsheds. • Protect Freeport reserves and interests, protect Caterpillar assets in area. I-11 should go around Freeport and Caterpillar properties (to either side). • Operations at the Sierrita Mine cannot be disrupted for the life of the mine, including future reserves. • Keep corridor as narrow as possible with lots of wildlife crossings. • Recessed below grade level – preferably based underground to minimize impact to viewshed and maintain connectivity of wildlife habitat between Tucson mountains and Waterman mountains. The underground option would also maintain rural quality of life for existing residents. Also helps existing surface transportation routes. • There would be sufficient wildlife crossings to assure wildlife connectivity at the same level as now. • In crossing the Tucson Mitigation Corridor (TMC), the highway would be at grade level, with sufficient wildlife crossings. An elevated highway through TMC is unacceptable. If the current restrictions on development within the TMC could not be modified, then that is a good reason not to select Option C/D. • Access should be very limited in the portion of the highway between Avra Valley Road and the southern border of the TMC. This should be done in a way that eliminates or greatly reduces the development of fuel, food, lodging, or other transportation service facilities along this portion of the highway.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Control the spread of buffelgrass in Avra Valley.
--	---

TOPIC	DETAILS
CLOSING COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Q: How were stakeholders selected for this process? Likely other stakeholders that would want / should be part of this process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A: After ASR public meeting phase, FHWA decided to do deeper dive, decided to establish this process, asked consultants to research records from Scoping and ASR meetings, collect email addresses for organizations, found 68 total organizations, sent emails to each of those organizations, asked for nominations for individuals from those organizations, and asked for those orgs to nominate any other individuals that might be interested in this process. Every nomination was placed in this process. No one turned away. This group / process is designed for non-governmental organizations. Federal, State and Local Agencies, along with Tribal, such as the Tohono O’odham Nation, outreach is a separate process. ◆ Thanks all for putting this all together, not an easy task to put things together like this, thanks ADOT/FHWA/Institute. ◆ Thanks, great to hear all of these specific issues, very eye-opening, great learning experience, hopefully will be more like this in the future. ◆ This was an excellent process, wish we had more time / meetings to address all issues, many issues not covered in this limited time, Avra valley unified in opposition to C/D route. Hope process continues. ◆ ADOT: Thanks everybody; we all know public process / democracy can be messy. Goal was to hear from everyone. This process will continue. Only in Tier 1 EIS right now. Still will be another environmental analysis. This is a learning process for State & FHWA. Appreciate everyone’s time on this. ◆ FHWA: Appreciate everyone’s time, appreciate feedback developed. USIECR report comes next, then continue NEPA process to look at pros and cons.