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1. **INTRODUCTION**

   The purpose of this report is to summarize and account for the planning and presentation of information for the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study during the first round of Public Open Houses held in April 2005.

2. **PUBLIC INFORMATION PLAN BACKGROUND**

   As outlined in the Public Involvement Plan (Appendix A), two rounds of public open houses are to be held within the study areas. The first round of public open houses was originally planned for Apache Junction, Florence/Coolidge, Queen Creek, and the Gila River Indian Community. The open house with the Gila River Indian Community was deferred at the request of the Community and will be held at a later date. Public open houses were held at the following locations:

   - City of Apache Junction
   - City of Coolidge
   - Town of Queen Creek
   - City of Chandler

   The purpose of the first round of public open houses was to present an overview of the study work plan, schedule, and existing and future study area conditions, as well as to obtain input on key issues associated with the development of these corridors.

3. **NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENTS / COVERAGE**

   Newspaper advertisements were placed in the following newspapers to notify the public of the Open Houses:

   - The East Valley Tribune (March 23, 2005)
   - Apache Junction/Gold Canyon News (March 21, 2005)
   - Chandler/Sun Lakes Independent (March 23, 2005)
   - The Tri-Valley Dispatch (Casa Grande, Coolidge, Florence) (March 23, 2005)

   The advertisements ran in the above-listed newspapers in late March, two weeks prior to the first Open House. In keeping with the requirements of Title VI, Open House advertisements provided an opportunity for persons with disabilities to request accommodations prior to the meetings.

   Prior to and after the open houses, several newspaper articles were featured in local newspapers. For samples of the newspaper Open House advertisements and newspaper coverage, please refer to Appendix B.

4. **NOTIFICATION BY MAIL**

   A notification advertisement was mailed to the project’s mailing list. This list, compiled since the very beginning of the project, had approximately 500 interested parties. The advertisements were mailed on March 21, 2005, approximately two weeks prior to the first Open House. Please see Appendix C for the open house mailing list and a sample flyer.
5. **OPEN HOUSES**

At each of the Open Houses, all team members participated and interacted with the community members by answering questions. Members of ADOT Transportation Planning staff, ADOT Communication and Community Partnerships staff, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the consultant team, and local government officials were present. **Table 5-1** lists the locations and estimated attendance at each of the open houses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House Location / Date</th>
<th>Number of Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache Junction Town Hall / April 6, 2005</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Arizona College / April 7, 2005</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Creek Town Hall / April 11, 2005</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler Senior Center / April 13, 2005</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPEN HOUSE ATTENDANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>450</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All open houses followed a similar format – a presentation was given followed by a public question and answer session. The same presentation was given at each open house. The remainder of the meeting was an open format where attendees could view the project displays and speak one-on-one with project team members. Section D.1 in **Appendix D** contains the material presented at each open house. Section D.1 in **Appendix D** contains samples of materials that were available and distributed at each open house. Comment forms were also available for attendees to submit written comments. A summary of written comments submitted from all four Open Houses is provided in **Appendix E** of this report.

Section 5.1 contains a summary of the presentation given by Dianne Kresich. Section 5.2 through Section 5.5 contains a summary of questions posed by attendees, as well as the response provided at each open house.

### 5.1 Overview Presentation Summary

Dianne Kresich, the project manager for the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study, welcomed all attendees to the meeting and thanked them for their attendance. Ms. Kresich explained that ADOT is conducting three corridor definition studies: Pinal County Corridors Definition Study, Williams Gateway Corridor Definition Study and the US 60 Corridor Definition Study. She explained that this round of open houses was specifically for the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study.

Andy Smith was introduced as the project manager for the Williams Gateway and US 60 Corridor Definition Studies and was available to answer specific questions regarding those two studies.

Dianne Kresich introduced a map depicting the study area for the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study. She explained that the map with the ‘corridor lines’ that was included in the open house advertisement originates from a previous study completed in 2003 by the Maricopa Association of Governments and the Central Arizona Association of Governments (MAG/CAAG) entitled Southeast Maricopa/Northern Pinal Transportation Study or SEMNPTS.
It was explained that the ‘corridor lines’ were a depiction of four freeway corridors that were proposed in the 2003 MAG/CAAG study. She explained that she hoped this is the last time that the ‘corridor lines’ map will be seen. She stated that the study area for the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study was better depicted by a much wider study area without ‘corridor lines.’ She described the end points of the two study areas as I-10 in Chandler to US 60 at Florence Junction, and US 60 in Apache Junction to I-10 near Eloy.

Ms. Kresich explained that the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study was being performed in response to a Arizona State Legislative request to perform a planning study to better-define each of the four corridors originally proposed in the MAG/CAAG study. The purpose of Pinal County Corridors Definition Study was described as: to determine the need and feasibility for two corridors within the Apache Junction/Coolidge Study Area and the East Valley Study Area. She explained that a planning study considers high-level issues such as how many people will be living in the area, where they will work, and how they will get to and from work. In addition, the study will consider the feasibility of a potential new state highway, including neighborhood concerns, geographic concerns, environmental concerns, and archeological concerns. Another important part of the study was to gather input from the public, city and county staff, and elected officials.

Ms. Kresich stated that the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study will ultimately make recommendations to the State Transportation Board regarding the need for a roadway, the type that it should be, where generally the road should be located if it is determine that it is needed, the function of the road (state function, regional function, local function), and who would be responsible for building and maintaining the road.

Ms. Kresich emphasized that the study will not recommend a road for which a need is not established, recommend a road that is not feasible to build, determine an exact alignment for the road, or design any aspect of the road.

Ms. Kresich described the overall study process. She explained that a planning study consisted of the collection of data on existing and future conditions (how much traffic, where do people live and work, where will they live in the future), the evaluation of the need for a road (are existing roads sufficient to handle projected traffic increases), and the evaluation of the feasibility of the road. Feasibility considerations will include environmental concerns, construction costs, and community input and perspectives.

Ms. Kresich stated that a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was formed by ADOT to provide advice during the study and to provide input from local jurisdictions. The TAC included staff members representing the following jurisdictions within the study area.

- ADOT Transportation Planning Division and Engineering Districts
- Maricopa and Pinal Counties
- All local jurisdictions in study areas
- Regional planning organizations (MAG, PAG, and CAAG)
- Arizona State Land Department
- Federal Highway Administration
- Gila River Indian Community
- Regional Public Transit Authority

Ms. Kresich stated that the study team has met with staff and elected officials from multiple jurisdictions. She highlighted some of the issues that were identified from the meetings with the local jurisdictions:
There is a significant amount of development already planned within the study area, and that multiple local agencies have planning studies underway to begin to address the transportation needs that will come as a result of the projected development.

- There are significant environmental and archeological issues within the study area.
- Funds would need to be identified to construct a corridor.
- Land use planning is underway for State Trust land, southeast of Apache Junction.
- Flood control dams, Central Arizona Project Canal, and the proposed SRP 500 kV transmission line offer potential locations for new corridors.
- A new crossing of the Gila River is desired.
- Improved access to the Coolidge Airport is a regional priority.
- Coordination with the Gila River Indian Community is vital.
- Existing development along Riggs Road and Hunt Highway severely limits corridor opportunities.
- Corridor opportunities exist at the eastern end of the East Valley study area in Pinal County.

Dave Perkins introduced the display boards, pointing out important information contained on each of the following presentation boards.

- An aerial of the northern Pinal County/Southern Maricopa County area.
- Study area map.
- Development trends within the study area.
- 2004 and 2030 population densities.
- 2004 congestion levels.
- 2030 congestion levels if the existing road system were not extended or widened.
- 2030 congestion levels for an assumed 2030 road system (the 2030 road system was based on information available in past and ongoing transportation planning studies in the MAG region, Maricopa County, and Pinal County, supplemented with information provided by TAC members. It was stated that the 2030 road system was subject to change pending ongoing and future transportation studies.

5.2 First Open House, Apache Junction

The first Open House was held on Wednesday, April 6, 2005 from 5:30-7:30 pm in Apache Junction at the new Council Chambers located at 300 East Superstition Boulevard. Approximately 85 people participated in this open house. Table 5-2 is a summary of the questions, comments, and responses from this open house held. Figure 5-1 is a photograph taken at the Apache Junction Open House. Several questions and comments submitted at the Apache Junction Open House were concerned with the financial feasibility of the project, strongly supporting traffic congestion relief. Many attendees at this open house were very interested in learning of the upcoming improvements of US 60.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the maintenance of existing roads included in the study?</td>
<td>ADOT is supporting several Small Area Transportation Studies being conducted by local jurisdictions that may review the maintenance of existing local roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would ADOT take over the roads if the counties can’t pay for it? How do you determine which roads are ADOT responsibility, and which are county responsibility?</td>
<td>There are certain roads that are maintained by the county, and certain roads that are maintained by ADOT. In order to determine whether a road should be maintained by the city, county, or state, ADOT looks at whether the road serves a state function rather than primarily serving local travel that stays within a small area or within a city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s the US 60 that I have to deal with every day. What are you doing with the US 60?</td>
<td>Widening of US 60 is included in the first phase of projects that are funded by the recently approved Proposition 400. This project will add general purpose and auxiliary lanes. Construction will begin in the fall of 2005, and will be completed in 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are all individuals on the study team ADOT employees?</td>
<td>The study team uses consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather than planning to spend money on building new roads, can we remove traffic signals on existing roadways and turn them into parkways?</td>
<td>Yes, a number of alternatives are possible, but that is beyond the scope of this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn’t it be wise to talk to the State Land Department about reserving right-of-way for future roads when they sell the land? Can’t there be a stipulation that if State Lands doesn’t provide right-of-way, they don’t get zoning?</td>
<td>The study team is coordinating with the State Land Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa County looked at Roads of Regional Significance coming off of US 60 and I-10. Is there a possibility of doing the same thing in Pinal County?</td>
<td>As Pinal County conducts its Small Area Transportation Study, they will identify major arterial roadways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How far will the US 60 widening extend?</td>
<td>The widening will extend to Power Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has ADOT considered toll roads for these corridors?</td>
<td>Yes, this study will consider toll roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When will we stop studying the roads, and actually move dirt?</td>
<td>This study began in the fall of 2004, and will be completed by fall of 2005. Upon completion of the study, the State Transportation Board will determine further course of action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will these graphics be available on ADOT’s webpage?</td>
<td>Some of the display boards will be available on the webpage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Second Open House, Coolidge

The second open house was held on Thursday, April 7, 2005 from 5:30-7:30 pm at Central Arizona College in Coolidge at 8470 North Overfield Road. Approximately 95 people participated in this open house. Table 5-3 is a summary of the questions, comments, and responses from the open house held in Coolidge on April 7, 2005. Figure 5-2 is a photograph taken at the Coolidge Open House.

Attendees to the Coolidge Open House were, for the most part, supportive of new corridors though some participants identified a few roads that they felt would not be desirable as a freeway corridor. Attaway Road was specifically mentioned. Some residents of the Chandler Heights community attended the Coolidge Open House and expressed concern over the east/west corridor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is public transportation a component of the study?</td>
<td>Yes, it is. While a detailed transit study will not be performed, this study will address how roads can accommodate public transit. Specific transit alternatives would have to be considered in a separate study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where did the initial corridor lines come from?</td>
<td>They came from the 2003 MAG/CAAG Study (SEMNPTS). Our study uses those lines as a resource, or a starting point. We have started fresh, as a lot of new homes have been constructed along the corridors, making a corridor difficult to construct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you still taking additional data from the local communities? Coolidge, for example, is changing daily.</td>
<td>To some extent, we can still take information. We are under a firm deadline to present to the State Transportation Board in November so we have to draw the line. Meetings have been held with each of the jurisdictions and they were asked for the best data that they had. For example, it was discovered through meetings with jurisdictions that the most recent population projections were available from the Central Arizona College (CAC) Bond Feasibility Study. It is understood that conditions are continually changing. The Arizona Department of Economic Security population projections were considered for use but there was a consensus among the study team and the TAC to use population projections from the CAC Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are we going to wait until the growth already comes, and then decide to construct the freeway?</td>
<td>We are trying to anticipate the future. If we take a look now, we would see mostly farmland. We are doing our best to anticipate the future. Another aspect of the study is to look for opportunities for a corridor. If development is slated to happen, we need to know about it as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once we make our recommendation of what roadways are needed, what is the subsequent process and how long does it take?</td>
<td>We will make recommendations to the State Transportation Board. Based on the decision of the Board, additional studies may take place. It was pointed out that this is not a quick process. The Loop 202, for example, was funded and took 15 to 20 years to transition from planning studies to construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the east/west route, is there a consideration to the South Mountain Loop?</td>
<td>Yes, the South Mountain Loop was included in the travel demand model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What sort of confidence level do we have to do projections over the next 20 to 25 years?</td>
<td>We have assembled the best modelers in the west. We have to make assumptions. This level of modeling is typical for this type of planning study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerning time, are we still looking at 25 to 30 years down the road?</td>
<td>Yes, new highways take a long time from conception through construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the study determines that it is not a state road, could it be done faster?</td>
<td>That would be up to the local jurisdictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What method do you take to gather public input?</td>
<td>We have established the Technical Advisory Committee to provide input from local jurisdictions. In addition, we are conducting these open houses to provide as many individuals as possible an opportunity to comment on the process. There is frequent communications with many interested parties both via email and telephone. We encourage you to fill out a comment card to ensure that your input is recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a large number of residents opposed a corridor through a neighborhood, how would you take that?</td>
<td>We would take that very seriously.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Third Open House, Queen Creek

The third Open House was held on Monday April 11, 2005 from 5:30-7:30 pm at the Queen Creek Town Hall at 22350 South Ellsworth Road. Approximately 150 people participated in this Open House. Table 5-4 is a summary of the questions, comments, and responses from the open house held in Queen Creek on April 11, 2005. Figure 5-3 is a photograph taken at the Queen Creek Open House.

The majority of attendees at the Queen Creek Open House appeared to be from the Chandler Heights Community, or owned homes along the Hunt Highway. Residents of Chandler Heights adamantly oppose a corridor to be placed along Hunt Highway. Many attendees felt that the Chandler Heights and Hunt Highway areas are already too developed for any corridor to be feasible. Residents of these communities also have a strong desire to keep the area as “rural” as possible. Several comments and questions also pertained to coordination with the Gila River Indian Community.
Table 5-4 – Questions, Comments and Responses from Queen Creek Open House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fissures and faults are significant issues that we must look at.</td>
<td>We will look at geologic data as part of our environmental investigations in the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are the stakeholders?</td>
<td>The stakeholders are the public officials, the engineers, the planners, etc., from jurisdictions within the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Canada can have solar buses and transit systems, why must we have nothing but freeways? Why don’t we have more buses, etc?</td>
<td>ADOT spends approximately 15% of its allowable flexible funds on transit. While a detailed transit study will not be performed, this study will address how roads can accommodate public transit. Specific transit alternatives would have to be considered in a separate study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding Hunt Highway, I spoke with Tim Oliver requesting definitions of what they have planned. They stated that Riggs Road is considered a major arterial (6 lanes). However, there are concerns regarding the expansion of this to a major arterial. Is the feasibility even there with the depth of the geotechnical areas?</td>
<td>We will look at geologic data as part of our environmental investigations in the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Creek has been discussing Alternative 7 for Williams Gateway. Will establishment of the Williams Gateway freeway take pressure off of the others?</td>
<td>The three studies are coordinating, the teams meet regularly, and they will determine the impact of the relationship of each corridor, and its impact on other corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the people live in unincorporated area of Maricopa County. The motivation of Gilbert/Chandler/Queen Creek is different than motivations from the County? Is there a formal way to get representation on the TAC?</td>
<td>Maricopa County is represented on the TAC. The TAC is a staff-level committee that does not conduct public meetings. Individual citizens are encouraged to attend open houses and submit comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5 Fourth Open House, Chandler

The final open house was held on Wednesday April 13, 2005 from 6:00-8:00 pm at the Chandler Senior Center at 202 East. Boston Street. Approximately 120 community members participated in this open house. Table 5-5 is a summary of the questions, comments, and responses from the open house held in Chandler on April 11, 2005.

Attendees to the Chandler Open House voiced both support for and opposition to new corridors. Opposition to corridors focused on Hunt Highway, yet many attendees recognized a need for new transportation facilities.
## Table 5-5 – Questions, Comments and Responses from Chandler Open House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why hasn’t environmental information been presented at this study?</td>
<td>It was explained that if we determine that a corridor is needed, we will then evaluate environmental and other information to determine if the corridor is feasible to construct. If we determine that a corridor is not needed, then we don’t need to do a detailed environmental review. We have significant environmental data ready to use should a need be established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second meeting will be held in late summer, and the report is due in November. How much input will the public be allowed being that the time frame and schedule are very short.</td>
<td>There is enough time for the public input to be incorporated into the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need for a corridor will be immediate. We have learned that if we build a freeway, the growth will come. No matter where we go with a freeway, the growth will occur around it.</td>
<td>No response provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the GRIC the organization that we are dealing with on this corridor?</td>
<td>GRIC is represented on our TAC. We are currently in the process of scheduling meetings with GRIC representatives to receive input on a number of issues. We will not be able to make complete recommendations without their input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-10 east/I-10 west is packed. The trucks are tying up the roads. It takes nearly 2 hours to get to Casa Grande in the morning.</td>
<td>An ADOT representative provided a brief overview of the status of widening of I-10. ADOT is doing a study for I-10 widening from Phoenix to Tucson. We are approximately 1 ½ years into a 3 year study. About 27 miles of the corridor passes through the GRIC. ADOT is continually coordinating with GRIC staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much of the study area is on GRIC and on State Trust Land?</td>
<td>Much of the area includes State Trust Land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assuming that the I-10 study indicates that you need to widen I-10, when would we actually see construction begin on I-10?</td>
<td>The current I-10 study is to establish purpose and need only. Further studies and design will be performed to determine priorities and construction schedules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There will be corridor restrictions as it passes through the GRIC. If the study draws out an additional 3 or 4 years, the corridor will be further developed and options will be limited.</td>
<td>The legislature requires that the study be finished by November, recognizing that opportunities are rapidly diminishing as development continues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5-4 – Queen Creek Open House
6. **GILBERT OPEN HOUSE**

Following conclusion of the first round of open houses, the Town of Gilbert requested that an additional open house be held in their jurisdiction. The purpose of this open house was to provide the residents of Gilbert, particularly those in the Hunt Highway and Chandler Heights areas, another opportunity to provide input and to receive information about the study.

Representatives from several jurisdictions, in addition to ADOT, were in attendance to explain and clarify their current plans for expansion of Hunt Highway and Riggs Road. These included representatives from Maricopa County, Gilbert and Queen Creek. Representatives from City of Chandler were not in attendance but provided information in advance of the open house to Ms. Kresich. Consultant teams were not present. This open house was held on May 2, 2005 from 6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the Town of Gilbert Southeast Regional Library, 775 North Greenfield Road.

Dianne Kresich, ADOT Project Manager, presented the power point presentation at the open house. The displays and materials available at the first four open houses were also available at the Gilbert open house.

A question and answer session was provided. All questions were directed to the local jurisdictions, and focused on their long-range plans for the Hunt Highway corridor. Several written comments were submitted expressing overwhelming opposition to a corridor along the Hunt Highway. No comments were submitted expressing support of an east/west corridor, though some of the comments acknowledge a need for a corridor of some type and offered alternatives to a corridor along the Hunt Highway. The proposed alternatives include expanding Riggs Road and constructing a corridor on the Gila River Indian Community. Submitted written comments were:

- I am opposed to the East-West alignment being along Hunt Highway for the following reasons:
  1. The San Tan Mountains Park MUST have a buffer between its borders and civilization.
  2. The Chandler Heights Community is an old, established, well-loved rural area that would be killed by a Hunt Highway alignment.
  3. “Buying” the right-of-way would involve the condemnation of homes already in existence, not to mention those that are in the planning/building stage.

- Thank you for another opportunity to voice our concerns re- Hunt Highway and for getting Tim Oliver here tonight.

- I would ask for Chandler Heights to be mentioned in your report. We are a unique community caught smack in the middle of this report. Chandler Heights is country with a very rural lifestyle. People have chosen to move here to be away from the cities. Defining Hunt Highway as anything but the current residential country 2-lane road will be the beginning of the end of Chandler Heights. Chandler Heights is the community south of Riggs Road, north of Hunt, east of Higley, west of Sossman. About 900 homes. We want to stay rural. Don’t be cause of our demise.

- I am a concerned resident of Chandler Heights – moved to this area for quiet, rural lifestyle, dark skies. I recognize [the] problem of traffic congestion. It takes me 1 ½ hours to get home from work (19th Ave in Phoenix) but it is worth it to live in such a neighborhood. It does not seem fair that a rural community such as Chandler Heights should have to pay for poor planning in Pinal County by having Hunt Highway or Riggs Road developed into a major highway or freeway. This would impact not only the Chandler Heights neighborhood but also the San Tan Regional Park. There are other East-West roads that are already wider than Riggs.
or Hunt that go through suburban neighborhoods where residents would probably welcome a major arterial or freeway close by. People live in those neighborhoods because they want to live near Walmarts and have easy freeway access.

- Please review Hunt Highway as a major corridor, this can not happen. There are so many homes, families, and history along this road that any development along it is not feasible. Thank you.
- Do not make Hunt a [major] road [it’s] called Riggs
- I live off of Hunt Highway. Homes all along [it] are worth hundreds of thousands of dollars! What sense would it make to bulldoze, make a lot of people really upset! I don’t want all of Pinal County zooming by. It’s bad enough! Hunt Highway needs [to be] improved for Safety, only!! Please put a highway through PINAL COUNTY THEY ARE THE ONES WITH THE PROBLEM!!
- Thank you for holding this open house on the “Hunt Corridor” east-west. The San Tan Mountains and Park is a beautiful, still pristine, desert area and will remain so for a long time as long as the park and ranches along the north side of the San Tans stay intact. The only need for an east-west corridor or freeway would be for the Johnson Ranch folks. This should be planned south of the San Tans or Queen Creek residents would be better served along Riggs Road or even further north not south. Not Hunt. Thanks to Queen Creek and Mark for staying with Hunt remaining a 2 lane (3 with turn lane) road.

7. **COMMENT CARDS**

A comment table was available at each open house for participants to utilize to fill out a comment form with any questions or comments they have concerning the study. Over 100 comment cards were returned. **Appendix E** contains a sample comment card.

Received comments have been stratified into four main categories: ‘both corridors’ comments, ‘north/south’ corridor comments, ‘east/west’ corridor comments, and ‘other’ comments.

Many comments included support for more transportation corridors because of the population growth, though many did not specify where the corridors should be located. Several comments submitted expressed support for a corridor in general, but do not want it located on or near Hunt Highway. Many stated that the east/west corridor should be further south or that a connection should be constructed to the Loop 202 or Williams Gateway Corridor.

Only four written comments were received that pertain specifically to the north/south corridor – three were in favor of the north/south corridor, and one was in favor of corridors in general, but opposed a north/south corridor on Attaway Road.

Overwhelmingly, the majority of submitted comments pertain specifically to the east/west corridor. Of these comments, just six expressed unilateral support of the east/west corridor along the Hunt Highway alignment. The remainder expressed opposition to the east/west corridor along the Hunt Highway.

7.1 **Comments that Pertain to Both Corridors**

The following comments pertain to both the north/south and east/west corridors. They are grouped by those that support both corridors, and those that oppose both corridors.
7.1.1 Comments Supportive of Both Corridors

Open House attendees submitted 27 comments that expressed unilateral support for either the east/west corridor or the north/south corridor. These are summarized below:

- Extend US 60. More corridors.
- We need to get relief in the area from Florence Junction west to Apache Junction.
- The explosive population in the near future would seem to favor that the major corridors in question would require construction of full-fledged freeways under state jurisdiction.
- It’s about time. US-60, I-10 and I-17 are mostly impassable if there is an accident or during morning/evening rush hours. We need ALTERNATE parkway routes as presented on the map I have submitted.
- The proper growth of central Pinal County is dependent on proper public transportation. This includes freeway corridors, railroad, aviation, etc. Coolidge has a proposed regional mall that sits on a proposed freeway alignment in the southeast area of the City of Coolidge. Coolidge is very supportive of the Apache Junction/Coolidge Study area.
- Move As Fast As Possible! Recommend more emphasis be placed on how Rapid Transit/public transit, might compare in cost if it could be designed at time of roadways. Will a recommendation concerning time frame be made i.e. cost to construct in 20 yrs versus 30 yrs etc.
- We need a limited access freeway connecting the East Valley to the Pinal County communities sooner rather than later. The growth in this area demands prompt action.
- These highways are definitely needed and are state issues – not regional. Proceed to design studies ASAP.
- Make Hunt Highway a 5 lane. Make Ironwood a 5 lane. Be Pro-active not Re-active – get ahead of the game!!!
- I am in favor of a freeway on Hunt Highway. It is definitely needed. Traffic will only get worse. I am also in favor of this north/south proposal from the 60 south. I would also like to see the #7 route coming from the airport.
- I am in favor of the north/south and east/west freeway. Thank you.
- With the number of people moving to this area, it is very important to move traffic East/West and North/South. People must be able to get to other major arteries. Please be Proactive no Reactive.
- Why no connection or plan for connection to Gateway Highway? Why not push Signal Butte right on down from the 60? GM knew you were going to do that 30 years ago. Why not? Now?
- -Bring us some freeways!
- -Let’s preplan, not panic plan
- -use the state land for common good, don’t sell it to developers who will NOT.
- Definitely need N/S corridor – State highway, to connect near Eloy or Picacho Peak on I-10. It will relieve traffic on US 60 and I-10. Recommend connecting to Picacho Peak to relieve congestion to I-10 I-8 intersection.
- (2) Hunt Highway – go south of San Tan Mts, OR at the Mt. Base by Honeywell, angle 45° SW to connect to I-10 near Casa Blanca Rd. 387?? Or further south OR, go parallel to Hunt 1 mile south on reservation. Thanks!
I strongly support the East Valley Corridor Study and support Engineering studies and the Exploring of Funding of Construction of a Transportation project.

Put the east-west Hunt Highway Corridor on a straight line from Florence Junction to I-10 and cross Hunt Highway at approximately Arizona Farms Road.

The corridors are great. The need is now so the faster you can get this done, the better.

Hunt Highway should be chosen as the east west route, and chosen immediately, before any more building occurs. [It’s] already a [highway] right? North-south should be a freeway all the way to Tucson via the Pinal Parkway [AZ 79] alignment. Leave I-10 between Phoenix and Tucson as a truck route.

I was at the meeting in Apache Junction. looking at the map ([aerial]) there was a strip of land by Florence that would be good for a freeway. I wouldn’t wait to secure a right of way due to fast growth. This strip of land runs SW and NE.

The East Valley Highway 60 from Power Rd to 79 to Florence needs to be widened. Sure it thins out some but with all the new building and Gold Canyon – [It’s] becoming a major disaster.

Not Fast Enough! We are one of the fastest-growing counties. If not done sooner, you’ll never have enough road structure to support the growth. Coming from another state – your state is far behind, on its roads, highways, and freeway systems. The roads are in bad shape (two lane) Highway 88 going to takes – not wide enough to support bicyclists, trucks, cars, hikers, motorcyclists, cars/trucks hauling large boats. It’s a death trap on that road! Try getting from Nodak to 88 (L) turn. Very bad viewing, much less traffic flow, you need to advance your roads, highways, and freeways. NOW, for future – It’s happening, the growth! With growth comes cars! since no real job (viable) in Pinal Co. – most go to Phoenix daily – MORE CARS AGAIN

It would seem to be advantageous to identify the east-west alignment (Hunt Highway) immediately so that right-of-way could be purchased before it is full of houses and a situation like South Mountain Freeway would occur wherein all the people living in the area state demanding that the freeway be built on Indian land -- that would be extremely expensive.

My husband and I live in South Chandler area and are very excited about the potential of new transportation corridors being put in between Maricopa County and Pinal County. I work as a project manager in Phoenix and my husband works as a training manager in Florence. After much thought and research, we choose to live in South Chandler to split the commute time for both of us.

We both carpool to cut down on mileage, emissions, and gas costs. However, my husband's commute has changed substantially since we moved in approx. 6 years ago. He now describes the frustration of mixing local traffic on single lane roads, which often travels 5 -10 miles under the posted speed limit, with commuters frantically trying to get to work in E. Chandler, Queen Creek, Johnson Ranch, Casa Grande, Coolidge, or Florence (depending on which route he takes). He describes the situation as very dangerous and I worry on a daily basis about his safety during his commute.

As the West Valley continues to spread unabated and the center line of the valley continues to shift away from Chandler, I worry about the ability of South Chandler and Pinal County to attract businesses and quality employment opportunities. We see many houses, but few businesses in S. Chandler. We feel that addition of enhanced transportation routes both between Maricopa and Pinal Counties, as well as routes linking this area of the valley with major Freeways, such as I-10 and US 60, will
help fuel the business growth in the area. It will also allow the thousands of Chandler residents the opportunity to work locally, which will reduce freeway traffic valley wide.

My husband and I would like to be added to your notification list when additional meetings on this topic are being held. We feel we will have a lot to contribute to the discussion. Please let us know if you have any questions.

- Not fast enough! (2)
- Not fast enough! Please hurry!!
- **HOW ABOUT ROUTING A FREEWAY SOUTH OF THE SAN TANS ON THE RES AND BUILD THEM A COUPLE OF CASINOS!! DOES ADOT EVER SEE THE HORRENDOUS TRAFFIC JAMS IN THIS AREA AT RUSH HOUR?? AND RELIEF IS NOT FOR 25 YEARS???
- Our local entities (county supervisors etc.) know this corner of AZ like no others. You’re spending thousands of dollars for information they most likely have at their fingertips. I felt you were not giving them due respect. That we need roads is a given and anything that can be done to expedite and fund them should be explored to the fullest.
- Common sense tells you that you can’t have over 1 million people in Pinal County in 2030 and expect the roads to be “uncongested.” This is obviously a Maricopa County view of Pinal County as usual. ADOT will once again be behind the eight-ball and paying more for future ROW because they failed to properly plan ahead.
- The state highways would be more congested except many people go out of their way to avoid “stopped traffic.” (The numbers of cars you count on a roadway may be deceiving because many people who need the road are avoiding it). Thank you.
- -poor handouts regarding maps and areas [affected]
  -unincorporated areas don’t seem to be represented on your formal committee
    -Not only Maricopa but Pinal too
  -need better community meetings in Coolidge, Florence and Apache Junction.
  -A.J., Coolidge, Florence need better connection to I-10 to avoid Phoenix
  -with the amount of growth Pinal County is now experiencing and the predictions on growth warrants **new roads**
  -because of the growth in Pinal County the state needs to acquire the land **now** before the developers [buy] it and you have no place for the roads
  -Pinal County roads were not built for 18 wheelers to run at 75 miles an hour hauling tons of rock per truck. nor for the amount of car/truck traffic they are now experiencing.
  -N/S corridor is more recommended, needed to carry traffic on our roads

### 7.1.2 Comments Opposed to Both Corridors

The following comment was submitted expressing opposition to both the east/west corridor and the north/south corridor.

- For the following reasons I think ADOT should decide not to proceed with either the east-west I-10 to US 60 project and the north/south US 60 to I-10 road improvements.
  1. The tremendous ROW [presumably right-of-way] and construction costs involved to build new freeways (or other roads) of this length. The E-W Road looks 30 miles long and the N-S road looks 50 miles. You are starting from scratch in most areas.
  2. Who would benefit? – Primarily land speculators – and they would create a whole raft of **new** problems of trying to get urban services into remote areas to facilitate more urban growth.
  3. Looking at the funding needed, there are **a lot** of transportation projects around the
State that would have a greater transportation and safety need than these – that could be addressed with the funding not spent on these projects. Look at the cost/benefit analysis of traffic movement and traffic safety for the entire Statewide system.

4. How long would it take to complete these projects and how likely is it they will encounter funding problems or loss of political interest?

5. There are no “phasing” or halfway alternatives. The roads need to be completed to carry traffic – they cannot “dead end.” They need to link to something to carry significant traffic and there are few “somethings” to choose from. There is nothing halfway to Coolidge.

7.1.3 Comments Supportive of Corridors Concept, but Opposed to Specific Routes

The following comments were submitted that expressed understanding and support for a new corridor, but are opposed to specific alignments such as the Hunt Highway. Many of these comments offered alternatives such as connecting a corridor to the Williams Gateway Corridor and the Loop 202. Other alternatives proposed expanding SR-87 in Pinal County and in the Gila River Indian Community.

- (A) Please avoid Indian land in that they pay no tax and very little development.
- (B) Can location consider release of BLM public and states land so that costs can be distributed over areas open for development? Do power line location suggest locations of less expensive land for expressways? Have “toll roads” been considered?

- East/west corridor already too developed for anything other than improved local roads
- Williams Gateway Corridor logical alternative to east/west for freeway alignment
- North/south corridor really could use a freeway to connect far East Valley to I-10
- May need to widen north/south corridor to include extension of SR 87 from US 60 to I-10

- Thank you for the cookies and treats. I feel that the East-West corridor along Hunt Highway to connect I-10 to 60 is not feasible due to the very residential makeup of the area. Besides it is not “nice” for Maricopa County residents to have to bear the Pinal County traffic connecting to I-10. Better to connect Hunt Highway (N-S) East to 202. Perhaps along Rittenhouse. This will also save the Williams Gateway Airport, which in 20 yrs will be a twin of Sky Harbor. : )

- Most of the traffic in Queen Creek is bypass traffic from Johnson Ranch. Residents of Queen Creek should not have to pay the price for an ill-conceived community. Put all of the Johnson Ranch traffic on a north-south corridor and connect into the Gateway option #7. Riggs and Ellsworth have been designated as roads of regional significance for many years. Another road along Hunt makes no sense. A east-west connection on the south side of the San Tan Mountains near Central Arizona College is the best location for this corridor.

- With the 202, a future Williams Gateway freeway, an Apache Junction/ Coolidge freeway, this eliminates the need for a Riggs/Hunt freeway. A Riggs/Hunt freeway completely destroys the Queen Creek livelihoods and those that want to maintain their rural lifestyles. Any freeways that are built should be in open land that won’t be a direct effect to residential areas that the Riggs/Hunt would be.

- We strongly disagree with the possibility of expanding Hunt Highway to be part of the Pinal County Corridor. It would disrupt the established rural neighborhoods, divide residents north and south of Hunt near San Tan Park. Hunt Highway already generates too much noise. Keep the corridor south of the San Tans and let it stay in Pinal County and utilize existing Highway 87. The Johnson Ranch traffic does NOT need to travel
Hunt Highway if a n/s corridor con move them north to US 60 or to a corridor north of Queen Creek Road that travels west to the 202.
NO on Hunt Highway expansion.
NO on Hunt Highway as a Pinal County Corridor.
NO on Hunt Highway as a Johnson Ranch traffic reliever.
Keep Hunt Highway communities rural and quiet.

- I find no need to build a state highway on Hunt Highway. We have one 5 miles north on the 202. We do need a north/south state highway.
- We are residents of Queen Creek just south of Riggs – We oppose any widening of Riggs or Hunt Highway to support traffic – We are established neighborhood and we are in a rural area, and do not look for Highway Roads in our backyards. I am in support of Queen Creek extension from #202 – preferable #7
- As homeowners in Orchard Ranch and the Town of Queen Creek, we do not support or understand the need to route a freeway between Hunt Highway and Riggs Road. There are many other locations that seem to make more sense, would not cost as much to build and would better serve the public. The only open space existing for the proposed corridor would be the most highly valued land with custom homes. Buy-out would be expensive. We agree with the Towns thought on using the Williams Gateway Loop for the new freeway connection.
- I don’t see [where an] East/West roadway near Hunt Highway is necessary. Chandler is working on Pecos, Riggs and 202 to take care of future East/West growth. ADOT should not put another East/West roadway thru Chandler. What the Southeast area of Chandler needs is improved North/South roads. Chandler is behind in the planning and construction for the North/South roads. A North/South corridor from US 60 to the Coolidge Area may be an improvement for them but not for Southeast Chandler.
- The Apache Jct./Coolidge study area and potential freeways makes sense. The East Valley study area with a freeway north of the San Tan Mtns is a bad idea. This is not like the 303 in the northwest valley. I see right-to-take issues and more. Better budget heavy for condemnation! 😊
- Opposed to a “BIGGER” Hunt Highway disaster. DO THE MATH! Pay the Indians. Go around the mountain – Go N-S @ Ellsworth to 60 & 202. LEAVE Chandler Heights ALONE. We’ll fight you!
- Hunt Highway is already established as a quiet residential road with NO commercial development. A better choice would be a connection further north that connects directly with freeway systems.

7.2 Comments that Pertain to North/South Corridor

The following comments pertain specifically to the north/south corridor.

7.2.1 Comments Supportive of North/South Corridor

The following comments expressed support of the north/south corridor.

- For the north-south study if recommended (when recommended), I think Tomahawk Rd to Snepfh should be closely examined. Then moving to the east of GRIC land to go further south.
- Widen Ironwood to six lanes and put freeway on Idaho.
7.2.2 Comments Opposed to North/South Corridor

No comments were received that expressed out-right opposition to the north/south corridor. However, the following comment expressed concern over a north/south corridor along Attaway Road.

- My family is concerned that a freeway will be located along North Attaway Road. Since our family’s home lies within 50 feet of the current roadway, we feel a freeway would threaten the home and the historic Walker Butte School, which sits directly behind the home. We feel there are better alternatives, such as the Felix/Clemens road alignments. While we understand this study does not recommend a particular location, we still believe it is important to make our wishes clear at this time.

7.3 Comments that Pertain to East/West Corridor

The following comments pertain to the east/west corridor.

7.3.1 Comments Supportive of East/West Corridor

- I am moving to Circle Cross Ranch near Queen Creek. We desperately need freeways out here and I support either option in this study. If I had to pick one route, I would pick the E-W corridor tying into I-10. The 60 is so hopelessly jammed I hate to think about dumping all the cars from this area onto it as well. I think the 10 could handle us better. I also support extending the Williams Gateway farther South into QC city limits to ease congestion and decrease our commute time. Thank you for your time.

- I am in favor of the regional “super arterial” concept, along the Riggs Rd alignment from Higley west. This would be a limited access roadway (every ½ mile minimum access points) with six through lanes and adequate turn bays.

- Quit studying and do something now! We already have a traffic nightmare on Hunt Highway. Use a toll freeway. People will pay. It is a mess!

- As a Chandler resident and a former Pinal County Senior Planner, I strongly advise the need for express-way type of roadways as pictorially shown from I-10 to US 60 via the Maricopa/Pinal County lines. Also the North/South segments shown. Populations are growing in SE Maricopa and NW Pinal Counties, requiring these Expressways.

- To Whom It May Concern: 4-13-05
  I represent the East Valley Partnership. This note is intended to be a place “holder.” EVP plans to bring our transportation committee and Full Board a resolution that will support the Hunt Highway/Freeway. Even though it may not be built for some years to come, it needs to be put on a map to start the process. It may need to be placed in a number of cities or Indian communities to accomplish the over all goal of assisting ingress and out flow of traffic. This corridor along with the others in the Pinal area study were suggested by AZ legislature when prop. 400 was [legally] approved. A more complete and comprehensive report will follow within 30 days.

- Re: Tribune newspaper article, “Hunt Hwy proposals draw opposition”

  We NEED a major corridor along Hunt Hwy to I-10!

  Since thousand's of homes have been built east of Arizona Avenue, Riggs Rd gets all the traffic to I-10.

  They speed right thru Sun Lakes, God forbid if you drive the speed limit, they are in
such a hurry, they will run right over you!

Sun Lakes used to be a quiet little retirement area for about 10,000 people. We can no longer sit on our patio's and enjoy life, it is so polluted with noise and gas fumes we stay inside. If there is a road closure on I-10, we get the traffic on Riggs from I-10 to Hwy 87 (Arizona Avenue).

So, I say to the people along Hunt Hwy....you all moving here in the last 5 years are part of the problem......so quit whining and accept a major corridor along Hunt Hwy to take care of your traffic...like the people in Sun Lakes along Riggs Rd have had to do...we never had any say about it at all!

I know, I live along Riggs Rd directly west of McDonald's at Riggs & Arizona Avenue!

7.3.2 Comments Supportive of East/West Corridor Concept but Opposed to Specific Routes

- Although I fully understand there is a need for an east-west corridor, the existing homes should take [preference] over future growth. The Complete destruction of many lives and lifestyles [inevitable] if the existing Hunt Highway is expanded from Ellsworth to Higley as well as further west. The residents of Chandler Heights are very concerned about their properties, homes and safety. We are a very rural community and are desperately trying to maintain that lifestyle. A freeway or even a 4-6 lane road would completely disrupt many families and homes. There are homes directly on Hunt Highway with driveways opening directly onto Hunt.

- Riggs Road seems to be more feasible as a major arterial than Hunt Highway. The road has been improved and expanded as development has moved in the area. There are many fewer homes directly on Riggs and even fewer driveways opening directly onto Riggs than Hunt. If Hunt Highway were to be expanded many homes and lines would be disturbed. The community of Chandler Heights is a rural community and does not want that lifestyle altered to the degree turning Hunt Highway into a 6 lane major arterial would do. I hope that the concerns of these residents are considered throughout this study.

- We are [adamantly] opposed to using Hunt Highway as a main artery connecting Pinal County to I-10. We strongly urge ADOT to consider putting this south of the San Tan Mt. Range as it has no existing residential areas.

- I really do not think, feel, like Hunt Highway expanded either as a freeway or an arterial road to service East-West traffic. Please, route the Pinal traffic south of San Tan Mtn. to connect to I-10. Please.

- No on Hunt Highway
  OK for super arterial on Riggs Alignment
  No freeway

- A freeway corridor along Hunt Highway makes no sense. The population of our area will not grow by much as we are 90% built out. Although the zoning in Chandler Heights shows R-4 we are R-43 land usage. The impact to our groves and the San Tan Mountain Regional Park will [be] detrimental! A corridor should be planned east/west south of Williams Gateway Airport and then south of the GRIC in Pinal County. KEEP PINAL TRAFFIC IN PINAL – NOT ON HUNT!
The communities of Chandler Heights, Orchard Ranch and the San Tan Mtn Foothills will actively and aggressively oppose any proposed freeway along Hunt Highway!

- My suggestion is leave Hunt Highway as is. Negotiate with the Gila River Indians to place a road further south. This gives them valuable access to land they can lease and develop. This avoids disturbing existing built out property in Chandler and Gilbert.
  Win-win?
- If have to build sound walls on Hunt Highway, move 1-2 miles further south. Win-win with GRIC – commercial on both sides of freeway. Ask GRIC to build with casino revenue and then they lease land to commercial development.
- There is a need for roads to move people from one end to the other since people rarely live where they work. The east-west corridor defined area for study is bordering very developed neighborhoods. Also, to place it parallel or along Hunt will only be used to service north of that road. A better place would be further south since much of the new growth is coming from Coolidge.
- Resources for Hunt Highway improvements, I-10 improvements and study the 101 possibilities to go farther South.
- As a resident of Chandler, directly on Hunt Highway… I will agree that there is a need for traffic congestion relief, but I DO NOT want a major freeway, highway, etc. on Hunt Highway. I have already had a motorist crash through my rear wall and DO NOT want a 30 foot block wall to stare at each day. Build your freeway on vacant land!
  Further study of Hunt Highway as a corridor.
  If Hunt Highway is considered it would need to be located ¼ to ½ mile south of Hunt Highway as the City of Chandler residential goes all the way up to Hunt Highway and our residents have not known this was a consideration. Work with Gila River Indian Community as you study further this issue.
- I live at the corner of McQueen Road and Hunt Highway. If some type of Road is required in the future, I would like to see it located south of Hunt Highway at least a ½ mile to keep it away from the neighborhoods.
- As a home owner in Queen Creek, I am against the proposed freeways. Johnson Ranch should have thought of this before expecting to ruin our rural lives. This will devalue our property, and the livestock lifestyle. J. R. should go south of Hunt Highway past the mountains and keep the other freeways as planned and in progress by Warner Rd.
- To Whom It May Concern:

As residents of Springfield Lakes in southern Chandler, we are very concerned about the potential placement of an interstate highway along the existing hunt highway corridor. Having lived along I-35 in South Central Oklahoma, we are well aware of the abundant noise pollution and increased traffic that interstates such as this typically bring. Additionally, we are concerned about the impact such a corridor will have on our property value, as well as, our quality of life.

We definitely agree that hunt highway needs to be improved. Currently, hunt highway allows for one lane of traffic in each direction. Minimally, this should be increased to three lanes in each direction to accommodate present and future east valley residents utilizing the corridor.

To reiterate, an interstate highway along this corridor would have a negative impact for the home owners that live along the proposed interstate corridor. If the Arizona Department of Transportation is determined to add an interstate highway in this area,
we **strongly** recommend that the highway be moved minimally one mile south on the of
hunt highway. Additionally, we recommend that the highway be below grade and have
retaining walls that minimize the noise pollution.

Thank you.

- 1. If you create a N/S corridor that accesses the Williams Gateway Freeway, the 202,
   and [US] 60, why do you need an E/W to 10 across an Indian Reservation where there
   are no businesses/employers?
- 2. What about the environmental impact to the San Tan Regional Park, the San Tan
   Mtns, and the established Chandler Heights Community amidst citrus groves?
- 3. Your population predictions for 2030 for the Chandler Heights region are inaccurate
   – the area encompasses 2 square miles, is almost 100% built out and only has about 800
   residents, due to the restriction of one water meter per acre.
- 4. Why not take the E/W corridor south of the San Tans through Sacaton where there
   are already existing state routes that connect to I-10?

### 7.3.3 Comments Opposed to East/West Corridor

The vast majority of comments received pertain specifically to the east/west corridor, and
overwhelming express opposition to the east/west corridor. These are summarized below.

- I am a resident of Chandler Heights and am very concerned about the plans along Hunt
  Highway – west of Ellsworth. I actually live on the existing Hunt Highway and am
  concerned about the expansion of Hunt. You are aware of the costs involved but
  wonder what other options are available. There are many residents with property and
  actual homes who are in fear of losing their property. Hopefully our concerns are heard
  and considered.
- I am a resident in Chandler Heights. I live at Recker Rd and San Tan Blvd. I do not and
  would not support a major road on Hunt Highway to support the people of Pinal County
to come thru [our neighborhood] and become a [nightmare] to this beautiful country.
- No Hunt expansion there is Riggs and others
- My name is *** -- my backyard is Hunt Highway. If you decide to expand Hunt you
  would remove ½ of my backyard and diminish my childhood dream – which consists of
  finally [owning] my very own horses, this includes my 10-yr-old daughter’s extreme
  love for horses. There is so much more to say I will email or send a letter to the address
  on the other side.
- Why should established neighborhoods sustain the traffic for the new neighborhoods? I
  am absolutely opposed to Hunt Highway becoming the major freeway as discussed.
  This plan is not compatible with our neighborhood. The sound reverberating off the
  mountains now is unbelievable.
- I’m against widening or adding access to more traffic along any part of Hunt Highway
  from Pinal County to Higley Rd. If any roads are to be built in the future in the Queen
  Creek/Chandler Heights irrigation areas please consider noise pollution and rubberizing
  roadways.
- 14 years on Hunt Highway – home built in 1959 – The whole idea of doing anything to
  widen this ROAD (not highway – it’s just the name) is not “feasible” and not wanted.
  The State will face a class action suit if this project is pushed forward.
- Because of the 100’s of residents that will be detrimentally impacted by a freeway
  corridor along Empire/ Hunt Highway, I cannot support and am adamantly opposed to a
  freeway corridor there.
We recently moved to 174th and San Tan on 2 acres of orange grove. This necessitated a 45 min drive to work and anywhere else our lives go vs. a 15 min drive. We did it so we could be as far away from freeways and Major Roadways as possible and still manage to Continue working – we are very opposed to this rural area and community being destroyed. It is one of the few areas one can still Ride Horses and it needs to stay that way, as well as the preserve needs to be kept in a rural application.

We have saved and waited for 41 years to be able to build our dream home in a rural area and do not want to see it destroyed and we know our neighbors feel the same way.

We can get to the airport just fine.

A lot of the people who want bigger faster Roads are predominately from California and Commercial entities.

I didn’t hear anything said that has convinced me the neighborhood desires will impact any decisions at all. Gilbert is represented and they are trying to Swallow Chandler Heights’ and area. They have already annexed most of the bordering property and when we go to their neighborhood meetings we are told this is already a done deal. If Chandler Heights is not represented Gilbert Representation will use whatever ability they have to see we are all consumed.

- We in Chandler Heights strenuously object to Pinal County thinking that the people who live in Maricopa County should be the ones who will be used for your poor planning of roads to your developments. Hunt Highway is not going to happen without a serious fight.
- ANY THOUGHT of TURNING THE HUNT HWY INTO A MAJOR ARTERY SHOULD BE DISCARDED. IT IS A VERY BAD IDEA.
- Concerned regarding Hunt Highway study area and any increase of traffic through this residential area, with residential driveways and access to homes directly off the existing road. Current traffic and speeds represent a hazard. I do not want to see expansion of Hunt Highway.
- I don’t see the East/West Corridor being a viable route via Hunt or Riggs Road.
- (No) on any hunt highway corridor.
  - Flood basin
  - Historical home on Hunt
  - Power lines
  - Right of ways established
  - Irrigation lines
  - Community against it
  - Pedestrian traffic from reservation
  - Bus stops
- Most residents of Queen Creek have chosen to live there to get away from the “city” and to live a more rural life. A Hunt Highway freeway would utterly destroy the atmosphere for my family and my neighbors. We have put a considerable investment of time and money to establish ourselves in QC. Please Do Not build a Hunt Highway freeway!
- I am adamantly against any traffic on the Hunt Highway. 85227
- Leave our neighborhood alone. More traffic means: More speeding cars 60-80 mph; more accidents; More [noise] – (it is very bad now!)
We like our rural area. And we have the right to keep our neighborhoods safe, quiet. Check the bus stops on Hunt and Higley. They are getting dangerous.

- No to Hunt Highway
- I am totally AGAINST a major [corridor] east-west along Hunt Highway. You have to look at all the existing neighborhoods along that to see that a highway would be very disruptive.
- Do not put a freeway down the Queen Creek portion of Riggs or Hunt. There are already residential areas in place that would be negatively affected. Those areas are people that enjoy their rural living. Pinal County needs to be considerate of existing residences already in place.
- Hunt Highway between Ellsworth and Higley needs to remain a two lane road to maintain current land uses. The homeowners along Hunt have already had to give up property to pave it in the first place – leave us in peace!
- I just bought a new house off Val Vista and 1/8 of a mile north of Hunt Highway in Southeast Chandler. I would not like to have a freeway next to my house because of the noise.
- I would prefer the ADOT NOT make Hunt a major highway. Are there alternatives? When I purchased my home I never dreamed a major road could exist on Hunt. Negative impact on property values.
- The only reason I bought my house off Hunt Highway in 1992 was because of the fantastic view in my back yard of the mountains and no houses, just farming. I’m afraid if this road is widened the state would put up a high wall and I would lose all of this.
- We do not want a 6 lane divided Hunt Road, either as an expressway or a freeway or a minor/major arterial breaking up our rural neighborhood. This Chandler Heights district is a unique and peaceful set of properties. Please do not make us the sacrificial lambs to correct the problems caused by the poor planning of Johnson Ranch developers. As the rest of the valley develops into pods of identical houses, please let residents of at least our area retain their right to not live on the fast track. Our area is about 98% built out therefore leaves no room for any more development. Families have the right to live in a city close to shopping and accessible freeways. They move to certain locals for just that. We on the other hand do not have a problem driving some distances to access freeways and shopping. Please leave it as it is and build the arterials where people want to be close to them. Thank you, Sincerely, …Chandler Heights Resident
- I read an article in the San Tan Sun News regarding the east valley corridor study. Since I read the paper regularly, I did not see an announcement for the 1st public hearing. In fact, none of my friends and neighbors here in the Sun River Community have heard of it.

I am opposed to the making of Hunt Highway into a 31 mile highway for numerous reasons.

First, we moved in this quiet neighborhood or the “edge of country” for the quiet, the beauty and less traffic which will be destroyed if you plan on building the highway. As it stated in the article, “build it and they will come”. On the contrary, if you build it we will leave. The Indian community will have the highway they have been waiting for to build another casino or resort! Our community has $500,000-$600,000 homes. The highway will greatly reduce the beauty and market value of our homes.

If you have been keeping in touch with the east valley specifically the area of South
Chandler, you will know that we are fighting to keep Wal-Mart out of this area for the same reasons. Due to public opposition, Wal-Mart has backed away from the site.

I am letting our community know about your project through our HOA. I will also be letting friends in other local communities know about the project. Please let us know in advance of the public meeting and we will be there to voice our opposition. If you plan on building the highway, build it through a corridor that does not impose itself on quiet residential communities.

If you lived along Hunt Highway you would see the beauty, understand our concerns and opposition and leave our “edge of country” alone.

- Need to strongly consider noise and environment concerns for existing homes on Hunt/Empire Blvd.
- “Please” look at the geo-technical conditions in Q.C. No roads-highways in geo-technically sensitive areas!!!
- ADEQ has already expressed great concern about the air quality in the Phoenix Valley. Why route Pinal County traffic through Maricopa County in a stagnant air flow area at the base of a mountain? Hunt Highway is not an intelligent choice for another highway.

7.4 Other Comments

This category includes comments that are related to other issues unspecific to the north/south or east/west corridors. Many comments pertain to the financing of the corridors, geotechnical engineering that would be required, and coordination with the Gila River Indian Community.

- So far so good. You had arrow boards up, clearly identifying ADOT meeting.
- This time clearly said a planning study. This was important information. Good!
- Do you have a copy of the Pinal County Development Plan? Do you have a copy of the State Land Development Plan? Where could I get a copy?
- Good job of telling the kind of questions to ask. I think folks got carried away at Peralta. I think most of that was our fault.
- Put the maps on the web as a .pdf
- Good to have public explanation of boards.
All in all a good presentation. Thank you.

- I am very concerned about traffic in Gold Canyon and a probable bypass. I am also concerned about turnoff safety in this area.

- Please make sure your recommendations include the source of funding or proposed source of funding for projects ADOT recommends be maintained by the county. If funding is not identified then the proposal(s) is worthless. (Both construction and maintenance funding) ADOT is a big enough stakeholder in these roads feeding existing ADOT roads that recommendations pushed down to the county level may severely limit options and construction in a timely manner of any proposed road.

- Idea – install thousands of solar panels over the Cap Canal – it will cast shade over the water lessening evaporation and security will be easy between existing fences on both sides of the canal.

- I strongly urge Pinal County to look at the financial feasibility of attempting to build any future roads over the Hunt Highway corridor between Sossaman Rd east to Thompson Rd. With over 28 FISSURES along the north side of the San Tan Mountains, it’s not feasible or really financially sound to attempt to build over 400’ – 500’ deep fissures. Both Maricopa and Pinal Counties should attempt to re-direct all roads away from this problem. Research, geo-
technical studies and review of all open fissure files at the State Geology Dept. in Tucson should be re-evaluated in this region.

- How will the taxpayers of Pinal County pay for these new freeways?
- These handouts have no information, as to [exact] location, right-of-way, or other information needed for landowners to be afforded.
- Talk with major [land] holds to see if willing to help etc. provide assistance with limiting future cost to build.
- This study has started with fairly specific assumptions of where new highways should go. Shouldn't those questions have been part of the study?
- SRP (the electric utility) has requirements for transmission and sub transmission lines in the study area. We would like to talk to you about co-locating facilities.
- Is this corridor definition study the Hunt Road alignment between Pinal and Maricopa Counties or the Riggs Road alignment? If the Hunt Road alignment what is the proposed position and participation requirements for the Gila River Indian Community.
- This e-mail is in reply to ADOT's public input request (sorry I could not attend the Open House) on the Transportation Infrastructure Corridor Definition Studies now underway for the East Valley and Northern and Central Pinal County areas. I've attached a two-page "SkyTran" alternative/option/complementary transportation infrastructure design plan that I think may assist ADOT in planning to meet the transportation/commuter transit needs/demands of the areas under study. While SkyTran is still in the prototype development phase, it won't be long before it, or another Personal Rapid Transit (PRT) system, is proven operationally (within five to ten years). As ADOT, MAG, CAAG and other Arizona transportation planning agencies consider the future, I think it would be wise to include emerging PRT systems like SkyTran in the overall advanced technology mix of transportation options/multi-modal innovations. As the Internet didn't exist 15 years ago, but has since played a revolutionary role in the advancement of almost everything one can think of; so too for the introduction and public acceptance of PRT systems like SkyTran over the next 15 - 50 years.

Personnally, I believe that the development (R&D) and deployment (manufacturing) of SkyTran Transport Systems in Arizona can be a ticket for this state to lead the world in high-tech transit system manufacturing and sales for the foreseeable future. My vision is that SkyTran will help make Arizona the most livable and enjoyable place to travel anywhere in the world -- no-wait, non-stop, affordable, high-speed, high-capacity, safe and comfortable transit services for all. A SkyTran R&D Institute at ASU-EAST, a 21st Century SkyTran manufacturing and assembly plant at Williams Gateway Airport, and a mandate from Arizona's taxpayers to do more with their transportation tax dollars for less, is the vision I hold for how to manage the doubling of Arizona's population over the next 25-50 years. The long-term transportation fix for Arizona is "SkyTran -- Transport Solutions for People, Products and Data." Please, don't continue this mindless "road-building" disaster; please, give Arizona's taxpayers the opportunity to invest in their future, not in oil futures! Regards! Anyone at ADOT or the Morrison Institute who wants to learn more about SkyTran? - just call us!

[XXXXX]
[XXXXX]
Mesa, AZ 85210

The following information was submitted with the above comment
10 reasons Skytran should be an integral part of ADOT’s long-range plans:

Skytran –
- Is cutting-edge, 21st century “clean” maglev transportation technology
- Can be built for 1/10 the cost of new highways (1/20 of light rail)
- Can transport as many people per hour as a six lane highway
- Requires very little right-of-way (perhaps 20 ft. Bi-directional)
- Gets commuters to their destinations no-wait and non-stop
- Can travel at speeds between 100 and 150 mph (100 mph urban/150 mph rural)
- Is completely automated and not subject to driver error/accidents
- Runs 3-dimensionally, with no intersections for accidents to occur
- Gets the equivalent of 200 mpg at 100 mph; runs on electricity
- Has no moving parts/surfaces to wear out; low maintenance costs

For more detailed information visit: www.skytran.net. Or, if you have questions or would like a Skytran presentation, contact: [xxxx]
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Public Involvement Plan
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Introduction
The scope of work prepared by the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) for the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study requires that the Kimley-Horn team conduct two rounds public involvement meetings following an open house/informational exchange format. Public involvement meetings are to be held at various locations in the study areas for the East Valley Corridor (I-10 to Florence Junction) and Apache Junction/Coolidge Corridor (I-10 to US 60). Additional requirements of public involvement include preparation and distribution of press releases and coordination with the ADOT Communication and Public Partnership Section prior to the public meetings. A public involvement Summary Report will be prepared for review by the ADOT Communication and Public Partnership Section and included in the Draft and Final Reports.

The above ADOT requirement for public involvement served as the foundation for the public involvement work plan described in the Kimley-Horn proposal dated August 6, 2004.

Pinal County Corridors Public Involvement Team
The key members of the public involvement team for the study are listed below along with their respective roles and responsibilities.

- Dianne Kresich, ADOT Project Manager, responsible for review of public involvement materials prepared by the Kimley-Horn team, approval and monitoring of the Public Involvement Plan, and coordination with the ADOT Communication and Public Partnership Section.
- The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) established for this study will be responsible for providing input on the Public Involvement Plan, attending public meetings, establishing Jurisdictional Working Groups, communicating with ADOT and the Kimley-Horn team on jurisdictional and community issues, and communicating progress of the study with the management and elected officials.
- Staff within the ADOT Communication and Public Partnership Section will be responsible for coordination with the ADOT Project Manager to ensure compliance with ADOT policies and procedures for public involvement.
- Dave Perkins, Kimley-Horn Project Manager, will be responsible for preparation and implementation of the Public Involvement Plan. He will take the lead in all technical aspects of public meetings and events. He will have quality control responsibilities for all materials and reports generated by the Kimley-Horn team.
- Joan Beckim and Carol Oaks, Kaneen Advertising and Public Relations Public Involvement Specialists, will provide input to the Public Involvement Plan, coordinate and host public information meetings, prepare and place open house newspaper advertisements, prepare and provide information to local news media, and prepare mailing lists of community groups,
stakeholder, and political leaders. Public outreach events will comply with ADOT policies and procedures as well as Title VI requirements.

The goal of the Public Involvement Plan presented in this document will be to build consensus for the recommendations of the study, thus facilitating corridor planning decisions that are consistent with what is best for the region and the State. This will be accomplished by establishing a public involvement process for two-way dialogue between ADOT and the Pinal County Corridors study team, and the governmental jurisdictions, stakeholders, and general community populations who may be affected by the recommendations of the study. Outreach in the form of public meetings and jurisdictional workshops will be the principal methods of distributing information on the study and receiving input.

Public involvement will involve communicating with representatives from the ADOT, the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), the Central Arizona Association of Governments (CAAG), Maricopa County, Pinal County, Pima County, Gila County, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Gila River Indian Community, local cities and towns, local residents, the traveling public, and other interested stakeholders.

Key elements of the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) are presented below.

1. Public Involvement Plan

The PIP (this document) will be developed by Kimley-Horn and Kaneen Advertising and Public Relations using input from ADOT Project Manager and the ADOT scope of work. The PIP will be presented to the TAC at the first TAC meeting. Once the PIP is finalized, the PIP will be implemented by the Kimley-Horn team throughout the study and monitored by the ADOT Project Manager.

2. Public Open Houses

The Kimley-Horn team will schedule and host two rounds of four public open houses each for a total of eight open houses. Each round of public meetings will be conducted in at four locations and each meeting will present information for both the East Valley Corridor and the Apache Junction/Coolidge Corridor. General locations of the meetings include:

- Apache Junction
- Coolidge / Casa Grande / Eloy
- Queen Creek / Sun Lakes
- Gila River Indian Community

All open houses will be two hours in length and consist of a brief presentation and question/answer session followed by an open house displaying study information.

The first round of open houses will be conducted in approximately month 4 (January 2005) of the study. The purpose of the first round of open houses will be to present information on the study work plan and schedule, to present information on existing and future conditions in the corridors, and to obtain input on key issues associated with the development of these corridors.

The second round of public meetings will be conducted at the same locations in approximately month 9 (June 2005). The purpose of the second round of public meetings will be to present and obtain public input on the evaluation of the alternative corridor definitions developed during this study.

The Kimley-Horn team will determine the locations of the open houses and prepare any materials needed such as graphics, handout materials, displays, and other items. Public meetings will follow the
ADOT and Title VI processes. A project mailing list will be developed using mailing lists from previous studies in the area, and will include current elected officials, local news media, local chambers of commerce, large industries or employment centers in the area, and others. Local news media will be contacted to help generate free publicity to inform the public of the study and upcoming open houses. Both rounds of public meetings will survey public perspectives on key study issues.

3. Newspaper Advertisements

Two newspaper advertisements will be prepared to announce each round of open houses. The newspaper advertisements will include a project location map, contact names, dates and times of open houses, ADA information, and other relevant project information. All newspaper advertisements will follow the Arizona Standards.

Newspaper advertisements will be the primary means of announcing the open houses. Ads will be placed in the Tribune (East Valley) which serves Mesa, Scottsdale, Chandler, Tempe, Gilbert, and Sun City. In addition, advertisements will be placed in the smaller communities in the Casa Grande Dispatch, Coolidge Examiner, Sun Lakes/Chandler Independent, and the Florence Reminder.

4. Public Input through Comment Forms and Inquiries

Comment forms will be the principal method of obtaining input on what the public wants and what they will support in the future. Comment forms will be written and designed to provide feedback to the Kimley-Horn team and ADOT. Comments will be summarized and documented for use in the final study results. Inquiries by phone and/or letter will also be recorded and become part of the public participation documentation. Responses to questions and comments will be made when requested.

5. Jurisdictional Working Groups

Approximately one month in advance of each round of public meetings, a two-hour workshop will be held with key jurisdictions to discuss community issues associated with the alignment and development of the corridor. Each TAC member will be asked to establish this working group within their jurisdiction and to distribute information to working group members in advance of the workshops. The purpose of the workshops will be to gain an understanding of the key corridor issues, opportunities, and constraints within the community as related to the development of the proposed corridors.

6. Public Involvement Reports

Following each round of meetings with the public and jurisdictional working groups, a summary will be prepared for presentation and distribution to the TAC. The summaries will summarize public involvement activities and will document open house notices, hand-outs, newspaper advertisements and articles, comment forms, public comments, and other related information. The summaries will be integrated into a Public Involvement Report which in turn will be integrated into the draft and final study reports.
APPENDIX B – NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENTS & COVERAGE

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OPEN HOUSE
Pinal County Corridors Definition Study

Wednesday, April 6, 2005
APACHE JUNCTION TOWN HALL
300 E. Superstition Blvd.
Meeting Room
5:30 pm – 7:30 pm
6 pm Presentation

Monday, April 11, 2005
QUEEN CREEK TOWN HALL
22350 S. Ellsworth Rd.
Multipurpose Room
5:30 pm – 7:30 pm
6 pm Presentation

Thursday, April 7, 2005
CENTRAL ARIZONA COLLEGE
8470 N. Overfield Rd.
Coolidge, AZ
Room 101-M Building
5:30 pm – 7:30 pm
6 pm Presentation

Wednesday, April 13, 2005
CHANDLER SENIOR CENTER
202 E. Boston St.
Multipurpose Room
6 pm – 8 pm
6:30 pm Presentation

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) is currently conducting the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study. The purpose of this Study is to determine the need for and feasibility of potential new roads in the depicted study areas. Four Open Houses will be held to present information on the Study’s progress, answer questions and gather input from the public. Please stop by one of the Open Houses listed above to learn more about this study.

Persons with a disability may request accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Carol Oaks at 110 S. Church Avenue, Ste. 3350, Tucson, AZ 85701, telephone: (520) 885-9009, or fax: (520) 885-0311. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange accommodation. This document is also available in alternative formats by contacting Carol Oaks.

For more information, visit our webpage at http://tpd.azdot.gov/planning/corridorstudies.php

Figure B-1 – Newspaper Advertisement for Pinal County Corridors Definition Study
B.1 Newspaper Article No. 1

Pinal growth puts study of freeways in high gear

Alia Beard Rau
The Arizona Republic
February 21, 2005

Maneuvering through Pinal County these days is a game of chance.

With a little luck, the drive along back farm roads and through an Indian reservation from Interstate 10 to Central Arizona College new Coolidge takes no time at all. Without it, the 35-mile trek from Florence to south Chandler takes forever along a two-lane highway crowded with construction trucks.

Pile on an exploding Pinal County population that is expected to grow from about 245,000 to almost 1 million over the next 20 years, and residents say transportation is a serious problem.

“The East Valley is soon going to go all the way to Florence,” said Chuck Backus, who lives in Gilbert and owns a ranch south of Apache Junction. “It’s just a matter of time, and somebody needs to plan it.”

A study developed in 2003 by the Maricopa Association of Governments, Central Arizona Association of Governments and Arizona Department of Transportation recommended four new transportation corridors be developed to help ease traffic in Pinal and Maricopa counties.

• A 31-mile East Valley corridor that connects Interstate 10 to U.S. 60 at Florence Junction, probably running along Hunt Highway.

• A 36-mile Apache Junction/Coolidge corridor that begins at Interstate 10 south Coolidge and follows Arizona 87 north to U.S. 60.

• A 7-mile extension of U.S. 60 from Goldfield Road to Ray Road that loops to the west of Gold Canyon

• A 15-mile Williams Gateway Freeway that runs west to east from Loop 202 through Williams Gateway Airport and connects to U.S. 60 just south of Gold Canyon.

The transportation organizations, led by ADOT, last month started gathering public comment on the suggested corridors and will continue with the first phase of public input through early April.

ADOT staff will first determine a need for the corridors and later this years conduct traffic studies, environmental studies and land use impact studies. They need to decide if the corridors are needed; what type of roads are most appropriate; the general area where they will be built and who will maintain them.

Once that is done, the organizations will make a recommendation to the State Transportation Board in November.

“These are planning studies,” ADOT regional planner Dianne Kresich said. “We’re talking to a lot of people to see how their needs would best be met.”

The first focus groups were held in Apache Junction and Gold Canyon. Residents overwhelmingly said these corridors are needed and sooner than later. Other public meetings will be scheduled for late March and early April.
“It’s brutal out there,” Gold Canyon business owner Victorya Goodrich said. “Driving on (U.S.) 60 is really getting dangerous.”

Gold Canyon resident Dave Burden predicted growth in Pinal County will be tremendous and transportation vital.

“It’s a ways out, but I think that economies from Tucson and the Valley are going to merge,” he said.

Ron Reinagel, president of Gold Canyon Business Association, agrees.

“They are building 800 brand new homes a month in Pinal County and most of them use Highway 60,” he said.

ADOT Kreshich said early discussions with area residents and leaders have determined there is intense interest in making transportation improvements to the area.

“They want to know when and what,” she said. “Development is happening so fast and we’re doing a good job of trying to meet those needs, but there is a fine line between building a highway to nowhere and being behind the development curve.”

She said she doesn’t want resident to assume these potential roads would all be freeways, and she would not estimate a construction timeline if some freeways are recommended.

The freeway process is a long-term one that often takes decades.

Mesa is banking on the Williams Gateway Freeway to provide easy access to the several hundred-thousand people who will live and work in that corridor in the years to come.

“Ten years from now, the freeway will be desperately needed,” said Jeff Martin, Mesa’s assistant development services manager.

Roc Arnett, president of the East Valley Partnership, said there will be a “phenomenal need” for the Williams Gateway freeway in 20-25 years.

“It takes about 20 years to build a freeway,” he said. “If you look at what we’re doing with the 202, San Tan and Red Mountain, those were on the drawing board 20, 25 years ago.”

He said the freeway will help achieve the goal of “100,000 jobs and 35,000 students’ in the Williams Gateway area in the next 20 years.

Apache Junction chamber of Commerce CEO Rayna Palmer said she is afraid the proposed corridor won’t be enough to handle the expected growth.

“I see this as an immediate remediation, but I don’t see it as long term,” she said. “There is such tremendous growth out here.”

Corrine Cornn, who lives south of Queen Creek in the Copper Basin neighborhood, said her area also needs corridors to combat increasing traffic problems.

“We are in a world of hurt,” she said. “We desperately need freeways.”

She estimated there are about 10,000 vehicles going out Hunt Highway to jobs in the East Valley each morning, and an equal number coming in to help build the hundreds of houses rising each month in the San Tan/Johnson Ranch area.

“It’s a 45-minute drive into Mesa on crappy roads,” she said. “It’s tough when you’re sharing the road with everyone else and a tractor going 10 miles an hour.”
Coolidge officials support the corridors, but not because of any need to alleviate traffic. They see them as an economic generator.

“Ever since traffic ceased to move through Coolidge back when I-10 was constructed, Coolidge has been virtually at a standstill,” City Manager Bob Flatley said. “A limited-access freeway would bring back a lot of the traffic that used to come through Coolidge.”

Westcor has announced plans to build a regional mall in Coolidge next to a future freeway. Flatley said a freeway would also help the city build a business airpark around their airport, like those of Scottsdale, Chandler and Mesa.

“These things are a big benefit to the city tax-wise,” he said.

B.2 Newspaper Article No. 2

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) will hold open houses to gather public input on possible new roads, including one connecting Apache Junction with I-10 and passing between Florence and Coolidge.

Staff reporter
Florence Reminder
March 24, 2005

Open houses scheduled in this area will be April 6 at Apache Junction Town Hall, 300 E. Superstition Blvd; April 7 at Central Arizona College, 8470 N. Overfield Road, Room 101-M Building; and April 11 at Queen Creek Town Hall Multipurpose Room, 22350 S. Ellsworth Road. Each one will be held 5:30 to 7 p.m., with a presentation at 6 p.m.

ADOT will present information on its Pinal County Corridors Definition Study, answer questions and gather input from the public.

B.3 Newspaper Article No. 3

The future of two possible transportation corridors in Pinal County will be the topic of public meetings in the Easy Valley and Pinal County next month. Local residents will have a chance to learn about transportation planning studies underway for the East Valley and Apache Junction/Coolidge corridors.

Staff reporter
Coolidge Examiner
March 30, 2005

* Thursday, April 7 - Central Arizona College, 8470 N. Overfield Road. The meeting will be held in Building M, Room 101 from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.

* Monday, April 11 - Queen Creek Town Hall, 22350 S. Ellsworth Rd., 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.

The Apache Junction/Coolidge Corridor Definition Study is examining a corridor beginning at I-10 south of Coolidge that could follow Arizona 87 north between Coolidge and Florence and then continue north to Apache Junction.
B.4 Newspaper Article No. 4

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) will hold open houses to gather public input on possible new roads, including one connecting Apache Junction with I-10 and passing between Florence and Coolidge.

Staff reporter
Florence Reminder
March 31, 2005

Open houses scheduled in this area will be April 6 at Apache Junction Town Hall, 300 E. Superstition Blvd; April 7 at Central Arizona College, 8470 N. Overfield Road, Room 101-M Building; and April 11 at Queen Creek Town Hall Multipurpose Room, 22350 S. Ellsworth Road. Each one will be held 5:30 to 7 p.m., with a presentation at 6 p.m.

ADOT will present information on its Pinal County Corridors Definition Study, answer questions and gather input from the public.

B.5 Newspaper Article No. 5

The future of two possible transportation corridors in Pinal County will be the topic of public meetings in the East Valley and Pinal County next month. Local residents will have a chance to learn about transportation planning studies underway for the East Valley and Apache Junction/Coolidge corridors.

Staff reporter
Coolidge Examiner
April 6, 2005

Arizona Department of Transportation is conducting the studies to determine whether freeways, highways or another level of roadway improvements might be recommended within the corridors. The study recommendations are scheduled to be presented to the State Transportation Board near the end of 2005.

* Wednesday, April 6 - Apache Junction City Hall, 300 E. Superstition Blvd., 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.
* Thursday, April 7 - Central Arizona College, 8470 N. Overfield Road. The meeting will be held in Building M, Room 101 from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.
* Monday, April 11 - Queen Creek Town Hall, 22350 S. Ellsworth Road, 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.
* Wednesday, April 13 - City of Chandler Senior Center, 202 E. Boston St., 6 to 8 p.m.

The study team will give a brief presentation at each meeting to provide information about existing and future conditions in the study areas.

The Apache Junction/Coolidge Corridor Definition Study is examining a corridor beginning at I-10 south of Coolidge that could follow Arizona 87 north between Coolidge and Florence and then continue north to Apache Junction.

The placement of this proposed road could affect the route of a 500-kV power line project managed by SRP.
B.6  Newspaper Article No. 6

Explosive growth in Pinal County almost certainly ensures roadway improvements in the near future, according to the Arizona Department of Transportation.

Brian Ahnmark
Coolidge Examiner
April 13, 2005

But whether or not those improvements will include a proposed fixed-access freeway joining the Coolidge/Florence area with Apache Junction is still up in the air.

As part of the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study, a team of representatives from ADOT held an informational open house at Central Arizona College on Thursday. The study is divided into two components; the East Valley area and the Coolidge/Apache Junction area. Thursday’s meeting centered on the proposed Coolidge/Apache Junction corridor.

Project Manager Dianne Kresich gave a 20-minute presentation to explain the goals of the study and fielded question from those in attendance.

Kresich said the team working on the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study used the 2003 Southeast Maricopa-Northern Pinal Transportation Study (SEMNPTS), conducted by the Maricopa Association of Governments and Central Arizona Association of Governments, as a resource. That study identified several potential freeway areas that did not fall into any clear jurisdiction, so ADOT took over the project.

In September 2004, ADOT began the process of going over the 2003 study, updating all of the information to account for rapid growth in Pinal County. They created a Technical Advisory Committee with the cooperation of community, county and regional representatives. The idea, Kresich explained, was that all cities, towns and other “stakeholders” in the study area would be interviewed and would have a say in the proceedings.

These interviews helped the study team collect data regarding population growth and residential development. The team also relied heavily on data collected as part of a Central Arizona College bond feasibility study, which established population projections well into the 21st century.

From this data, the study team developed extensive models regarding population, employment and travel demand for 2030 - 25 years in the future. The focus, Kresich explained, is on the need and feasibility of potential new roads.

“We look at population today, and we look at the population projected for 25 years in the future,” she said. “Then we ask the question: Is there a need for new roadway facilities to meet their needs in 2030?”

The verdict?

“The transportation system that exists today is not going to be enough to accommodate the development that’s occurring in this area,” Kresich said.

But that does not necessarily mean an interstate will dissect Pinal County from Coolidge to Apache Junction. In addition to determining need, the study group is also working to determine which type of roadway enhancements are necessary for the county - and a freeway may not be necessary.
“A lot of the future travel in the area could - and I’m not saying would or will, but could - be handled by an enhanced local and county road system,” Kresich said, stressing cooperation between varying levels of government to keep commuters moving.

Feasibility is another major component of the study. Kresich said factors the team has taken into account include existing developments, environmental and archaeological issues, drainage, politics and community concerns.

And that’s just to determine a general quarter- to half-mile corridor where a roadway could be built; this study will not determine the precise route of the proposed road.

“This isn’t an engineering study, it’s a planning study,” Kresich said, debunking the common misconception that the study group has already settled on the exact location of a major freeway through Pinal County.

Existing structures - such as flood control dams, the Central Arizona Project Canal and the proposed SRP 500-kV power line - could also determine the path of a new road.

“These are all potential opportunities for locating new roadways,” Kresich said. Other possible benefits of a roadway could include new crossings of the Gila River and improved access to the Coolidge Municipal Airport.

After more studies and another round of open houses in the fall, Kresich and her team will present their findings and recommendations to the State Transportation Board in November 2005. The team will discuss need and feasibility, as well as proposing an appropriate type of road. They will recommend a general location - not an alignment - if applicable, and will also decide on jurisdictional responsibility; that is, who should be responsible for building and maintaining the road.

ADOT is interested in potential state highways. If the STB recommends state roads, ADOT will continue to be involved in the project and will go on to conduct engineering studies that will determine an exact route for the road.

On the other hand, the STB could determine that no state highways are needed or feasible, thus leaving the county and municipalities responsible for upgrading their transportation systems.

Although no precise timeline exists for this project, members of the study team referred to the Loop 202 project in Maricopa County. Dave Perkins of ADOT noted that Loop 202 was planned between 15 and 20 years ago, and will take at least another five years to finish.

“And that was a pretty fast-track project because it had a funding source of sudden sales tax,” he said.

Florence Mayor Tom Rankin was vocal in the waning moments of the meeting, pointing out that in November, Pinal County has a bond issue to renew a half-cent sales tax that has been in place for 19 years. He stressed that Maricopa County was able to build Loop 202 because of funding through sales tax, and asked for community and voter support of the sales tax renewal to help Pinal County pay for necessary road improvements.

“There has to be something,” Rankin said after the meeting. “It may be a parkway or a beltway. I don’t know that we can justify a freeway at this time.” He said that the roadway could help or hurt the communities of Coolidge and Florence, depending on how the municipalities react to the increased traffic and how they decide to market themselves.
Should a major roadway cut through the Coolidge/Apache Junction corridor, Rankin supports a route along Arizona 79.

“The most logical choice is coming down (Arizona) 79, where the right-of-way is already secured,” he said. Rankin said the town of Florence has been discussing roadway improvement with developers who have annexed land around Felix Road, Hunt Highway and Arizona Farms Road.

“We are working with each development that comes in to put the infrastructure in to make Felix Road a seven-lane highway, and Hunt and Arizona Farms right now are at a five-lane projected increase,” he said. “Wherever [the road] comes, it’s going to come through Florence before it gets to Coolidge. We realize that, and we realize that’s the price you pay for natural growth.”

Coolidge Vice Mayor Gilbert Lopez asked if the study group was still open to taking additional growth data over time, citing the conservative projections established by the CAC bond feasibility study.

“It’s changing and evolving daily,” Lopez said.

Kresich and Perkins said the study group believes it has the best information available at this time, as it is on a strict deadline to wrap up the study in time for the November hearings. Kresich stressed that the study committee could have taken the easy route and relied on growth projections produced by the Arizona Department of Economic Security, which elicited chuckles from the crowd.

“You know how low those are, and those are the official population projections,” she said.

According to Perkins, almost every jurisdiction on the Technical Advisory Committee said the best available information was provided by the CAC study.

Coolidge City Manager Robert Flatley was not as concerned with the relatively conservative growth estimates of the CAC study. He did, however, express some disappointment that the corridor study has not yet accounted for traffic that would travel south along this proposed roadway from Maricopa County and the East Valley into Pinal County, allowing motorists to avoid driving west to I-10 in order to reach Pinal County.

In discussing the feasibility of routing a new roadway through Pinal County, Kresich stumbled upon a hot topic: the proposed 500-kV power line headed by the Salt River Project.

For months, SRP has worked with communities in Pinal County to establish a number of potential power line routes for an energy line intended to link energy sources in Phoenix, Pinal County and Tucson. City officials from both Coolidge and Florence initially spoke out against a proposed “green line” route that would place the power line east of Coolidge in the vicinity of Valley Farms Road.

However, western routes along Curry Road and Eleven Mile Corner Road also prompted opposition from land owners and residential developers. The Coolidge City Council remained neutral for months.

But in January, the City Council suggested that SRP consider a different eastern route passing between Coolidge and Florence in the vicinity of Clemans Road. At the time, Flatley reasoned that the proposed Coolidge/Apache Junction freeway corridor could very well travel that exact route, setting up a convenient combination of projects. The city of Coolidge proposed that SRP
route its power line along the right-of-way next to the freeway, effectively killing two birds with one stone. To do so, the City Council also proclaimed its support of the green line.

Rankin and the town of Florence have since repeatedly stated their opposition to this stance taken by Coolidge.

“The power line will be in before the freeway is built,” Rankin said at Thursday’s hearing. “We are completely against the green line, but the 500-kV line will not have any bearing on this [roadway] at all.” With the power line expected to be up and running within 11 years, and the potential roadway still likely 20 to 25 years away, Rankin asserted that the development flooding the area after the power line is built will fill in the area and make highway construction impossible.

But Flatley said the joint roadway/power line project is still an option - albeit one that would require some foresight on the part of ADOT. Should SRP settle on an eastern route for its power line, Flatley believes that ADOT could work with SRP to secure the right-of-way it needs for roadway construction.

“If ADOT had an idea that the corridor might come through there, it would be an opportune time for ADOT to acquire right-of-way land more cheaply by working with SRP,” he said. “But the power line will go in first, no question.”

This article ran under the headline “Coolidge-A.J. highway being studied, but not a certainty” in the Florence Reminder on April 14, 2005.

B.7 Newspaper Article No. 7

Residents voice concerns on Pinal freeways study

Lisa Nicita
The Arizona Republic
April 13, 2005

More than 70 people packed Queen Creek Town Hall on Monday to voice concerns and gain information about possible freeways in the southeast Valley and Pinal County.

It was the third of four open houses held by the Arizona Department of Transportation in an attempt to answer questions and deal with rumors about the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study under way.

The final public hearing will be tonight in Chandler.

Dianne Kresich, a senior transportation manager for ADOT and the project manager for the study, said it will determine whether new state highways are needed and how feasible it would be to build them.

One corridor being studied runs from Interstate 10 to U.S. 60 at Florence Junction, and would possibly run along parts of Hunt Highway.

Another is a 36-mile Apache Junction/Coolidge corridor that begins at Interstate 10 south of Coolidge and follows Arizona 87 north to U.S. 60. Exact routes have yet to be established.

“There’s been some fear, I think, that it’s already been determined, and that’s not the case,”
Kresich said. “I hope people come away educated as to what a study will and won’t do.”

Many of the residents in attendance were from the Chandler Heights neighborhood, an unincorporated area of Maricopa County in southeast Gilbert.

Dave Garrett, 50, of Chandler Heights said he was worried that the east-west route, which could possibly result in expanding Hunt Highway, would disrupt his neighborhood.

“Six lanes would be in the middle of my living room,” Garrett said. “There’s lots of room in other areas that have already designated easements.”

Shawn Hawkins, 37, and his wife Stacy also live along Hunt Highway, in a home built in 1930. Hawkins said he is concerned that residents of Chandler Heights don’t have a voice at planning meetings since they reside in an unincorporated area of Maricopa County.

“It’s intimidating to some extent,” he said. “I hope coming to these will make somewhat of a difference.”

ADOT plans to make a recommendation based on the study to the state Transportation Board in November.

B.8 Newspaper Article No. 8

ADOT Eyes Hunt for State Highway

Susan Henderson
San Tan Sun News
May 7, 2005

Residents of Cooper Commons, Springfield, Sunbird, Solera and Sun Groves may someday have more than each other for neighbors. An Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) study underway since last fall will determine the “need and feasibility” for transportation facilities along four corridors, one of those being a 31-mile stretch along Hunt Highway, just south of Riggs Road in Southern Chandler.

A series of recent public meetings, including one in Chandler, gave residents their first glimpse of the study, and their first chance to react. About 120 people attended the Chandler meeting, and during the public comment period, residents overwhelmingly spoke in favor of more transportation facilities, if not specifically in favor of the corridors identified in the study.

“I think everyone who lives out here can tell you the need is immediate,” said one resident.

“If you build a freeway, they will build around it, as you can see with the 202 (Santan Freeway),” said another. “The quicker you build it, the faster you can satisfy the growth factor.”

ADOT Public Information Officer Matt Burdick says 30 comment cards were turned in at the meeting, and that comments were evenly split in support for or against a potential freeway.

“There were some who voiced opposition to any sort of highway along Hunt Highway, and there were others who stressed the need for transportation facilities of any kind for Southern Chandler.
because of the existing needs and the growth that’s happening. But, there are certainly those who voice concern about facilities along Hunt Highway and what kind of impact that may have.”

Maricopa County District 1 Supervisor Fulton Brock says the County’s focus should not be on turning Hunt into a state highway.

“I am in favor of expanding Riggs Road and other arterial streets in the grid system.”

Brock has been meeting recently with residents of the Chandler Heights neighborhood association regarding residents’ concerns about speeding along Hunt, and says improving the existing Hunt Highway is critical.

“It looks like our staff will be able to recommend adding some stop signs along Hunt and possibly a traffic signal.”

Burdick says Chandler, Gilbert, Queen Creek and the County all “own” portions of Hunt Highway, and are all planning improvements, including traffic signals, stop signs, adding lanes, or widening. Those improvements, says Burdick, will continue to unfold regardless of ADOT’s long-term plans for the corridor.

Dianne Kresich, project manager for the study, says actual construction is decades away, and that the study objectives are limited in scope at this time to: determine need and feasibility; gather input on corridor opportunities and constraints from the public, city and county staff and elected officials; estimate population and employment in 2030; and to determine whether neighborhoods, archaeological sites, and drainage make construction feasible.

The study outcomes will include a recommendation for what type of facility is needed, whether it is an arterial, parkway, or highway, but won’t determine design or exact alignment.

Connecting Hunt Highway to I-60 in the east and I-10 in the west would take “significant cooperation and agreement” with the Gila River Indian Community says Burdick, who notes that an easement would be critical to construction.

Population in the study area is expected to boom in the next 25 years. In the Maricopa County portion of the study, including sections of southeast Chandler and Gilbert as well as Queen Creek and Apache Junction, ADOT estimates the population will jump from 127,000 residents to 414,000. The Northern Pinal County section, including Florence, Coolidge, Eloy and Casa Grande is expected to grow from 183,000 to an astounding 1,073,000 residents.

According to Kresich, it is that growth that is driving ADOT’s study, which is just the first step of many before construction could begin. Environmental and design studies would be next, and funding would have to be identified.

“Already congestion is a problem,” says Kresich. “Options for locating potential new roads are getting smaller all the time. Existing development along Riggs Road and Hunt Highway severely limits corridor opportunities. Far more corridor opportunities exist in Pinal County.”

A second series of public meetings will be held later this summer, and ADOT will present study results to the Arizona Transportation Board in November. For more information on the study, as well as maps of the corridors under consideration, visit http://tpd.azdot.gov/planning/corridorstudies.php.
Two separate projects are being considered along Hunt to serve the booming area on the boundary of Maricopa and Pinal counties.

One possible project would involve Gilbert expanding Hunt to six lanes in the Chandler Heights area. Also, the Arizona Department of Transportation is studying a regional corridor on or near the Hunt alignment, from Interstate 10 to U.S. 60 near Florence Junction. That study could result in a road, expressway, freeway — or nothing.

Though several major new roads or freeways are under study near the county line, the potential Hunt improvements are the most controversial because many rural neighborhoods line Hunt Highway. Residents have spoken out against any expansion as transportation planners have turned to the public in recent weeks for input.

“Looking at the Hunt is just not acceptable,” said Gordon Brown, a Pinal County resident who has followed the issue. “It would destroy neighborhoods in the Chandler Heights area.”

The same problem would happen in Queen Creek, Brown said, where developments are full of residents who oppose city amenities such as shopping centers, wide roads and freeway access. Those neighborhoods fear commercial development would follow wider roads and destroy the area’s rural character.

Transportation officials recognize they will have difficulties making any improvements. ADOT doesn’t want to disrupt neighborhoods, said Dianne Kresich, an ADOT regional planner who is studying the Hunt corridor.

“This severely limits what we can do,” Kresich said.

To build a road, officials would have to make costly real estate purchases where homes line Hunt. Or they would have to build in the Gila River Indian Community, which may also oppose a road and charge high prices for the land.

ADOT will take the rest of the year to figure out what improvements — if any — are needed along Hunt. Gilbert will wait for that study to see how that might affect the town’s long-standing plans for a wider Hunt Highway, town spokesman Greg Svelund said.

Even if the town does decide to widen the road, it doesn’t have funds for it in the next five years. And Chandler Heights residents would have to agree to annexation, Svelund said.

Pinal County Supervisor Sandie Smith opposes a freeway along Hunt because of the impact on neighborhoods.

“It shouldn’t aim right at people who are already there when you have other alternatives,” Smith said.
Pinal County residents instead need more north-south roads that meet U.S. 60, Smith said. If studies show a need for a major east-west road, Smith suggested building one north of Florence toward where state Route 387 intersects Interstate 10.
APPENDIX C – NOTIFICATION BY MAIL

C.1 Sample Flyer

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OPEN HOUSE
Pinal County Corridors Definition Study

Wednesday, April 6, 2005
APACHE JUNCTION TOWN HALL
300 E. Superstition Blvd.
Meeting Room
5:30 pm - 7:30 pm
6 pm Presentation

Thursday, April 7, 2005
CENTRAL ARIZONA COLLEGE
8470 N. Overfield Rd., Coolidge, AZ
Room 101-M Building
5:30 pm - 7:30 pm
6 pm Presentation

Monday, April 11, 2005
QUEEN CREEK TOWN HALL
22330 S. Ellsworth Rd.
Multipurpose Room
5:30 pm - 7:30 pm
6 pm Presentation

Wednesday, April 13, 2005
CHANDLER SENIOR CENTER
202 E. Boston St.
Multipurpose Room
6 pm - 8 pm
6:30 pm Presentation

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) is currently conducting the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study. The purpose of this Study is to determine the need for and feasibility of potential new roads in the depicted study areas. Four Open Houses will be held to present information on the Study's progress, answer questions and gather input from the public. Please stop by one of the Open Houses listed above to learn more about this study.

Persons with a disability may request accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Carol Oaks at 110 S. Church Avenue, Ste. 3350, Tucson, AZ 85701, telephone: (520) 885-9009, or fax: (520) 885-0311. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange accommodation. This document is also available in alternative formats by contacting Carol Oaks.

For more information, visit our webpage at http://tpd.azdot.gov/planning/corridorstudies.php
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<td>AZ</td>
<td>85225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Byron</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>1408 S Dobson Rd. Mesa</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Ranch Community Association</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>5300 S. Rural Rd., #3 Tempe</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Egan</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>1005 US 66 Tempe</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosie Dominguez</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>1106 N. River Circle Payson</td>
<td>Payson</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Schultz</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>8017 E. Emnss St. Mesa</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid Haggard</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>2-122 N. Sahuaro St., #333 Chandler</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James A. McFalls</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>628 N. Main St. Eloy</td>
<td>Eloy</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis Ruth Anderson</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>628 N. Main St. Eloy</td>
<td>Eloy</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Bello</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>628 N. Main St. Eloy</td>
<td>Eloy</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Culp</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>628 N. Main St. Eloy</td>
<td>Eloy</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Royal</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>628 N. Main St. Eloy</td>
<td>Eloy</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrel Tidwell</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>628 N. Main St. Eloy</td>
<td>Eloy</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Byron K. Jackson</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>628 N. Main St. Eloy</td>
<td>Eloy</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank A. Amuboo</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>628 N. Main St. Eloy</td>
<td>Eloy</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lakes Homeowners Association No. 3, Inc.</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>FC Service Corporation 98532 S. Rigs Rd. Sun Lakes</td>
<td>Sun Lakes</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85248-7411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Stiltz</td>
<td>Coordinated Urban Development Coordinator</td>
<td>460 E. Van Buren, Suite 410 Phoenix</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himanshu Patel</td>
<td>Florence - City Manager</td>
<td>PO Box 2670</td>
<td>Florence AZ 85222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Caraya</td>
<td>Florence - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 2670</td>
<td>Florence AZ 85222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Knipper</td>
<td>Florence - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 2670</td>
<td>Florence AZ 85222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold J. Bassford</td>
<td>Florence - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 2670</td>
<td>Florence AZ 85222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Sanders</td>
<td>Florence - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 2670</td>
<td>Florence AZ 85222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velline Weidendorf</td>
<td>Florence - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 2670</td>
<td>Florence AZ 85222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas J. Rankin</td>
<td>Florence - Mayor</td>
<td>PO Box 2670</td>
<td>Florence AZ 85222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Kimball</td>
<td>Florence - Public Works Director</td>
<td>PO Box 2670</td>
<td>Florence AZ 85222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Smith</td>
<td>Florence - Vice Mayor</td>
<td>PO Box 2670</td>
<td>Florence AZ 85222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>231 H Salley St., Box 929</td>
<td>Florence AZ 85222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Duck</td>
<td>Florence Planning Director</td>
<td>PO Box 2670</td>
<td>Florence AZ 85222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Police Department</td>
<td>PO Box 688</td>
<td>Florence AZ 85222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Remainder/Blade Tribune</td>
<td>PO Box 616</td>
<td>Florence AZ 85222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Hotlin</td>
<td>Game &amp; Fish Department - Habitat Specialist</td>
<td>7221 W Greenway Rd.</td>
<td>Phoenix AZ 85023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Jose Sanchez</td>
<td>Gila County Board of Supervisers</td>
<td>1402 E. Ash</td>
<td>Globe AZ 85339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor Ronald P. Naranjo</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor Mary Thomas</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linne Louis</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Community Manager</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berneil Allison, Sr. Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Allison-Ray</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Antonio</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Antone</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Croye, Jr.</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Elswish</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willy H. Jones</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecile R. Lenns</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina Morago</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Nelson</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Paul</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Robertson</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Santos, Sr.</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Swank</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Sams</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patoka White</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewell Whitman</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Shade</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Director of Transportation</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Anne Morrical</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - Transportation Planner</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton AZ 85237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamir Rhyll Gilbert</td>
<td>Deputy Town Manager</td>
<td>98 E Civic Center Dr.</td>
<td>Gilbert AZ 85234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Pettit</td>
<td>Gilbert - Interim Town Manager</td>
<td>1625 S Gilbert Road</td>
<td>Gilbert AZ 85234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Grosser</td>
<td>Gilbert Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>PO Box 527</td>
<td>Gilbert AZ 85234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Garnet</td>
<td>Gilbert - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 527</td>
<td>Gilbert AZ 85234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Morrison</td>
<td>Gilbert - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 527</td>
<td>Gilbert AZ 85234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Presmak</td>
<td>Gilbert - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 527</td>
<td>Gilbert AZ 85234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Ohe</td>
<td>Gilbert - Council Member</td>
<td>PO Box 527</td>
<td>Gilbert AZ 85234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Townsend</td>
<td>Gilbert Governmental Relations Coordinator</td>
<td>PO Box 527</td>
<td>Gilbert AZ 85234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Steven M. Sabman</td>
<td>Gilbert Mayor</td>
<td>PO Box 527</td>
<td>Gilbert AZ 85234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Skucek</td>
<td>Gilbert - Vice Mayor</td>
<td>PO Box 527</td>
<td>Gilbert AZ 85234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marborough Estates Owners Association</td>
<td>1834 E. Baseline Rd., Suite 102</td>
<td>Tempe AZ 85283-1508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heywood Realty and Investment</td>
<td>986 W McQueen Rd., Unit 1233</td>
<td>Chandler AZ 85224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsends at South Meadows Association</td>
<td>1834 E. Baseline Rd., Suite 102</td>
<td>Tempe AZ 85283-1508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aztec Owners Office Manager</td>
<td>Homeowners Association of Central AZ</td>
<td>2111 E Highland Ave.</td>
<td>Phoenix AZ 85016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacienda Homeowners Association</td>
<td>264 S. Bowery St.</td>
<td>Chandler AZ 85224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Commonwealth Homeowners Association</td>
<td>J. Gregory Lake</td>
<td>5303 S. Rural Rd., #3</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonora Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Jack Bremel</td>
<td>5851 W. Glenview Place</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Commonwealth Community Association</td>
<td>Jack Jones</td>
<td>5303 S. Rural Rd., #3</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countrywide Estates Community Association</td>
<td>Jan Lines</td>
<td>5303 S. Rural Rd., #3</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fruits Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Jan Lines</td>
<td>P.O. Box 12510</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony II Estates</td>
<td>Jennifer Stevens</td>
<td>9S1 S. Powell Way</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartzsite Estates Homeowners Association, Inc.</td>
<td>Jane Koehler</td>
<td>1101 W. Ranch Rd.</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trona Homes Association</td>
<td>John E. Perkins</td>
<td>1389 S. Alma School Rd., Ste. 175</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85210-3025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byfield Heights Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Jamari Association Services</td>
<td>3355 N. Washington St.</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Vista Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Jamari Association Services</td>
<td>3355 N. Washington St.</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Reserve Homes Association</td>
<td>Jamari Association Services</td>
<td>3355 N. Washington St.</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saguaro Canyon Community Association</td>
<td>Julie Martinez</td>
<td>1032 E. Etcona Place</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Oaks</td>
<td>Kawan Advertising &amp; Public Relations, Inc.</td>
<td>110 S. Church Ave., Ste 3350</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heatherbrook Association</td>
<td>Karen Bartoo</td>
<td>2520 N. El Dorado Street</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Lakes of Gila Springs Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Karen Pierce</td>
<td>5739 W. Linda Lane</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Vista Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Kevin Bishop</td>
<td>915 Baseline Rd., #116</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrn. Owner/Office Manager</td>
<td>KEZ 69.9</td>
<td>5610 N. 7th Ave., B-306</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>1569 E. River Road, Ste 100</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn. Owner/Office Manager</td>
<td>KPHO/CBS 5</td>
<td>4801 N. Black Canyon Hwy.</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciel</td>
<td>KPWX TV - President</td>
<td>PO Box 711</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>KSAZ TV 10 - General Manager</td>
<td>511 W. Adams St.</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn. Owner/Office Manager</td>
<td>KSDK RADIO 99 FM</td>
<td>714 N. 3rd St.</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn. Owner/Office Manager</td>
<td>KYTV KMES NEWS RADIO</td>
<td>5303 N. Central Ave.</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn. Owner/Office Manager</td>
<td>KYTV 3 TV</td>
<td>5650 N. 7th Ave.</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Corona Village III Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Laurie Roberts</td>
<td>P.O. Box 7567</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpen Park Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Park Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackman Ranch Owners Association</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Oaks Estates Community Association</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritelli Homeowners Association, Inc.</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemente Ranch Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creekwood Ranch Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlingen Ranch Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Place Homes Association</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantana Ranch Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denwood Lakes Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Premontre Association</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecos Ranch Community Association</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyards of Chandler Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner Ranch Phase III Association</td>
<td>Lepin and Renegar Mgmt. Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13330</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Point North Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Linda Rutledge</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2796</td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>MAG - Transportation Director</td>
<td>382 N. 1st Ave., Ste. 300</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>MAG Executive Director</td>
<td>382 N. 1st Ave., Ste. 300</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Herzog</td>
<td>MAG Senior Project Manager</td>
<td>382 N. 1st Ave., Ste. 300</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Manor at Ray Ranch Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Mara Schreider</td>
<td>611 N. Los Albo Drive</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Crossing Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Marc Chinnamon</td>
<td>3761 S. Camelback Place</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrthoView Chateau Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Margie Drotos</td>
<td>2595 S. Kyrene Road, #117</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Kempton</td>
<td>Maricopa County Department of Transportation</td>
<td>2591 W. Durango St.</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>Breck</td>
<td>Maricopa County Supervisor</td>
<td>301 W. Jefferson, 10th Floor</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Knaak</td>
<td>Maricopa County Supervisor</td>
<td>301 W. Jefferson, 10th Floor</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Kidley</td>
<td>Maricopa County Supervisor</td>
<td>301 W. Jefferson, 10th Floor</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Rose</td>
<td>Wilcox</td>
<td>Maricopa County Supervisor</td>
<td>301 W. Jefferson, 10th Floor</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Maricopa County Supervisor</td>
<td>301 W. Jefferson, 10th Floor</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>Maricopa County Transportation Planning Branch Mgr</td>
<td>25511 W. Durango St.</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrington Place Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Mark A. Vander Steep</td>
<td>P.O. Box 25466</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Village Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Mark A. Vander Steep</td>
<td>5303 S. Rural Rd., #3</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Mark A. Vander Steep</td>
<td>P.O. Box 25466</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premiere at Desert Breeze Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Mark A. Vander Stee</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>2801 W Durango St</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Vincente Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Mark A. Vander Stee</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>2801 W Durango St</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Nikee</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community College</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Buck</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>145 N Centennial Way</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Winds at Twelve Oaks owners Association</td>
<td>Mel Jai</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community College</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merl</td>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community College</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Etter</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community College</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>See</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community College</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bryan</td>
<td>Tappett</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community College</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Rawles</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Whalen</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Keni</td>
<td>Hawker</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connor</td>
<td>Walters</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Ranch Owners Association</td>
<td>Motes Property Services</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rialto Hills Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Motes Property Services</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Song Estates Homeowners Association, Inc.</td>
<td>Motes Property Services</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Lloyd</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantabria Shores at Ocotillo Condominium Association</td>
<td>Miek Del Monte</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstitious Ranch Community Association</td>
<td>Mike Sorne</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>Eastwood National Contractors.com</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherri</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Powers</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Ramos</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell</td>
<td>Muhlerecht</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Gruver</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Hartig</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Hollow</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg</td>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperos Unit 4 Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Peterson Company</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside Community Association, Inc.</td>
<td>Phyllis Carpenter</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Meadows Community Association</td>
<td>Phyllis Carpenter</td>
<td>602-285-4747</td>
<td>Mesa Community Council</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D – SAMPLE COMMENT CARD

We welcome your comments on the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study.

Attn: Carol Oaks
Kaneen Advertising & Public Relations
110 S. Church Ave, Ste. # 3350
Tucson, AZ 85701