Black Mountain Boulevard
State Route 51 / Loop 101 Interchange to Cave Creek Road

Public Scoping Meetings Summary

Project Overview

Black Mountain Boulevard (BMB) is a proposed major arterial roadway in the City of Phoenix General Plan extending south approximately five miles from the Sonoran Boulevard/Cave Creek Road intersection to the ramp connections at SR 51. This roadway would significantly improve access within the Desert View Village area of north Phoenix. Since 1994, planning efforts for BMB have been on-going, including the ramp connections to the SR 51 Freeway. The preliminary design and environmental study will take place in 2012, with final design and construction from SR 51 to Mayo Boulevard to follow. A series of public involvement meetings will occur throughout the study. The Public Scoping Meetings were held on Wednesday, January 25 and Thursday January 26, 2012. A round of public workshops will be held in March to provide an opportunity to review and comment on developed alternatives and a final round out meetings will be held in the fall to review and comment on the recommended alternative.

Public Scoping Meetings

Two Public Scoping Meetings were held in January to introduce the study to the community and to identify issues, concerns, and opportunities within the study area. In total, 72 people signed in at the meetings and 20 comment forms were received.

The meeting locations were strategically chosen to provide a convenient location to meet with community members in both the southern and northern portions of the study area:

6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.    6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.
Pinnacle High School      Sonoran Trails Middle School
3535 N. Mayo Boulevard    5555 E. Pinnacle Vista
Phoenix, AZ 85050         Phoenix, AZ 85054
Notification Efforts
Efforts were made to notify the community by the following methods:

Prior to the public scoping meetings, the study team:
  • Distributed approximately 7,000 notices to residences and businesses through a door hanging method
  • Distributed 25 notification posters to highly visible locations
  • Placed newspaper advertising in the Arizona Republic
  • Provided HOA boards (Aviano, Fireside, Wildcat, Tatum Highlands, and Desert Ridge Community Association) with meeting notification to be disseminated throughout the communities
  • Distributed 66 emails to the study’s database

Meeting Summary

Information presented at each meeting was identical. The project’s Public Involvement Manager welcomed and thanked attendees for their participation. An overview of the purpose of the meeting was provided and the study team was introduced. The presentation was then turned over to the Engineering Project Manager to discuss the study in detail. He reviewed the study’s history, location, and funding; potential environmental considerations; and progress to date. At the end of the presentation, the meeting was opened up to a question and answer session using question cards.

The following comments have been categorized into Alignment Considerations, Traffic and Noise, Transit, Funding, and Other.

Alignment Considerations

**Q:** *I strongly recommend an alternative instead that includes the widening of SR 101, Cave Creek Road, 40th Street, Tatum Boulevard, etc.*

**A:** In addition to the roadway alternatives to be developed, a “No Build” alternative will be considered which includes a traffic model showing what the future traffic impacts would be on the area if existing roadways were widened.

**Q:** *Why does the road have to jog over east to 40th Street and then back to Cave Creek Road? This brings it very close to existing houses. Why not go straight so future homeowners would be aware of what is in the area before they buy their homes?*

**A:** The General Plan alignment shows the roadway aligning along 40th Street and has been part of the public record. Several different alignments will be developed and evaluated, and the outcome of this study (recommended alignment) will become public record. Future land development will have a responsibility to disclose this information to future homeowners.

**Q:**
1. *What are the obstacles to a west of the high school option? The Fireside community especially would find this helpful regarding school safety.*
2. *Can you move it west of the school?*
3. *Is serious study being given to swinging the connector west of Pinnacle High School? This would be far less impactful to residents of La Verne, Fireside, and Wildcat Ridge developments as well as reducing congestion at the intersection of Mayo Boulevard and Black Mountain Boulevard during the start and end of classes at Pinnacle High*
4. Are there any other options rather than dumping out on Black Mountain Parkway – such as west of the high school, grade school, and neighborhoods?

A: At this point in the study, all the obstacles and constraints are unknown. This stage of the study is intended to collect data and discover all the obstacles and constraints. It is known that land west of Pinnacle high School is owned by the Bureau of Reclamation and Arizona State Land Department. These organizations have planned development in the area. There are several constraints west of the Pinnacle High School that will have to be considered.

Q: Why does the northern alignment bump up against existing subdivisions? Now is the time to avoid homes that have been in existence for almost two decades.

A: Alignments have not been decided upon at this stage in the study. This comment will be considered.

Q: Is there access to both north and south SR 51 and east and west SR 101?

A: What was programmed and envisioned has been a connection to SR 51 only. The study team has received several comments regarding a connection to SR 101 as well and as a result this will be evaluated. The alternatives will have to consider the MAG and ADOT policies and the geometric landscaping.

Q: Is the alignment of the Sonoran Parkway west of Cave Creek Road fixed?

A: Yes, it is under construction at this time.

Q: How will the Sonoran Parkway connect to SR 303, west of I-17?

A: That segment of roadway is beyond the limits of this study.

Q: I believe we need to plan and do not support a “No Build” option. What role can I play in the design process?

A: Participate in the public meetings. In March, workshops will be scheduled to provide and opportunity to review and comment on the alternatives developed. Comments can also be provided through the website at any time.

Traffic and Noise

Q: Will sound walls along State Route 101 be part of the overall project? We need sound abatement for nearby homes and schools.

A: Noise is an environmental consideration that will be included as part of the study. As the alignments are developed and analyzed; noise modeling will be completed to identify opportunities where abatement is needed.

Q: Currently the proposed Black Mountain Boulevard is going to bring major traffic through the heart of the residential community. It is going to be a major problem for the security and kid’s safety. Your comments?

A: At this stage in the study it is too early to know all the traffic impacts. As the study progresses, traffic models will be prepared and evaluated to help narrow down alternatives. Additionally, statistics regarding residential communities adjacent to freeways and crime will be collected from the police department and evaluated.
Q: If this was a plan for a long time, they should not have given permission to residential houses. It would have been nice to have commercial entities besides the road due to significant noise.
A: Thank you for your comment. There are areas throughout the city in which residential areas back up to arterial streets. It is consistent with the urban planning. Noise generated by the project will be evaluated as an environmental consideration.

Q: How will you address safe and easy access for day care, high school, and elementary school students to and from schools?
A: Traffic modeling will be conducted showing how each school will interface with the alignments developed. The results of the modeling will help when evaluating the criteria for each alignment.

Q: Will SR 101 have direct access to Black Mountain Boulevard? Cave Creek Road and Tatum Boulevard are already congested and dumping SR 101 traffic onto Cave Creek Road or Tatum Boulevard to access Sonoran Boulevard and Black Mountain Boulevard will only make things worse.
A: A direct connection with SR 101 will be considered and evaluated with the alignment alternatives. A connection was not originally envisioned with the funds allocated for this project, but it will still be evaluated in this study.

Q: What is the vision for the complete Black Mountain Boulevard? Stoplights at every intersection or divided parkway similar to Galvin Peak Parkway?
A: The roadway was originally envisioned to be a six lane roadway with a raised concrete median separating the northbound and southbound traffic. However, the results of the study will confirm the adequacy of that original idea. In some areas, the roadway may or may not be three lanes in each direction.

Q: Why wouldn’t you study the impact along Cave Creek Road and at the intersection of SR 101 and Cave Creek Road?
A: The traffic modeling will include areas of significant impact outside the study area. One of these areas will be the intersection of SR 101 and Cave Creek Road.

Q: What is the preliminary estimate of how many cars will be taken off Tatum Boulevard at Desert Ridge and also Deer Valley Road?
A: The model produced by the Maricopa Association of Governments has been requested to get that information. More information regarding traffic counts will be known when the study progresses and more traffic modeling has been completed.

Q: How can it be feasible to dump that much traffic on Deer Valley Road?
A: At this point in the study it is not known how much additional traffic would be directed to Deer Valley Road. Additional traffic modeling would be necessary to determine this number.

Q: What are the plans for the traffic study?
A: The regional traffic model from MAG will be considered.
Q: **Will a roundabout be considered at Deer Valley Road?**
A: A roundabout has not been considered at this point, but it is certainly an option. The City of Phoenix generally uses the more conventional signalized intersections.

Q: **How large of a freeway, parkway, or boulevard will this be? How many lanes?**
A: It will not be a freeway. It used to be called a parkway before it was downgraded to a boulevard. It is envisioned to be a six lane roadway with a raised concrete median including sidewalks, bike lanes, and landscaping.

Transit

Q: **Are there any plans for mass transit down SR 51 and if so, how does this plan take this into consideration?**
A: Yes, the City is working with Valley Metro regarding their plans for transit in the area. There are plans for a park-and-ride facility in the area.

Funding

Q: **Is funding available to Deer Valley Road or Mayo Boulevard? Depending on the source of information, we have heard both.**
A: The portion between Mayo Boulevard and Deer Valley Road is built. The funded portion is from SR 51 to Mayo Boulevard on the east side of Pinnacle High School. If looking at an alternative to the west, the funded connection would be from SR 51 to Deer Valley Road because Mayo Boulevard does not continue west of Pinnacle High School.

Q: **When is the goal to have the Black Mountain Boulevard connect to Cave Creek Road (outside of money issues)? When is the money supposed to be available?**
A: The portion between Deer Valley Road and Cave Creek Road would be built in conjunction with development in the area. The developer would be responsible for funding and constructing the roadway network adjacent to Black Mountain Boulevard. There is no funding for this portion at this time.

Q: **Is this always about money, your jobs, and getting money from the federal government?**
A: No, it is about studying a transportation corridor in this area of the City of Phoenix and to help move regional traffic in the future when development makes getting around more difficult.

Q: **If there’s no money to build Black Mountain Boulevard to Pinnacle Peak Road can they build the project but not open access until there is money? (Similar to 64th Street and SR 101)**
A: Once the traffic models have been completed and evaluated an interim solution can be reviewed which could include this option.

Q: **What are the plans to obtain funding to the unfunded section?**
A: The unfunded section from Deer Valley Road north will be driven by development. The developer would be required to provide funding for the network of roadways.
Q: During the environmental study will they look at the health risk of Valley Fever as a result of disturbing the Sonoran Desert, which will release spores?
A: Air quality is an environmental consideration that will be included.

Q: I understand that you will look at and analyze all sorts of data and come back with different projects. What is next? Will we vote on which one makes the most sense? What if no alternative makes it through?
A: At this point in the study, the study team is seeking initial input from the community and stakeholders regarding issues, concerns, and opportunities. With that input, some preliminary alternatives will be developed. At this point there will be another round of community workshops to gather more input. At the same time, evaluation criteria will be developed to help analyze the alternatives. A preferred alternative will be a result of the evaluation and will be presented in the fall timeframe.

Q: Is there anything that can be done to stop this project?
A: One of the alternatives to be evaluated will be the “No Build” option.

Q: Do you have any 3D artwork design samples to show us?
A: No, not at this point in the study. As alternatives are refined and the study progresses, more details will be known and artist renderings can be provided at that time.

Q: Why is this needed (and don’t say future development)?
A: Future development is part of the answer, as it will greatly impact the residential density in the area. The City has a Smart Growth Policy that says the City will try to focus funds where developers can’t build or wouldn’t build. The southern area connection is not surrounded by developable land and there is no one else except for a source like this that can develop the land.

Q: Is transportation more important than quality of life in neighborhoods? Why not just use Cave Creek Road?
A: There will be a “No Build” alternative considered as part of this study.

Q: Why not study impact on housing valuation?
A: Impacts to home valuations have already taken place and been accounted. When a home is appraised the appraiser takes into account the location and proximity to known minor and major arterial streets. Home valuations are not included in the study.

Q: Homeowner values in the area have decreased by almost fifty percent. There are too many homes currently on the market that won’t sell and developers won’t build new homes if they can’t sell them. To say that this project is needed due to future development is a false statement. Growth will not occur in the next 20 years. I am disturbed by the implication that this open land will be developed. Why do we need to do this now? This is a matter of economics. Let’s wait until it is actually needed – we are jumping too far ahead of ourselves.
A: Thank you for your comment. This area is an area that planners indicate will someday develop. The facts are: there are approved and existing developments in the area and Arizona State Land has land planned for development. This planned area is missing an arterial alignment. Traffic is forced to use either Cave Creek Road or Tatum Boulevard. One reason for building now, is that funding is available. There are no guarantees that funding will be available again in 20 years when development requires new roads.

Q: There is a dam east of Cave Creek Road. Is it a problem to bridge over the dam or could the roadway bend around the dam?
A: This will be considered when evaluating the alternatives. The study team will coordinate with the Maricopa County Flood Control Department to ensure that all requirements are met.

Q: Is a 404 permit required?
A: It depends on the preferred alignment. If crossing jurisdictional waters, then yes a 404 permit would be needed. The area that would be impacted would determine what kind of permit would be necessary.

Q: How do you decide what considerations and topics are part of the study? Will we be able to comment on what is being evaluated?
A: The environmental study is part of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). That process dictates what will be considered. There is a format used based on the Federal Highway Administration’s standards. The public is more than welcome to comment on the categories to be evaluated.

Q: The notification was distributed later than I would like to have seen. What was done to notify the community? How do you ensure people who own houses are getting the information they need? How do you ensure the HOA stakeholders are providing information to the homeowners?
A: Members of all HOA boards were invited to attend a stakeholder meeting on January 10, 2012. At that meeting they were informed of these scoping meetings and given the responsibility to help inform the communities in which they represent. Additionally, approximately 7,000 fliers were hung on resident’s doors, notification posters were displayed in community centers and businesses in the area, and newspaper ads were placed.

Q: When will the website be operational? It is not functioning as of January 20, 2012.
A: The errors on the website have been addressed and corrected.

Q: What is the process for addressing stakeholder concerns and how do we know what are representatives are asking?
A: The summaries from the stakeholder meetings will be made available to the public which include the questions asked and responses given. One of the roles of the stakeholder group is to help disseminate information throughout the communities. They are to help receive comments to bring to the study team’s attention as well as relay information they learn to the communities that they represent.
Q: What is a good way for a public member to review the questions and answers that have been provided to date?
A: We will make that information available on the project website. Please know that all identifying information such as name, address, phone number, and email address will be removed to protect privacy.

Q: Will the road be built like the Tatum widening project that was done seven years ago? Tatum was originally a four-lane road, and when it rains the road floods.
A: Black Mountain Boulevard will be build to City standards and drainage will be considered as part of the design process.

Q: What assurances that this project will run smoother than the Sonoran Parkway Project?
A: This study will follow a federal process (NEPA) and will get the public and stakeholders involved early and often.

Q: Will there be sidewalks or traffic signals?
A: Ultimately there will be sidewalks and traffic signals, as well as landscaping. The final roadway will be a complete street.

Q: According to ADOT’s website, a boulevard is four lanes.
A: That is the ADOT classification for a boulevard. This project is within the City of Phoenix and is not a freeway.

Comments Received during the Question and Answer Session

Comment: Before the SR 51, it was awfully difficult to get downtown. Even today, if you live in this area and you want to go downtown, you wait at least one or two stoplight cycles to get through each intersection. One historical mistake made has been not being ready for development and not building roads in time. Roads need to be built before housing.

Comment: I feel it would be detrimental to the Tatum Highlands community, i.e. traffic congestion, decreased air quality, etc to have to road right next to the community. There is open state land between Cave Creek and Tatum Highlands that could be used or perhaps other alternatives.

Comment: The major concerns I have with this project focus on safety around Pinnacle High School and PV School #32 and the congestion that will be produced by ending this project north at Mayo Boulevard. Deer Valley Road cannot handle the traffic that will be generated and you will have gridlock in our community unless the project is extended to Pinnacle Peak Road. The traffic volumes projected for the future is over 50,000 cars per day. We simply cannot have that kind of volume without an exit point north on Pinnacle Peak Road. This project needs to go up to at least Pinnacle Peak Road.

Comment: How about putting the SR 51 extension to the west of Pinnacle High School? It will reduce negative impact on the high school and new elementary school, pedestrians and pedestrian traffic, as well as general negative impact on the Fireside community. Speeding traffic on Mayo is a major concern.
Written Comments Received Via Comment Forms:

1. If you live in the Desert Ridge community or the Tatum Highlands community, do you currently experience difficulty with access and/or traffic congestion in your area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 18 100

If yes, please describe:

- I live off 44th and Deer Valley. There is a lot of congestion on Deer Valley if Road does not go thru to Pinnacle at a minimum it will compound the problem.
- Very bad congestion on Tatum. N.B. Tatum has extreme number of U-turns NB to SB
- There are no problems now so what's the need for this project? Stop wasting taxpayers money. We're in already bad shape.
- No problems- Why are you considering this? Why are you wasting taxpayer money on this? This is outrageous!!!
- Tatum both directions between Loop 101 and Deer Valley. Deer Valley West through Tatum intersection. Deer Valley Between 40th Street and Cave Creek Road (2 Lanes)
- Traffic during rush hour at Deer Valley and Tatum, and 40th and Deer Valley is challenging. I look forward to creative ideas on reducing the impact on housing communities.
- Tatum Blvd congestion
- No major traffic problems
- Increased traffic congestion near Desert Ridge shopping- Tatum and Deer Valley backdrops during rush hours
- Congestion at Mayo and Black Mountain during school start and end as well as pinnacle HS functions and sports events. This will increase when new PV Elementary School opens this fall. Adding a connector to SR51 at this point will further amplify this problem.
- 1. High Traffic on Deer Valley to get to Tatum. 2. High Traffic on Tatum to get to Deer Valley. 3. High number of U-turns at left turn lanes right at Tatum and Deer Valley North Bound.
- We have had an increase in through traffic on Jomax during AM and late afternoon in the past few years with increased development on Cave Creek Rd.

2. Please list any issues that you see regarding the planned project of Black Mountain Boulevard between SR 51/Loop 101 interchange and Cave Creek Road in order of importance.

a. It will take too long to build it
   Stay away from 40th St. (Tatum Highlands)
   Present congestion, serious accidents, noise, pollution
   Backup onto already congested Tatum and 101
   Safety of our children with the ramps connecting to a road between a high school and an elementary school
   Access resulting in higher crime in the area
   Children's safety
   High School/ Elementary School - Unsafe
Proximity to the high school and the elementary school
Increased noise, traffic, air pollution and the like
High speeds thru high school and elementary school as well as residential area

b. Suggestion: put it through as much vacant state trust land as possible
Adverse impact on quality of life in general
Pollution/poor air quality on this involved area
Additional traffic in our community - Deer Valley is only 2 lanes by Black mountain and Tatum, Mayo doesn’t connect to Tatum, etc.
Noise
Children's safety
Noise, traffic, speed
Decreased property value
Easier access to area by lower quality demographic

c. Devaluation on properties in surrounding areas, i.e. Aviano, Fireside, Desert Ridge, Tatum Highlands.
Sound Pollution/Congestion of planned roadway

Access to loop 101 will not be improved with only a connection to SR51
Children's safety
The integration of the design in the landscape
Encouraging development of open state land
Increased traffic flow thru schools and residential areas

d. Negative impact on Jomax as it will be used as a major cut through to Cave Creed Road from Tatum. It is already a noisy, unpleasant drag strip.
Devaluation of properties of surrounding areas, i.e. Desert Ridge, Fireside, Aviano
Children's safety
Disturbing wildlife and native desert
Drop in home and property values

e. No purpose to this, more people teleworking, losing jobs and leaving area
Children's safety
3 lanes each way is too much traffic!

3. Please provide any other comments or questions you have about the project:

• 1. Please consider traffic impacts to Jomax Road where the connection is made? 2. Why couldn't BMB be extended north to connect to Dynamite?
• The route should connect to the Sonoran Parkway, and that should connect it to I-17 and the 303
• We do not need this project. People are losing homes, leaving the areas and more and more people are self-employed and are working at home. Stop the road building. Space is nice!
• You are ruining the quality of life for those that moved to this area to escape an urban lifestyle and congested, over-built highways.
• Councilman sounds like government, spend it
• Strongly feel ramp should be placed west of High School!!
• Is there anything that can be done to stop this project or no matter what it will be done?
• I think the city planners can do better than to just allow "urban sprawl." Why not plan development better? Why not have open areas for our enjoyment? How many strip malls, banks, gas stations, and fast food restaurants do we need?

If you have a question, would you like to be contacted by a team member?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please tell us how you heard about this public meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Ad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice on your door</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend or neighbor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other Responses: HOA in Aviano
Facebook for BMB/Desert Ridge
Public Workshops Summary

Project Overview

Black Mountain Boulevard (BMB) is a proposed major arterial roadway in the City of Phoenix General Plan extending south approximately five miles from the Sonoran Boulevard/Cave Creek Road intersection to the ramp connections at SR51. This roadway would significantly improve access within the Desert View Village area of north Phoenix. Since the 1990’s, planning efforts for BMB have been on-going, including the ramp connections to the SR51 Freeway. The preliminary design and environmental study will take place in 2012, with final design and construction from SR51 to Mayo Boulevard to follow.

A series of public involvement meetings will occur throughout the study. The Public Scoping Meetings were held on January 25 and January 26, 2012. Public workshops were held on Tuesday, March 27, Wednesday, March 28, and Tuesday, April 3. A final round of meetings will be held in the fall 2012 to review and comment on the recommended alternative.

Public Workshops

Three public workshops were held to introduce the alternative alignments to provide the community an opportunity to review and comment on developed alternatives. In total, 144 people signed in at the meetings and 43 comment forms were received.

The workshops were held:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, March 27</td>
<td>6 p.m. to 8 p.m.</td>
<td>46 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3535 E. Mayo Boulevard</td>
<td>Pinnacle High School Cafeteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, AZ 85050</td>
<td>5555 E. Pinnacle Vista Drive</td>
<td>39 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, March 28</td>
<td>6 p.m. to 8 p.m.</td>
<td>39 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoran Trails Middle School Cafeteria</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ 85054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, April 3</td>
<td>6 p.m. to 8 p.m.</td>
<td>59 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorer Middle School Cafeteria</td>
<td>22401 N. 40th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notification Efforts

Efforts were made to notify the community by the following methods:

Prior to the public workshops, the study team:

- Distributed approximately 6,800 notices to residences and businesses through a door hanging method
- Mailed approximately 300 notices to residents in gated communities
- Distributed 25 notification posters to highly visible locations
- Placed newspaper advertising in the Arizona Republic on March 14, 16, and 17 in zone 7.
- Provided HOA boards (Aviano, Fireside, Wildcat, Tatum Highlands, and Desert Ridge Community Association) with meeting notification to be disseminated throughout the communities
- Distributed 212 emails to the study’s database, including stakeholders and project team members

- Posted notification on the project website at www.blackmountainblvd.com and http://phoenix.gov/streets/construction/bmb.html

- For Sonoran Boulevard interest, please see http://www.phoenix.gov/parks/sonoran.html
Meeting Summary

Information presented at each meeting was identical. The project’s Public Involvement Manager welcomed and thanked attendees for their participation. An overview of the purpose of the meeting was provided and the study team was introduced. The presentation was then turned over to the Engineering Project Manager to discuss the study in detail. He reviewed the study’s progress, location, environmental considerations, potential enhancement features, alignment alternative concepts, traffic volumes, environmental criteria to be considered, and the next steps. At the end of the presentation, the meeting was opened up to a question and answer session using question cards and participants were asked to breakout into small working groups to review the alternatives.

The following summarizes the question and answer session from the three workshops. Questions have been categorized.

Alignment Considerations

Alternative 1

Q: Would Black Mountain Boulevard go over or under Loop 101?
A: Black Mountain Blvd (BMB) would go over Loop 101 by virtue of new bridges for the BMB ramps.

Q: How high will the ramps from SR51 be compared to the residential area of Fireside in Alternative 1?
A: At the point when the ramps (BMB roadway) reach the residential area of Fireside, it will be at grade level to match the BMB roadway which exists today.

Q: Will you develop 3D artwork so the public can visualize what the future BMB ramp bridges would look like?
A: Yes, 3D simulations will be developed to show to the public at the fall 2012 public meetings.

Q: Has the current Alternative 1 as stated in the presentation been approved by the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR)?
A: Yes, the BOR’s Environmental Impact Statement for the Reach 11 Recreation Master Plan (approved in 2003) was developed with Alternative 1 in mind. The BOR’s input towards both alternatives 1 and 2 is supportive.

Q: Are there any commercial zoned areas around Black Mountain Boulevard at the connection points and Deer Valley Road?
A: At this time there are no commercially zoned properties in this area. There are plats for residential, but according to the City’s General Plan it is for low density residential.

Q: Why are you considering this roadway now, adjacent to the schools?
A: The BMB alignment has been part of the City of Phoenix General Plan since early 1990’s. The neighborhoods, including Pinnacle High School and the new Fireside Elementary School have been developed recognizing the alignment of BMB and its intent to serve transportation needs of the community and the schools.

Q: How is 45 mph safe in a high school zone?
A: 45 mph is a safe operational speed for an arterial street. Several high schools around the Valley exist on arterial streets. The specifics of the actual roadway design will be considered, including the speed limit.
Q: **What about the school buses?**
A: The bus circulation in and out is a big deal as well and will be considered when the study progresses into the design phase.

Q: **Will it be safe for kids to walk around this area?**
A: Pedestrian safety is a number one priority for the City.

Q: **In alternatives 1 and 2, will the ramps be treated with rubberized asphalt? This would help reduce traffic noise.**
A: This decision will be determined in the final design phase of the project in consultation with the Arizona Department of Transportation who will be responsible for the maintenance of ramps.

**Alternative 3**

Q: **In Alternative 3, would the road extend directly across Deer Valley Road in a straight line to Cave Creek Road or would it connect with Black Mountain Boulevard at some point and if so where would it connect?**
A: Alternative 3 would connect to Deer Valley Road just west of Pinnacle High School at the 32nd Street alignment and then go east along Deer Valley Road to the existing BMB intersection and then north to Cave Creek Road.

Q: **Will the future 32nd Street go over Reach 11 and connect to Deer Valley Road?**
A: The future 32nd Street is not envisioned to go through the CAP Canal or over Reach 11, but would connect to Deer Valley Road to serve traffic needs for future development south of Deer Valley Road.

Q: **In Alternative 3, how far is the proposed ramp from the residential area?**
A: Alternative 3, at the point where it connects to SR51, is the same distance away from Wildcat Ridge residential as Alternatives 1 and 2. As indicated previously, Alternative 3 swings west of Pinnacle High School and intersects Deer Valley Road at the 32nd Street alignment. In the area of the 32nd Street alignment (currently vacant property) there is future residential planned on both sides of the 32nd Street alignment, south of Deer Valley Road.

Q: **In Alternative 3, is it possible to go under the Reach 11 Park like the Deck Park tunnel?**
A: No, the flood pool balance of the area would be inhibited. The Reach 11 area is a regional flood detention basin to capture floodwaters so they do not impact communities of Phoenix and Scottsdale.

Q: **If Alternative 3 was developed going north, where would it be located north of Pinnacle Peak Road?**
A: BMB north of Pinnacle Peak Road would proceed along either of the two alignments being evaluated with this study; the 1990 General Plan (GP) alignment, or the alignment ¼ mile west of the 1990 GP alignment.

Q: **Alternative 3 is an alternative in terms of responding to the public, but is it a feasible alternative going forward?**
A: Alternative 3 is the only alternative which swings west entirely within Reach 11 and therefore introduces significant environmental impacts to Section 4(f) resources (park properties) and flood pool impacts. To help reduce these impacts, Alternative 3 must be all on bridge across Reach 11
which makes the cost 2 ½ times more than Alternatives 1 and 2, and more than the current funding allocated.

Q: Why are you studying Alternative 3 if the cost to construct is $57 million?
A: Alternative 3, to go west of the High School, was one of the first items of input received from the public, as early as the summer of 2011, before the study team began its work. Since then, we have begun to gather the relevant engineering and environmental project considerations and are now able to share early assessments of the impacts of Alternative 3; however, the study is still in the early phases of gathering and assessing project data and the team does not want to prematurely indicate this alternative is no longer feasible. When the study team conducts the alternative analysis over the next few months (summer 2012) a better assessment of the alternatives will be available. This information will be shared with the public no later than the next round of public meetings in fall 2012.

Alternative 4 (No ramp connections to SR51)

Q: If Alternative 4 is selected, then why do you need to build Black Mountain Boulevard?
A: Alternative 4 means that the current regional federal funding allocated for the project would not be authorized for the ramp connections to SR51. Since BMB is a planned arterial in the City’s General Plan (planning document for all future development), it would still get built by Developers north of Deer Valley Road up to Cave Creek Road, as sections of Arizona State Lands are sold and developed. BMB is part of the City’s street system needed to serve the traffic needs of north Phoenix.

Q: If Alternative 4 is selected, will that discourage future expansion of Black Mountain Boulevard north of Deer Valley Road to Cave Creek Road?
A: No. The “no connection to SR51” alternative simply means that the City will not be permitted to use the federal funding to build the ramp connections to SR51. The City’s General Plan alignment exists today and if a developer came in tomorrow and bought state land property, those portions of BMB would be build independent of this process.

Q: If alternative 4 is accepted, what happens to Sonoran Boulevard from the west where it ends a Cave Creek Road?
A: This study does not alter the alignment of Sonoran Boulevard west of Cave Creek Road, nor does it have any bearing on changing the current construction schedule of Sonoran Boulevard.

SR 51/Loop 101

Q: What about connection alternatives to Loop 101?
A: Direct ramp connections between Loop 101 and BMB are not included in any current planning or programming, and as such are not included within this study nor will they be built with this project. The design of Loop 101 in this area did not take into account future BMB ramps directly connecting to Loop 101, and any future project to add these ramps would likely require extensive reconstruction of the freeway through the project area. Therefore, depending on the final configuration of the Preferred Alternative, future Loop 101 connections may or may not be feasible, and any consideration of making these connections would be subject to future studies and agreements between the City of Phoenix, the Arizona Department of Transportation, the Maricopa Association of Governments and the Federal Highway Administration.

Pinnacle Peak Road
Q: In the first phase, could Black Mountain Boulevard go all the way to Pinnacle Peak?
A: It is being considered as one of the project enhancements.

Q: What is the reason for the dog-leg to the east, north of Pinnacle Peak Road?
A: BMB is intended to fit the 1-mile arterial road grid system between Cave Creek Road and Tatum Boulevard. Cave Creek Road angles to the east, therefore a “dog-leg” shift to the east was included in the General Plan alignment for BMB.

Q: Can you provide additional details regarding the alignments north of Pinnacle Peak Road?
A: The study will progress over the coming months so that more details will be available at the next round of public meetings in the fall 2012.

Q: What will the intersections of Black Mountain Boulevard and Pinnacle Peak Road and Black Mountain Boulevard and Jomax Road look like? What is the visual impact?
A: These intersections will be arterial-to-arterial intersections; at ground level with traffic signals, and look very much like those which exist today along Tatum Boulevard or Cave Creek Road.

BMB/40th Street Near Tatum Highlands

Q: Since the General Plan alignment of BMB coincides with the existing ½ street of 40th Street which abuts the west side of Tatum Highlands, is it possible to push the alignment westerly and relocate 40th Street in order to create a buffer between the roadway and the residents?
A: There are two alignment options for this location which are being considered as part of the study; the General Plan alignment (which coincides with the existing 40th Street) and the alignment ¾ mile west of the General Plan alignment.

Q: What are anticipated obstacles to moving the Black Mountain Boulevard west ¼ mile from the 40th Street alignment?
A: The major issue is that the ¼-mile west alignment is not compatible the Arizona State Land Department planning efforts for the Tatum East-West (Azara) planned development and the US Army Corps of Engineers Clean Water Act permits for drainage wash corridors. Others issues include compatibility with the Cave Buttes Dike in the area; the arterial street grid network; and modifying the City’s General Plan.

Q: Why would the City even consider putting six lanes right behind a residential neighborhood (Tatum Highlands) when an alternative is available to place it ¼ mile to the west?
A: The development of Tatum Highlands was done recognizing the City’s General Plan and vision for BMB. The study will evaluate the two alignment options under consideration.

Q: Why didn’t Richmond Homes disclose this to us when we bought our home in Tatum Highlands?
A: The developer (Richmond Homes) was obligated to have disclosed it. BMB has been in public record documents since the 1990’s.

Q: When can we see details of the alignment at the dike?
A: The alignment evaluation results will be available at the public meetings in the fall of 2012.

Q: Why is Tatum Highlands not in the floodplain?
A: The western portion of Tatum Highlands is in the floodplain. The Flood Control District of Maricopa County will be starting a study sometime this summer where they will be evaluating the floodplain...
and maybe even identifying potential flood improvement projects in this area. The name of that project is the Pinnacle Peak Area Drainage Master Study.

Q: There is no reason for you to put this boulevard through state land where people ride bikes and horses. It doesn’t make sense when Cave Creek Road is very near by.
A: The land owned by the Arizona State Land Department will eventually be sold in the future and developed. The City is looking at the overall transportation system and how to make it most effective.

Q: If the roadway is built along 40th Street, will our properties be taken out?
A: No, there will be no residential properties taken.

Q: How wide will the roadway be between Jomax Road and Cave Creek Road?
A: The roadway is planned to be a six-lane arterial, with three lanes in each direction. That’s the ultimate build out condition. The roadway in this area would be build by a developer as future development occurs.

Q: Will the state land at Cave Creek Road and Dynamite Boulevard be used for this project?
A: No, the State Land property at Cave Creek Road/Dynamite Boulevard is north of the BMB terminus, which is at Cave Creek Road/Sonoran Boulevard. The Arizona State Land Department will eventually sell all of its lands for the highest and best use.

Q: What will happen to 44th Street?
A: Nothing, 44th Street will remain where it is today. The unconstructed portion of 44th Street will be constructed as the area is developed.

Q: What is planned for the streets in the county island north of Jomax Road?
A: Nothing resulting from the BMB study. The roadways in the County Island fall under the jurisdiction of the Maricopa Department of Transportation and they would be able to comment as to any plans for the area.

Q: There is ongoing work on Pinnacle Vista Drive, is the road going to be paved in the near future?
A: This may be a county dust-proofing project. The Maricopa Department of Transportation would be able to comment as to any plans for the area.

Cave Creek Road

Q: Why can’t you widen Cave Creek Road in area 3 (north of Pinnacle Peak Road) versus building a new road through the desert (State Land)?
A: Both Cave Creek Road and BMB are arterial roadways designated in the City’s General Plan (long term planning efforts) to serve the traffic needs of north Phoenix. BMB north of Pinnacle Peak Road will be build by developers as sections of development occur. Cave Creek Road will be evaluated in the future based on future traffic needs.

Q: Why can’t the BMB extension cut west to Cave Creek Road south of Jomax Road?
A: A connection of BMB south of Jomax Road would introduce arterial street grid system and traffic operation problems. Additionally, this would not be compatible with the planning of the Tatum East-West (Azara).
**Funding**

**Q:** Why does the BMB need to end at Cave Creek at the specific location where Sonoran Boulevard connects? Couldn’t BMB be moved further west of Cave Creek Road?

**A:** The study requirement is to come up with a transportation facility that connects SR51 to the Sonoran Boulevard and Cave Creek Road intersection. Looking at alignments west of Cave Creek Road would fall outside that study area and would not serve the community area. West of Cave Creek Road is “preserve” property. There is also a planned extension of Dynamite Road to connect to Sonoran Boulevard which will also help serve the traffic needs in the future.

**Q:** Can the federal money be used to create an interchange at 32nd Street and extend north of Loop 101 instead of the connection to Black Mountain Boulevard?

**A:** No, the money is programmed at a regional level for only BMB between SR51 and Deer Valley Road.

**Q:** Why are you spending money on new roads when the current ones are so poorly maintained? Is money for maintenance included in the current budget estimate?

**A:** Money for maintenance comes from other city wide funding sources. The funding programmed at the regional level is only for BMB and not for maintenance of other city roadways.

**Q:** Why such a rush to build roads with the economy the way it is?

**A:** Regional funding was approved in 2004 for the southern portion of BMB (ramp connections to SR51) and that provides the opportunity to serve the need for the community now and to be prepared for when more people move to the area as more homes are built. Please keep in mind that there is no adjacent developable land in this southern portion of BMB, and therefore there is no developer that will build the roadway as part of their development, as is the case to the north. Building the ramp connections to SR51 now, when we have the funding is a responsible decision recognizing that in the future BMB will be built by the developers anyway.

**Q:** You mentioned that Black Mountain Boulevard could not be funded by the City if the federal funds were not available. Can you elaborate?

**A:** The City of Phoenix citywide has approximately $20 million in its annual Capital Improvement Program, but the State takes about $12 million per year. The City is left with approximately $8 million per year for capital improvements citywide. With only $8 million per year, the City could not fund this project (BMB south of Deer Valley Road to the ramp connections with SR51). That is why regional funding is important. Please keep in mind that BMB north of Deer Valley Road is planned to be built by the Developers as sections of State Lands are developed.

**Q:** Is all of the funding secured for all of the alternatives? Is there capacity to fund Alternative 3?

**A:** There is regional funding to about $28 million, that’s $25 million dollars for construction and $3 million for right of way acquisition. Alternatives 1 and 2 are within the allotted budget. Alternative 3 is estimated at $57 million and no additional capacity to fund it.

**Planning Efforts**

**Q:** What are the City’s plans for the area independent of the project?

**A:** BMB has been in the City plans (General Plan and Street Classification Map) since the 1990’s, and has been considered by all of the planning organizations in the city. As developers purchase and develop sections of State Land property, those corresponding sections of BMB will be built by the developers.
Q: If the BMB ramp connections to SR51 are not constructed, then why is BMB needed north of the freeway?
A: The City’s arterial street network is based on a one-mile grid system. At present, there is a 3.5-mile grid break on Loop 101 between Cave Creek Road and Tatum Boulevard. As development occurs in the large tracts of State Land property north of the freeway, traffic congestion will become greater on Tatum Boulevard and Cave Creek Road. The BMB ramp connections to SR51 would help alleviate some of that congestion on both roads and help move more traffic efficiently through the area. As new developments occur, the existing roadway system will not support the additional growth.

Q: Was the current placement of the arterial street next to the high school part of the original Black Mountain Boulevard plan?
A: Yes. BMB was part of a general plan alignment developed in the 1990s. The high school developed subsequent to that with the intent of BMB to serve its transportation and access needs.

Q: Why should plans from 1990’s still be considered relevant in 2012?
A: All of the planning for development that was conducted since the 1990’s has been consistent with the way the land and the roadway system were envisioned in order to function and operate effectively.

Q: How often is the General Plan updated?
A: The General Plan is updated every ten years. Additionally, amendments are made to the General Plan as rezoning issues arise.

### Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q:</th>
<th>When is the quickest that design could be completed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>Part of the study through 2012 includes developing preliminary engineering design. Once the Environmental Assessment for the preferred alternative is approved (late 2012), the project team will begin final engineering design for only the section of BMB south of Deer Valley Road. Final designs would likely occur in calendar year 2013.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q:</th>
<th>Will Black Mountain Boulevard be constructed only as future development occur north of Deer Valley Road?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>Yes, that is correct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q:</th>
<th>What is the projected date Black Mountain Boulevard will be improved to Pinnacle Peak Road from Deer Valley Road?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>There is no set timeframe. However, this segment is being considered to be added to the initial construction project south of Deer Valley Road, if warranted by the traffic analysis and the budget allows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q:</th>
<th>When is Black Mountain Boulevard to Cave Creek Road expected to open?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>This portion of BMB will be build by developers as they purchase and develop State Land property; therefore, no timeline is available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q:</th>
<th>What is the estimated construction start date along the 40th Street alignment north of Pinnacle Peak Road?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>There is no set timeframe. Construction of the portions of BMB north of Pinnacle Peak Road is driven by future development and built by the Developers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traffic and Traffic Noise

Q: **Will the studies consider population growth as development occurs in the future?**
A: Yes, the traffic studies will use traffic volumes based on populated growth to the year 2035.

Q: **Why is a connection to SR51 necessary and what is the impact if it is not built?**
A: The BMB ramp connections to SR51 will serve the growing transportation needs of north Phoenix and balance the arterial grid system for the community. Without BMB the traffic impacts to Cave Creek Road, Tatum Boulevard and the other roads throughout the community will continue to worsen as growth occurs.

Q: **Have you completed traffic congestion studies?**
A: No, collecting the traffic volume data is currently underway. The traffic studies will be completed in the next few months and the results will be available in the next round of public meetings in fall 2012.

Q: **How are you planning to resolve traffic congestion on the northbound SR 51 ramp going west and merge to Loop 101?**
A: ADOT has another study currently underway, to evaluate the traffic congestion on the existing north SR 51 ramp to the west Loop 101, and to propose possible solutions. The BMB study will coordinate with the Loop 101 study as the BMB traffic analysis is developed. We anticipate that the planned northbound ramp to BMB will help the traffic congestion on the SR51 to Loop 101 ramp. The results from these traffic studies will be available for the fall 2012 public meetings.

Q: **If the ramps are built as proposed, is there an estimate of how many current residents of Desert Ridge communities would actually use the ramps on a regular basis?**
A: Yes, those results will be part of the final traffic study and available in the fall 2012 public meetings.

Q: **What is the impact from the traffic north of the connection on Cave Creek Road?**
A: The traffic volumes from all of the surrounding roadways will be accounted for in the traffic study. Those results will be available at the fall 2012 public meetings.

Q: **How accurate are the traffic volume counts on Jomax Road?**
A: The 24-hour period traffic volumes were provided from the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) regional traffic model which was updated in 2011. All of the traffic data will be checked and verified as the traffic study progresses.

Q: **Would Jomax Road traffic heading westbound still have access to Cave Creek Road?**
A: Yes.

Q: **Will there be any sound barriers (high exterior walls) near residential areas?**
A: A noise analysis will be conducted as part of the Environmental Assessment. The results will be available at the fall 2012 public meetings.

Q: **Is there enough traffic congestion to warrant the roadway?**
A: The traffic study results will be available in the fall 2012 public meetings. However, we do anticipate that BMB will show helping traffic congestion and improve travel times and travel mobility for the community, both in the interim and future build conditions.
Q: How will the intersections such as Jomax Road and Black Mountain Boulevard be handled in the future?
A: It is most common to install traffic signals at arterial-arterial intersections. In the interim, there is a chance that the intersection could be directed with a stop sign until traffic volumes increase.

Q: With respect to the number of cars that currently travel from SR51 though Tatum Boulevard, how much of this traffic is expected along SR51 to BMB through Deer Valley Road?
A: Those results will be available will the results of the traffic studies in the fall 2012 public meetings.

Q: What statistics are you projecting for the number of cars traveling along new roads that will result in pedestrian accidents or automobile accidents this close to a High School?
A: You can’t really predict accidents, but we will be looking at the roadway geometrics, design features, projected traffic volumes and pedestrian activities as we look to improve safety and mitigate potential for accidents.

Q: Did the Sonoran Boulevard Traffic Study take Black Mountain Boulevard traffic into consideration?
A: Yes it did, BMB projected traffic volumes are included in the regional MAG model.

Q: When do the traffic study, is it done on a model so that it doesn’t have a preponderance of kids ages 16-18 driving?
A: The regional model takes socio-economic data into account, but it does not take into account the age of the driver.

Q: Are speed mitigation options being considered in front of Pinnacle High School?
A: Yes, Alternative 2 was developed specifically to reduce speeds by including tighter right-turn geometrics, as we see with conventional traffic interchanges. Other traffic speed mitigation options will continue to be identified and considered.

Q: Can Black Mountain Boulevard be reduced to four-lanes? If not, why?
A: BMB south of Mayo Boulevard will include four lanes, two in each direction. North of Mayo Boulevard, BMB is planned to be a six-lane roadway in its ultimate build out, consistent with the City of Phoenix Street Classification Network.

Other

Q: Will the public have a chance to provide additional input prior to the recommended alternative being presented at the public hearing?
A: Yes, the next round of public meetings will be held in fall of 2012 when a draft Environmental Assessment will be available.

Q: Will City Council vote on the alternatives?
A: No, City Council does not vote on the alternatives.

Q: Does existing residential take priority over future residential?
A: None of the BMB alignments are being considered through existing residential areas. Both existing and planned residential areas are considered when evaluating environmental considerations.

Q: Are the current property owners going to be compensated for the drop in value due to being located near a freeway, versus the current “desert space” location?
A: BMB is not a freeway. It will be an arterial street similar to Tatum Boulevard. This study does not speculate property values.

Q: *How did this meeting notification not get mailed?*
A: Notices were mailed to properties located within gated communities and in county islands. All other communities should have received a flier by a door-hanging service.

Q: *What can we do to stop this?*
A: BMB is already an approved alignment, so the City’s General Plan would need to be revised. The Desert View Village Planning Committee represents this area. This committee is composed of residents from this area who work with Arizona State Land Department and the City of Phoenix Planning Department to establish the zoning, the General Plan and the street alignments in the area. They hold public meetings monthly.

Q: *Will you be doing a study to evaluate the effects on the values of the homes in the community?*
A: No. There is not a direct correlation between a roadway project and property values. The City has talked to appraisers and real estate agents regarding this and the issue is that it is the perception of the buyer. Somebody might like the additional access provided by BMB and another might not like traffic.

Q: *Any weight restrictions being considered on this road given the planned connection in the west to I-17/303 and the SR51 in the south?*
A: No, we are not anticipating this to be a truck traffic corridor.

Q: *How can we go from a street to a six-lane highway? Do you have any historical information from when the connotation of “street” went from 2-lanes to 6-lanes?*
A: BMB will not be a freeway. In the late 1980’s, there was a freeway proposed to connect SR51 to I-17. Council policy said there was not to be a freeway in this area. It was then called a parkway and later changed to boulevard. A boulevard means there is a median.

Q: *Is there any possibility to change zoning now?*
A: Yes, the Desert View Village Planning Committee represents this area. This committee is composed of residents from this area who work with Arizona State Land Department and the City of Phoenix Planning Department to establish the zoning, the General Plan and the street alignments in the area. They hold public meetings monthly.

Q: *Does the State Land Department have a projected date that the land will go to auction?*
A: Arizona State Land Department desires to sell land at the highest value possible. At this time, the recovering market plays a big part in the timing of land sales. There is still a lot of land near Desert Ridge that will need to be sold off first; however there is a lot of interest in this land at this time.

Q: *Is there any data showing positive economic impacts to communities with the addition of connections similar to the proposed connections?*
A: It depends on the buyer. One buyer might like access and another might dislike traffic. It depends on the buyer and the market conditions at the time.

Q: *Who deliberates and votes to approve or disapprove the alternatives?*
A: The study team compiles the data on the alignments, and identifies the impacts to each alignment based on the evaluation criteria established for the project. Then all alternatives are run through the analysis, and a preliminary preferred alternative is recommended and reviewed by the City, the
Arizona Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration. The preliminary preferred alternative, along with the evaluation matrix will be presented to the public in the fall 2012 public meetings in order to arrive at a preferred alternative following the public hearing which concludes the study.

Q: Does cost play a factor in the analysis?
A: Yes, it is one of the factors considered.

Q: Does the engineering firm make a recommendation to the city?
A: It is a recommendation of a preliminary preferred alternative developed in cooperation with the Stakeholder Group, the City, the Arizona Department of Transportation, and the Federal Highway Administration.

Comments Received during the Question and Answer Session

Comment: Need a pedestrian overpass over Mayo Boulevard to Fireside Elementary.

Comment: We have spent a lot of time talking about issues for Black Mountain Boulevard north. Today’s meeting was supposed to lay out alternatives.

Comment: Northbound Black Mountain Boulevard – north of Deer Valley – Black Mountain Boulevard will dead end at Rough Rider. Traffic will be forced to use a two-lane Rough Rider road through a neighborhood.

Written Comments Received on Comment Forms

1. Please provide us with any comments or questions you have about the project.
   - In balancing efficiency and safety, it would appear that option two provides for smooth traffic flow while mitigating traffic speeds in front of the high school. My family’s preferred option.
   - The right turn option (#2) seems to be the best. BMB is bumper to bumper between 7:10 a.m. and 7:45 a.m. and when school gets out. As is Deer Valley Road east of BMB and Mayo Boulevard west of the high school. These bottle neck issues should be addressed when building this project or it would be a nightmare. It would also be a nice concession to the neighbors to build the Reach 11 Park at the same time and provide us an access point.
   - The purpose of this project is not very clear or convincing. The cost does not appear to be justified just to make this connection. It doesn’t benefit the residents in the area much, rather bringing more traffic, noise, safety, and environmental concerns to residents.
   - Please do not build on 40th Street (between Briles and Jomax). Our backyard faces 40th Street and Briles and we’d prefer not to hear or see that traffic! Please move it west of 40th Street.
   - Alignment 1 is my favorite option. I also like the option for area #3 that moves the road further to the west of 40th Street. Great information and meeting.
   - Bridge between school over BMB is very necessary.
   - 1.) I wish Alternative 3 was more financially viable. 2.) Will funding for park improvements in Reach 11 be part of this project to help with the residential areas affected by the project? 3.) Will retaining walls and rubberized asphalt be used to control traffic noise? 4.) Don’t forget increased traffic on Mayo Boulevard and kids crossing that street from the neighborhoods in the south for the new school. That crossing must be made safe.
   - For area 3, Tatum Highlands homeowners are better served with the alternative ¼ miles west of the homes. I like the alternative that was discussed in area 3 for BMB that was ¼ miles west of 40th Street.
• I would suggest the project planners read the five day long series that the Arizona Republic recently published concerning the diminishing air quality in greater Phoenix. It cites studies that show the negative impact of traffic pollution on children who can suffer diminished lung capacity in future years. To place a busy road next to a high school and one block from an elementary school is irresponsible when an alternative routing west of Pinnacle is available.

• Please provide maps in color showing the four alignments.

• We desire to see the alignment moved to the preserve side or provide a horse/pedestrian overpass to access the preserve land on the west side of Cave Creek. There is value in the revenue homes bring to the county and city. This is for the area Jomax south of Dynamite.

• When BMB is complete my concern is speed and traffic on Jomax Road. How will traffic be slowed down through the community?

• Different rendering angles would have been appreciated. This way the viewer gets a better perspective of how the road would look from street level.

• Looking at a low speed alternative does not address the real issue in my opinion. The real solution should focus on separation of the ramp traffic from the school traffic.

• We are very concerned about the negative impact this project will have for the residents of Aviano regarding our safety and security. What is the proposed speed limit for BMB?

• Please be sure to take extra care in the traffic study of SR 51 north to Loop 101 west and how that will affect the BMB transition. Also would be in favor of lower speed limits on BMB if possible (35 mph?).

• To appease residents, perhaps a listing of options such as trees, noise walls, and traffic lights would be helpful. Besides safety, noise, and views are a major concern. Building six lanes of traffic right behind homes is obscene. The entrance and exit ramps to SR 51 seem poorly planned. How will funneling three lanes of traffic into one lane help?

• BMB should not curve to the east and run right next to the neighborhoods along 40th Street at Tatum Highlands (40th Street and Jomax). That is ridiculous to ruin our homes when the road could easily be built one quarter mile west and not ruin our homes. This seems like a no-brainer solution to the huge issue this would have to decrease the values of the homes along 40th Street.

• I saw an alignment that shows 40th Street one-quarter mile west of the existing plan. I support this adaptation in Area 3. I also am speaking on behalf of three of my direct neighborhoods.

• Our house backs up to the future BMB. We will arguably feel the impact of this new road the most. Please consider curving BMB further west towards the high school to mitigate the impact to my home. Also, please make sure all pedestrian bridges are wheelchair accessible. I am happy to discuss this further with staff.

• Does Prop 400 provide funding for all of these options? Who are the stakeholder s from Wildcat Ridge HOA? When will construction start? Why was Alternative 3 developed when it is not even attainable? What are the plans to mitigate noise? Will the water treatment plant be enlarged due to this growth? Where is this project in the design process?

• I am concerned that the northern alignment of Sonoran Boulevard (Dove Valley Alignment) will be adversely impacted by this project as it moves toward linking with I-17. Since the northern alignment will be completed in 2013-2014 and the southern alignment has not even been sighted yet, it will be the only access to I-17 for years. The northern alignment must remain a minor arterial road through the preserve not through way to I-17 from SR 51.

• Concerned about future traffic volume on Sonoran Boulevard looking for solution to heavy traffic to I-17.

• Need to consider the change in traffic patterns on Deer Valley. During rush hours and on weekends it is already extremely difficult to get out of my neighborhood. I understand funding is not available for turning lanes but I am asking for consideration of stop signs at 45th Street (4-way stop) at minimum to allow neighborhood circulation. At the present time to go south from my neighborhood. I have to go
north to Pinnacle Peak, east to Tatum Boulevard and then south to the freeway, approximately 2 miles added just to get out of the neighborhood.

- This was planned before houses were built. I bought my house because of this plan. It will provide a safe 5-10 minute commute time for me and reduce congestion on Tatum Boulevard.
- We had reviewed the plans for this project prior to purchasing our home. We support the construction of this road to extend to SR 51. It will greatly improve traffic flow and congestion at the Tatum Boulevard and Cave Creek exits. Is there any impact to the Reach 11 trail system?
- Looking at the public safety and children's safety, I don't recommend any construction of this freeway.
- This project would destroy the privacy and safety of the Fireside community. It would endanger students, their parents, and create traffic horror. I truly hope you would build walls on SR 51 highway and ramps. Please take human lives and environment into your outmost considerations.
- You should consider moving the road ¼-mile west of 40th Street.
- I believe this will have more of a negative impact for the area. It will cause more noise, air, and light pollution in addition to adding more heat in the desert as concrete adds more. Furthermore if this was in the plan as early as 1994 why would the city issue building permits for residential homes in the area as late as 1997. Seems careless and irresponsible. Furthermore how will the city compensate homeowners that have already suffered severe losses in property values due to carelessness of the city and local governments issuing too many building permits to construct more homes than were necessary. This just proves that this city as well as other local government agencies acted irresponsibly and incompetently. This is going to ruin property values even more. How do you plan to compensate area property owners?

Why is there no disclosures provided to homeowners in the area that purchase homes after 1994 when this so called plan was in place so that homeowners could be made aware before they bought. Also, I think the way you snuck around folding information sheets and sticking them in screen doors was done poorly as most people usually take it as junk and toss it without reading it. These should have been mailed as official notice from the City of Phoenix. Just goes to prove that you are being very sneaky about this.

Also as someone that has relocated here from Illinois you folks have no idea what congestion and traffic is. Rush hour and backups here are a walk in the park. This project is totally unnecessary and will do more harm than good. Seems real fishy to me. Perhaps someone stands to profit from this monetarily at the residents expense.

2. Please provide your comments on Alignment 1.

- Traffic will move too fast in front of Pinnacle High School.
- Ignores the negative impact on residents and students of both Pinnacle High School and Fireside Elementary.
- This is the least preferred option.
- My concern with this option is the speed on the off ramp.
- Option 1 has too much traffic at too high a rate of speed.
- I like this option the best.
- This is the last option.
- Seems like a racetrack into our neighborhood and right by our schools.
- No.
- Not supported due to safety concerns with this much traffic close to the school.
- Okay. Need ability to connect to Loop 101.
- This being the most affordable – causes the biggest concern for accidents for students known for reckless approach to traffic.
- Ranked 4. Too fast of an on/off exit. Traffic backups also possible. Traffic will be too fast in front of the school.
3. Please provide your comments on Alignment 2.

- Best option.
- Ignores the negative impact on residents and students of both Pinnacle High School and Fireside Elementary.
- This is a good choice to slow the speed exiting SR 51.
- This one seems better as far as speed control. The most relevant.
- Option 2 slows the traffic better than option 1 and is significantly better. I still worry about traffic volumes in this school and residential area. More pedestrian crossings will be necessary on BMB, Mayo Boulevard, and Deer Valley Road.
- Better plan.
- This is the third preferred.
- This option seems to be the most feasible. Slowing traffic coming into BMB is a good idea. I’d suggest a stop sign to turn onto BMB or to go onto SR 51 (or light).
- Not supported due to safety concerns with this much traffic being this close to the school.
- Need ability to connect to Loop 101.
- Prefer #2 with slower speed ramps and future option to connect to Loop 101.
- This turn is far too sharp and will insult many. It will multiply car accidents in high traffic areas, otherwise a good idea. Devise a slower turn with a light up the road.
- Ranked 2. Like the slower speed. Feel there will be a big back up on traffic in front of the school.
- Second choice.
- This is not so good. We can slow down to 45 miles per hour without the built in obstacles forcing us to do so.
- A little better, but still horrible for residents and schools.
- No.
- While this option is slightly more expensive, it will make the traffic a little slower/safer on the on/off ramps. I support this alignment.
- Prefer this option, however it should consider expanding Mayo Boulevard to Deer Valley Road and routing high school traffic to Mayo Boulevard.
- Worst option.
- Best option – will slow traffic.
- Okay on alignment but concerned that the “slow down” will create more issues than it will resolve.
4. Please provide your comments on Alignment 3.
   - Will back traffic up at Deer Valley Road.
   - Short of “no build” this is the best option to reduce the impact of traffic pollution on residents and students.
   - This is the best (aside from Alignment 4) alternative to avoid the extra traffic around the school zones. This will also help spread the traffic between BMB and Cave Creek Road.
   - Too much bridge structure. This is going to be ugly.
   - Great option from a design perspective. Can we come up with alternative funding mechanisms to make this option happen?
   - Too expensive and not needed.
   - This is the second preferred option, but too costly.
   - The lowest impact on our neighborhood but the price probably makes it unreasonable (unfortunately).
   - Not supported due to cost and perspective traffic it could lead to on BMB.
   - By far the most expensive, yet most desirable. If the City were responsible for costs for accidents this would be more affordable.
   - Ranked 1. Will take traffic away from front of school and away from neighborhood. Don’t like the high ramp. However, easy off and on.
   - First choice.
   - This does not appear to be an option.
   - The best option. You still would be using so much funding in the future. This alignment will not interfere as much with the community, traffic, and environment.
   - No.
   - This option is not feasible due to the price. This is not a practical solution.
   - Realize this is too expensive.
   - Second best option.
   - Appears to be too expensive.
   - No funding for this so why is it included at all? This will cost two and a half times the other routes.
   - This is the option we prefer.
   - Does not make sense (money on design). I believe this will create the most long-term benefits. Will make shade for the park.
   - This would be my first choice.
   - This seems to be the wisest alternative. Cost is always a major consideration. Put the budget to a vote.
   - Don’t think this one will solve existing overload issues on Tatum Boulevard and Cave Creek Road.
   - Slow traffic down.
   - Favor this alternative over any east of the high school unless access to the high school is redirected away from BMB or BMB traffic and local school traffic are grade-separated in some fashion.
   - Not a good option.

5. Please provide your comments on Alignment 4.
   - Does not allow for future development.
• Until we know how many residents will actually benefit from this project we should save the $32 Million.
• This saves money and will not cause extra traffic near residential areas. This is the preferred option.
• Best alternative.
• Doesn’t make sense.
• Poor choice.
• This is the most favored option to save the cost and reduce the negative impact to the area.
• Very shortsighted in the near term, way worse in the long term.
• Probably the lesser of the four evils.
• I support this this alignment.
• Ranked 3.
• No – an off ramp and on ramp is needed.
• Great option.
• I prefer this
• I do not support this option. This road is necessary to accommodate the capacity and population of the area.
• Don’t support.
• Second worst option.
• Would be a shame to lose the allocated funding. Concern would be too much traffic until future funding is raised.
• No.
• Stupid.
• We all know this makes no sense.
• Not in favor, we need another access point to alleviate traffic on Tatum Boulevard and Cave Creek Road.
• Strongly favor this proposal. Do not use tax money. Developers should fund.
• No need to build full BMB roadway if no connection to SR 51. We need a connection.

6. Please tell us how you heard about this public workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Ad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice on your Door</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Neighbor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response to “Other” category:
• HOA (3)
• Meeting in my neighborhood
• Email distribution (4)
• Notice in the mail and direct contact by project team
• Association newsletter
• Councilman Waring
• Local business
• Letter in the mail
Black Mountain Boulevard
State Route 51 / Loop 101 Interchange to Cave Creek Road
Public Open House Summary (August 30, 2012)

Project Overview

Black Mountain Boulevard (BMB) is a proposed major arterial roadway in the City of Phoenix General Plan extending south approximately five miles from the Sonoran Desert Drive/Cave Creek Road intersection to the ramp connections at SR 51. This roadway would significantly improve access within the Desert View Village area of north Phoenix. Since 1990, planning efforts for BMB have been on going, including the ramp connections to the SR 51 Freeway. The preliminary design and environmental study will take place in 2012, with final design and construction from SR 51 to Mayo Boulevard to follow.

A series of public involvement meetings have occurred to date. Public Scoping Meetings were held on January 25 and January 26, 2012. Public workshops were held on Tuesday, March 27, Wednesday, March 28, and Tuesday, April 3. An Open House was held on August 30, 2012. A public hearing will be held in spring 2013.

Public Open House

A public open house was held to present four alignment alternatives and request feedback from the community. In total, 87 people signed in at the meeting and 48 comment forms were received.

Thursday, August 30
6 p.m. to 8 p.m.
Explorer Middle School
Cafeteria
22401 N. 40th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85050

Notification Efforts
The community was notified of the public open house by the following methods:

Prior to the public open house, the study team:
• Distributed approximately 6,800 notices to residences and businesses through a door hanging method
• Mailed approximately 300 notices to residents in gated communities and unincorporated Maricopa County areas
• Hung 25 notification posters in highly visible locations such as the Desert Broom Library, Barro’s Pizza, Circle K gas station, Starbucks, dry cleaners, Press Coffee, Fuzion Fitness, Pita Jungle and Humble pie.
• Placed newspaper advertising in the Arizona Republic on August 15, 17, and 18 in Zone 7
• Provided HOA Boards (Aviano, Fireside, Wildcat, Tatum Highlands, and Desert Ridge Community Association) with the meeting notification to be disseminated throughout the communities by email
• Sent 219 emails to the study’s database as well as stakeholders and project team members
• Posted notification on the project websites at www.blackmountainblvd.com and http://phoenix.gov/streets/construction/bmb.html
Meeting Summary

Summary/Overview slides ran on a continuous loop providing an overview of the project and open house. This was set up at the entrance and attendees viewed this summary prior to visiting the other stations. The summary included what the team has done to date, the purpose of the open house, and the project purpose and need. It described the alternatives analysis, the existing conditions simulations and overview of the evaluation criteria. It explained that the room was set up by north of Deer Valley Road and south of Deer Valley Road and that we requested input on the alternatives presented.

The following agencies had representatives in attendance to answer questions:
- City of Phoenix
- Arizona Department of Transportation
- Federal Highway Administration
- Arizona State Land Department
- Paradise Valley Unified School District

All information below was posted on the project websites two weeks prior to the open house for the public to review and comment on the alternatives. Below describes the displays and exhibits that were presented.

North of Deer Valley Road: “Alternative 1-N” along 36th Street and 40th Street alignments between Deer Valley Road and Cave Creek Road at Sonoran Boulevard. The following information was available:
1. Evaluation Criteria and Alternative Evaluation Matrix
2. Alternative 1-N roll plot
3. Representatives from Arizona State Land Department were available to discuss specifics on State Land Planning in the project area.
4. Roadway/Landscape Graphics

South of Deer Valley Road: “Alternatives 1A and 2” alignments at current Black Mountain Boulevard between SR 51 interchange and Mayo Boulevard. The following information was available:
1. Evaluation Criteria and Alternative Evaluation Matrix
2. Alternative 1A video simulations and roll plot
3. Alternative 2 video simulations and roll plot
4. Roadway/Landscape Graphics

“Alternative 4”/No Build (No connection to SR 51): The Alternative 1-N would be built along 36th Street and 40th Street in the future when State land is sold to developers and would occur between Deer Valley Road and Cave Creek Road.

Traffic data
1. Travel times (AM/PM)
2. Traffic 2-D V-simulation model for 2015 build condition at Deer Valley Road
3. Traffic operations at Deer Valley Road

In addition to the above information a representative from the Arizona Department of Transportation was available to answer Air Quality and Noise Analysis questions. The following information was available:
1. Noise comparison video
The following pages contain the input received in writing on the comment forms distributed at the open house.
**Comments received in writing via comment form**

Responses to questions asked in regard to Alternatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 1A</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
<th>Alternative 1-N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Alignment, 30 MPH off-ramp to BMB (&quot;S curve&quot; concept) Comment provided by participant</td>
<td>General Plan Alignment, half diamond interchange configuration to/from SR 51 (&quot;T&quot; concept) Comment provided by participant</td>
<td>Traffic calming roundabout option Do you prefer a roundabout at the southern end of BMB?</td>
<td>No connection to SR 51, but future BMB to be built by future development Comment provided by participant</td>
<td>General Plan Alignment, Deer Valley to Cave Creek Road Comment provided by participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Makes for a smoother transition to BMB.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Too harsh and annoying. The roundabout should accomplish this.</td>
<td>Likes: None - would be sad if we didn’t connect. Dislikes: Don't do it.</td>
<td>Likes: Looks good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Seem to make sense for better flow and less accidents. Our view must include pedestrian bridge and traffic calming circle for safety. Dislikes: Project ends abruptly at Mayo Boulevard.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Plan includes must build traffic calming circle and pedestrian bridge. Dislikes: Slow down seem too abrupt.</td>
<td>Comment: Needs to be done to relieve Tatum and Cave Creek issues. Dislikes: Not being done with rest of project. Like building a home then finishing the basement two years later. Got to be more cost effective to do it all at once.</td>
<td>Likes: Access to northern developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Best option. Dislikes: 2015 way too long to get this done.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Northbound traffic from SR 51 will be crashing at the 90 degree curve.</td>
<td>Dislikes: Doesn’t solve any traffic problems. Likes: Do this sooner, not later. Dislikes: Phoenix should pay for this soon, not wait on developers.</td>
<td>Likes: Access to northern developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Alternative 1A will help alleviate traffic on Cave Creek Road and Tatum Boulevard best. Dislikes: BMB should stay at three lanes north and south going north from SR 51 as much as possible.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Sharper curve. Concerned about backup on SR 51.</td>
<td>Likes: This is a bad option.</td>
<td>Likes: Access to northern developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Everything would like BMB extended to Pinnacle Peak and Pinnacle High School access to Deer Valley plus parking for Pinnacle High School.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Would be slower and quieter. Would encourage future growth in the area. Dislikes: More dangerous to get on freeway.</td>
<td>Likes: Best plan for preserving my property value. Dislikes: Won't think I will use this road. Will bring more traffic to BMB.</td>
<td>Likes: Access to northern developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Like quicker access to SR 51. Dislikes: The entrance and exit traffic would create noise and pedestrian hazard in my backyard. Schools are very close.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: I like quicker access to SR 51 and the hard turn should slow ramp traffic. Dislikes: I do not want additional cars on BMB, visible from my house. This is a freeway exit right between two schools. It’s not safe.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Access to northern developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Alternative 1A is the best.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dislikes: Major road too close to homes and schools. Traffic will be forced to use Deer Valley to get any further north. Risk of BMB becoming another I-17.</td>
<td>Dislikes: Major road too close to homes and schools. Traffic will be forced to use Deer Valley to get any further north. Safety issue for high school.</td>
<td>Likes: I don’t think development will occur in these areas quick enough for this to be an issue. Dislike: Risk of BMB becoming another I-17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1A</td>
<td>General Plan Alignment, 30 MPH off-ramp to BMB (“5” curve” concept)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment provided by participant</strong></td>
<td><strong>Traffic calming roundabout option</strong> Do you prefer a roundabout at the southern end of BMB?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislikes: Will there be traffic calming deterrents at Mayo Boulevard?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dislikes: Does not connect to SR 51.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: I think this option will keep traffic flowing better and will ease any back-ups on the actual freeway and ramp.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dislikes: I think this will slow traffic and cause delays and rear-end collisions.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dislikes: It would be disasterous to not build the ramps connecting SR 51 and BMB. Future development would and to ramifications, delays, etc. Current far north Phoenix neighborhoods need these ramps and grid systems (we drive out our way to and from our homes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislikes: Everyday, I drop my kid at Pinnacle High School at 7:10 a.m. and it takes 15 minutes for commute. My house is less than a mile away.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dislikes: it is already crowded. There are two schools on either side of the road (exit).</td>
<td>Likes: No connection needed.</td>
<td>Dislikes: It is already crowded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Smoothest access in both directions, probably reducing noise of braking and acceleration. This will reduce traffic to and from SR 51 for residents in Desert Ridge Area, which will reduce Tatum and Cave Creek traffic problems.</td>
<td>No – most people don’t know how to use a roundabout safely.</td>
<td>Dislikes: Don’t like the “T” – noisy and blocks the flow of traffic.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Comments.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: This seems to be safer for traffic to be forced to slow.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: I prefer this alternative with mitigation # 1 and 2. At this time, I do not want BMB developed into a four lane road. Dislikes: Do not want mitigation #6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Comments.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Better option from 1A as it forces traffic to stop before getting to the high school.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Same as Alternative 2 except I would accept traffic to be faster and louder with this option.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Slows traffic more efficiently. Would like to see these enhancements: roundabouts, pedestrian walkway, Pinnacle High School access to Deer Valley Road, landscape (quieting) improvements. Dislikes: Will create a road in my backyard where there wasn’t one before. Destroy serenity of trail area our family uses every week.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Preferred option. First choice. This eliminates the flow of traffic past two school zones and past my backyard. Highly preferred. Dislikes: Will increase traffic to BMB, Deer Valley, and Mayo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Best alternative.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dislikes: Unless other ramps to Loop 101 mainline are added. This alternative is a foolish waste. Wildcat Ridge came after the road plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Likes: Like it – see on the map since the dawn of development out this way!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Fine with either option 1a or 2. Very good ingress once the exits are built.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Fine with either option 1A or 2. I am looking forward to this ramp.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Do not like it at all. Total waste of tax money. Dislikes: Waste of time – approximately 15 minutes morning and evening. So dislike this option. Likes: LOS 5 is too long term. Not sure I have an opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislikes: Bringing large car and truck traffic through school and residential area will be a disaster.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dislikes: Car and truck traffic can kill children. Will be dangerous to the residential community and school children.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Likes: Best alternative – No road. This is the only option for us to avoid noise, crime, and traffic. No mitigation of extension of BMB to Pinnacle Peak. Likes: Do not like it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1A</td>
<td>General Plan Alignment, 30 MPH off-ramp to BMB (“S curve” concept)</td>
<td>Traffic calming roundabout option Do you prefer a roundabout at the southern end of BMB?</td>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>General Plan Alignment, half diamond interchange configuration to/from SR 51 (“T” concept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Works the best! I am for this concept! Please move forward with this project.</td>
<td>Dislikes: No off-ramp from Loop 101. Need the connector, so design accordingly. Needs a connector from Deer Valley to Cave Creek Road to relieve the traffic. Additional Comments: Need to improve Deer Valley Road from BMB to Cave Creek Road. Consider adding an off ramp to BMB and Cave Creek Road to eliminate the congestion at SR 51 merge.</td>
<td>No – move to Mayo Boulevard.</td>
<td>Dislikes: More expensive. Reduces the capacity. Bad idea. You will have accidents with this bad design.</td>
<td>Dislikes: Bad idea. This connection is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Sweeping curve from SR 51 to BMB.</td>
<td>Dislikes: Hard turn to slow traffic. Easily could see northbound vehicles not slowing quick enough.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dislikes: Traffic at 20 miles per hour will back up onto SR 51.</td>
<td>Dislikes: No funding or realistic plans to handle traffic from BMB to Cave Creek Road on Deer Valley Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: This appears to have better traffic flow than Alternative 2 with flow. Dislikes: No plans to increase flow from BMB to Carefree on Deer Valley Road.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Slower off-ramp. Roundabout. Safety crossing. Dislikes: Do not like the additional traffic in residential area. Need to develop a safer pedestrian and bike lane for residents and especially students and kids. Do not like general bike lane shared with car lanes. Too much money for convenience of saving people time!</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Do not favor convenience for automobiles. No connection to SR 51. Dislikes: No roundabout around school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Best choice. Dislikes: Seems very ugly – miles of concrete in the sky as does option 2. Also, great concern about freeway ramp emptying traffic onto single lane Deer Valley west of BMB.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Likes: I do not like. Dislikes: There are better ways to control speed other than adding unnecessary turns.</td>
<td>Dislikes: I do not like.</td>
<td>Dislikes: I do not like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: The two but only as the lesser of the two unappealing choices. Dislikes: Seems very ugly – miles of concrete in the sky as does option 2. Also, great concern about freeway ramp emptying traffic onto single lane Deer Valley west of BMB.</td>
<td>Yes – but no one knows how to use a roundabout. No one ever yields correctly. Could be a major problem near the high school.</td>
<td>Dislikes: Sharp turn looks very dangerous. Very disappointed there is not a west of Pinnacle High School Alternative. 34th Street needs to be opened as an alternative route to the school.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Curves are safer at speed. Dislikes: Nothing.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Likes: Dangerous hard turns.</td>
<td>Likes: Great! Build it today!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislikes: It makes no sense to develop a plan utilizing BMB south of Deer Valley without contemplating the impact on an already packed Deer Valley west of BMB and east of Cave Creek. Deer Valley has to be expanded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1A</td>
<td>General Plan Alignment, 30 MPH off-ramp to BMB (“5 curve” concept)</td>
<td>Traffic calming roundabout option</td>
<td>Do you prefer a roundabout at the southern end of BMB?</td>
<td>Comment provided by participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Roundabout is a must. Pedestrian bridges and 34th Street connector also highly desired. I am very concerned that these will be eliminated due to the lack of funding.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: I prefer this so that traffic will slow well in advance of entering neighborhood and school zone. Roundabout, overpass, and 34th street connector not necessary.</td>
<td>Dislikes: Until BMB is developed, Mayo and Deer Valley will not provide flow for increased traffic.</td>
<td>Dislikes: I am concerned that traffic will not slow quickly enough before reaching the school and neighborhood. Until BMB is developed, Mayo and Deer Valley will be inadequate for traffic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>General Plan Alignment, half diamond interchange configuration to/from SR 51 (“T” concept)</th>
<th>Traffic calming roundabout option</th>
<th>Do you prefer a roundabout at the southern end of BMB?</th>
<th>Comment provided by participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Roundabout is a must. Pedestrian bridges and 34th Street connector also highly desired. I am very concerned that these will be eliminated due to the lack of funding.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: I prefer this so that traffic will slow well in advance of entering neighborhood and school zone. Roundabout, overpass, and 34th street connector not necessary.</td>
<td>Dislikes: Until BMB is developed, Mayo and Deer Valley will not provide flow for increased traffic.</td>
<td>Dislikes: I am concerned that traffic will not slow quickly enough before reaching the school and neighborhood. Until BMB is developed, Mayo and Deer Valley will be inadequate for traffic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>No connection to SR 51, but future BMB to be built by future development</th>
<th>Traffic calming roundabout option</th>
<th>Do you prefer a roundabout at the southern end of BMB?</th>
<th>Comment provided by participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Roundabout is a must. Pedestrian bridges and 34th Street connector also highly desired. I am very concerned that these will be eliminated due to the lack of funding.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: I prefer this so that traffic will slow well in advance of entering neighborhood and school zone. Roundabout, overpass, and 34th street connector not necessary.</td>
<td>Dislikes: Until BMB is developed, Mayo and Deer Valley will not provide flow for increased traffic.</td>
<td>Dislikes: I am concerned that traffic will not slow quickly enough before reaching the school and neighborhood. Until BMB is developed, Mayo and Deer Valley will be inadequate for traffic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 1-N</th>
<th>General Plan Alignment, Deer Valley to Cave Creek Road</th>
<th>Comment provided by participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Roundabout is a must. Pedestrian bridges and 34th Street connector also highly desired. I am very concerned that these will be eliminated due to the lack of funding.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Do wish ramp could be delayed until BMB is developed but understand need to plan and build now while funds are available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Dislikes: We live off Black Mountain and Rough Rider. We’d prefer no connection from SR 51 because of noise and traffic. We understand the road development by the builders which is in the future. We’re also concerned about security issues since we’re not gated. |

| Dislikes: Land is available north of dam to move off 40th Street to the west. Saving value of homes in Tatum Highlands is state land and would save a lot of heart ache! |

| Dislikes: Most concerned with existing north of Deer Valley Alignment. Feel evaluation weighted existing planning (“94) was skewed. Also several evaluation criteria were double counted in favor of 40th Street alignment. |

| Likes: Mr. Webb from Aztec was very informative and professional. Thanks for your time. Dislikes: Six-lane cross-section is excessive and proper sound mitigation and traffic calming measures are very necessary. |

| Likes: I like this street not being connected to SR 51. |

| Likes: This is the best alternative – Do not connect to SR 51. Dislikes: Too close to houses along 40th Street. Move road west. |

| Likes: No connection! Utilize Cave Creek Road and Tatum Boulevard. Leave 40th Street unconnected and smaller route. Help maintain our home values and land. We moved to this area by choice to not be near a major road. Dislikes: This road is too close to the homes north of Pineapple Peak in Tatum Highlands. Consider connecting to Cave Creek before the dam. Utilize Tatum Boulevard and Cave Creek Road as main routes not 40th Street. At the least move further from the homes. |

| Likes: No connection continues utilizing Cave Creek and Tatum instead of putting another major road through our backyard. Do not move forward with any of this construction. Please don’t ruin our home values and land. Dislikes: If improvement of the road is needed it cannot be this close to the homes of Tatum Highlands. Move further out or connect to Cave Creek before the dam. You are ruining the neighborhood. |

<p>| Likes: Keeps all options open without building something we do not need now. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 1A</th>
<th>General Plan Alignment, 30 MPH off-ramp to BMB (&quot;S curve&quot; concept)</th>
<th>Traffic calming roundabout option</th>
<th>Do you prefer a roundabout at the southern end of BMB?</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>General Plan Alignment, half diamond interchange configuration to/from SR 51 (&quot;T&quot; concept)</th>
<th>Traffic calming roundabout option</th>
<th>Do you prefer a roundabout at the southern end of BMB?</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
<th>No connection to SR 51, but future BMB to be built for future development</th>
<th>Comment provided by participant</th>
<th>Alternative 1-N</th>
<th>General Plan Alignment, Deer Valley to Cave Creek Road</th>
<th>Comment provided by participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes to slow traffic down on BMB in front of Pinnacle High School and to give southbound traffic an opportunity to turn around before entering SR 51.</td>
<td>Dislikes: Southbound BMB to 90-degree left turn ramp for SR 51 – The southbound design of BMB connecting at a 90-degree left turn ramp has a high potential of a more vehicle impact causing fatality. With a high presence of teenage drivers within close proximity, a vehicle will inevitably not turn, continue straight, and fall from the elevated ramp down into the water retention basin. SR 51 northbound off-ramp to 90-degree right turn for BMB – With a stop sign, this creates a high volume of cars stopping and reaccelerating producing more emissions into the atmosphere than Alternative 1A. This design of Alternative 2 was meant to slow the traffic from SR 51 into BMB. This ramp design is no longer needed with the latest addition of the traffic calming roundabouts as requested from public opinion.</td>
<td>Yes to slow traffic down on BMB in front of Pinnacle High School and to give southbound traffic an opportunity to turn around before entering SR 51.</td>
<td>Dislikes: None.</td>
<td>Dislikes: With the indefinite future growth of the Northern area of the City of Phoenix, the no-build option of not building the elevated on-ramp and off-ramp for SR 51 to BMB is not an option. When the entire BMB is complete, it must connect to SR 51. With no connection, this creates our current congested condition of traffic impacting Deer Valley Road. A no-build does not solve traffic issues; it will create more problems in the future.</td>
<td>Likes: Does not connect to SR 51. Dislikes: Far too close to the western boundary of Tatum Highlands (north of Jomax Road). Plus what is the impact if the dam is disrupted? And why a road in a floodplain?</td>
<td>Likes: I like this option because it would prevent BMB from being an alternate connect from the 303 to the 51.</td>
<td>Dislikes: Why can’t there be a traffic calming roundabout at Jomax and 40th Street?</td>
<td>Likes: Smoother flow in my mind.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: The T may slow people at the SR 51 connection but only at the connection.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dislikes: BMB stopping at Deer Valley south.</td>
<td>Likes: I am okay with the building of BMB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Lower road elevations approaching BMB.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Slows traffic</td>
<td>Dislikes: Aesthetically poor design and higher road elevations create additional barriers and sight lines in the community.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: ASLD would like everyone to assume that development is coming. There are still 28,000 homes in Shadow inventory and the Schiller Index states that Phoenix is on the cusp of another housing bubble. The few communities that would benefit most from this for now and into the future are against it for a number of reasons that have been articulated at the meetings. The negative impact on home values cannot be ignored. The growth is not there nor is it sustainable.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Balances traffic between Tatum and Cave Creek. Dislikes: Loss of natural desert, but progress will occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: This works with some speed concerns. Dislikes: Too few speed reducing items from SR 51.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: The 90-degree turns keep speeds in mind. Dislikes: Possible future access to Loop 101.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dislikes: Overcrowding of current roads with development.</td>
<td>Likes: None. Dislikes: The 40th Street alignment at Tatum Highlands for BMB puts Tatum Highlands at sharp contrast to future development. The set-back of BMB is too close to the Tatum Highlands subdivision. Future developments adjacent to Tatum Highlands will have a greater set back. Many residents of Tatum Highlands are strongly opposed to the 40th Street alignment. Please consider and design a north-south route that is moved to the west.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dislikes: Do not like the T concept. Seems dangerous for drivers.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1A</td>
<td>General Plan Alignment, 30 MPH off-ramp to BMB (&quot;S curve&quot; concept)</td>
<td>Traffic calming roundabout option</td>
<td>Do you prefer a roundabout at the southern end of BMB?</td>
<td>Comment provided by participant</td>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>General Plan Alignment, half diamond interchange configuration to/from SR 51 (&quot;T&quot; concept)</td>
<td>Traffic calming roundabout option</td>
<td>Do you prefer a roundabout at the southern end of BMB?</td>
<td>Comment provided by participant</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Traffic calming roundabout option</td>
<td>Do you prefer a roundabout at the southern end of BMB?</td>
<td>Comment provided by participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Will reduce traffic at Tatum Blvd. and Deer Valley Road. Dislikes: Provides for a freeway off-ramp directly adjacent to Wildcat Ridge development; will increase local traffic; will increase local noise; will increase parking and gridlock at Pinnacle High School. This is the worst option available, in my opinion.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: It is farthest away from southwest edge of Wildcat Ridge development; forces vehicles to come to some semblance of a slow-down point at the i-intersection seems like the most logical alternative to allow for future connection to SR 101 nearby; will reduce traffic at Tatum Blvd. and Deer Valley Road. If building is to occur, this is the best option available. Dislikes: Provides for a freeway off-ramp directly adjacent to Wildcat Ridge development; will increase local traffic; will increase local noise, will increase parking and gridlock at Pinnacle High School.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Eliminates a freeway connection directly adjacent to the school and neighborhoods. Dislikes: Does not eliminate traffic congestion at Tatum Blvd. and Deer Valley Road.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: I like the fact that it filters out of Desert Ridge to dispose of traffic or alternative routes from other surrounding communities since Deer Valley is currently one lane. Dislikes: I do not like that it would not connect to SR 51.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Keeps traffic out of the neighborhoods south of Deer Valley Road, who likely will not use BMB north of Deer Valley Road. Dislikes: Does not reduce current traffic problems at Tatum Blvd. and Deer Valley Road.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: The flow seems like it would be better.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dislikes: The two right angle turns would likely inhibit traffic too much.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Dislikes: Needs to be built soon. Too much traffic as it is.</td>
<td>Likes:</td>
<td>It gets built and the development can be behind us.</td>
<td>Likes:</td>
<td>It gets built and the development can be behind us.</td>
<td>Likes:</td>
<td>It gets built and the development can be behind us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Best alternative in the long term.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Minimum 2nd option at best. Dislikes: Does not address traffic flow and congestion. Actually will create more traffic.</td>
<td>Dislikes: A &quot;no build&quot; option is not viable or realistic for surrounding communities impacted throughout Desert Ridge.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dislikes: I prefer a connection to SR 51.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dislikes:</td>
<td>No access to SR 51</td>
<td>No access to SR 51</td>
<td>Dislikes:</td>
<td>No access to SR 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: I prefer this option to Alternative 2. This keeps traffic flowing and slows traffic at the roundabout.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dislikes: I do not like the stop. I would prefer to see the traffic continue to flow as in Alternative 1A.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dislikes: I prefer a connection to SR 51.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dislikes:</td>
<td>No access to SR 51</td>
<td>No access to SR 51</td>
<td>Dislikes:</td>
<td>No access to SR 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: The general plan works to accommodate many needs. With the roundabout, the traffic appears to be slowed sufficiently. Dislikes: The district still shares a concern about getting students across BMB safely. Also, not enough info regarding PHS parking and added entrance/exit points to school.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: In accordance with a roundabout, this plan appears to slow traffic the most. Dislikes: same as 1A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dislikes: No access to SR 51</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dislikes:</td>
<td>No access to SR 51</td>
<td>No access to SR 51</td>
<td>Dislikes:</td>
<td>No access to SR 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes: Roundabout, traffic calming, access to Reach 11 area, potential for pedestrian bridge, access to lot potential in future</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Likes: Traffic calming Dislikes: Sharp turns not needed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Likes:</td>
<td>It gets built and the development can be behind us.</td>
<td>Likes:</td>
<td>It gets built and the development can be behind us.</td>
<td>Likes:</td>
<td>It gets built and the development can be behind us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional comments provided not in response to question on comment forms:
- Construction will not happen until development occurs – developers pay for road improvements.
- No #6 mitigation (Black Mountain Improvements from Rough Rider to Pinnacle Peak Road)
- Do not want SR 51 traffic dumping directly into High School.
- Expand Cave Creek Road.
- Develop 40th Street – Extension is already there.
- Expand already existing Deer Valley Road to three-way lane.

Comments received on Potential Mitigation Features handout:
- Agree that this (traffic calming) is needed for safety reasons. Training for student drivers and school a plus.
- Pedestrian bridge makes sense if kids will have access to housing area east of Mayo.
- Landscape and median island improvements are awesome. I love it. Less noise and more appealing visually.
- Parking for Pinnacle High School desperately needs more parking.
- Yes to Pinnacle High School access to Deer Valley Road.
- Yes to landscape and median island improvements.
- Yes to parking at Pinnacle High School

Residents’ individual ranking of Potential Mitigation Features in order of preference:
1. Traffic calming
2. Pinnacle High School access to Deer Valley
3. Pedestrian overpass
4. Landscape and median island improvements
5. Parking for Pinnacle High School
6. BMB improvements from Rough Rider Road to Pinnacle Peak Road
7. Deer Valley Road improvements.
Responses to how attendees heard about the public open house.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Ad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice on your Door</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Neighbor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Meeting #1 Summary

Date: Tuesday, January 10, 2012
Time: 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.
Location: Vestar Branch Boys and Girls Club
3975 E. Lockwood Drive
Phoenix, AZ 85050

Participants
Aviano HOA
Desert Ridge Community Association
Fireside HOA
Tatum Highlands Association
Bureau of Reclamation
Pinnacle High School
City of Phoenix
Arizona Department of Transportation
The project’s engineering project manager
The project’s public involvement manager

Summary

The project’s public involvement manager started the meeting at 5:40 p.m. by thanking attendees for their time and participation. She briefly reviewed housekeeping items, including general rules for stakeholders, and led the attendees through brief introductions.

She then explained the roles, expectations, and commitment required of participating stakeholders; and emphasized that the goal of the stakeholder meetings was to discuss issues, concerns, and opportunities from the communities, build team consensus, encourage community participation in public events, and to help spread factual information not rumors. Participants agreed to the roles, expectations, and commitment and signed a partnering charter that states the following:

As a participant representing my organization in the Black Mountain Boulevard stakeholder group during the Preliminary Design and Environmental Study, I agree to adhere to the established roles and expectations, and work together with the City of Phoenix team to reach a consensus on the preferred roadway alternative.

A copy of the signed charter can be found attached to the summary notes. She then turned the presentation to the project engineering project manager. He explained that many associations in attendance may be familiar with the remaining presentation, but he would review it for those who have not had a chance to familiarize themselves with the information. He reviewed the study’s history and progress to date; limits and design elements; funding; and study schedule.

The City of Phoenix Deputy Street Transportation Director explained that 70 percent of funding is through a regional funding source allocated for transportation and the remaining 30 percent is provided by the City. Funding has been allocated for this study and construction of the ramps from the SR 51/101 interchange. Although, if a
consensus is not reached in regards to the preferred alternative, there is a possibility that the funding will go back to the regional pool of funds provided by the Maricopa Association of Governments and be reallocated to other projects in the region. Black Mountain Boulevard is government sponsored, meaning that it is not developer driven. That makes it unique. A network of roadways that will eventually be constructed connecting the Black Mountain Boulevard to the surrounding area will be developer driven and will need to be funded by future developers.

The project engineering project manager then explained that a round of agency and public meetings have been scheduled for January 24 through January 26. This round of meetings will follow a more formal format where the goal will be to present information to the community and listen to their feedback. In the spring, a second round of public events will be scheduled and conducted as a workshop format. The goal will be to interact with the communities, present alternatives, and ask for feedback on the alternatives presented. A final round of public outreach will occur in late summer 2012 to present the preferred alternative. He explained that there are several opportunities for the communities to get involved in the study, including through use of the project websites.

He opened the discussion to a question and answer session. Below is a summary of the discussion:

Q: Who is Desert View Village?
A: Desert View Village is the City’s Village Planning Committee appointed by the city council that represents this area. They are responsible for commenting on zoning and land use districts, identifying areas included in the General Plan for refinement, and identifying needs and issues related to the implementation of the General Plan. The committee reports to city staff and city council.

Q: Will the HOAs be provided with notification material for distribution prior to the public meetings and workshops?
A: Yes, you will be provided with electronic information that you can distribute through your preferred distribution methods.

Q: Is it possible for the alignment to go west to the high school?
A: It is possible but there are significant impacts of an alignment west of the high school. There are concerns with several planned developments, parks, the cemetery, and Bureau of Reclamation and Arizona State Land to the west. The City would need to evaluate all alternatives proposed and put them through a screening process to determine the most feasible alternative.

Q: Is an underpass possible for either pedestrian or roadway?
A: It can be evaluated. There are several constraints that would need to be considered, including the profile of the roadway and the height of the completed roadway if an underpass was constructed. If the roadway is too high when completed, it could obstruct the view from residences.

Q: Was consideration given to this roadway when the school was constructed? Did the school know this was a possibility?
A: The alignment of this roadway pre-dated the high school and the school was aware that this roadway was planned. High schools are generally located adjacent to arterial streets to help with bus circulation.

Q: When the alignment to the north is constructed in conjunction with future development; do City regulations and standards apply to roadways constructed by developers?

A: Yes, the City will be involved in the development of any roadways connected to the Black Mountain Boulevard.

Q: Will the team prepare visual renderings of what the completed roadway will look like?

A: Yes.

He explained that several comments have been received to date from residents, and provided participants with written summaries of the comments received. He then turned the presentation back to the project’s public involvement manager to open the floor to a discussion of additional concerns, issues, and opportunities. Comments have been categorized into six categories: alignment considerations, traffic/noise, pedestrians, parking, regional mobility, and other.

The following summarizes the additional comments received:

Alignment Considerations

- Fireside residents have been vocal and would like to see the alignment go west of the high school for the following reasons:
  1. Proximity of the high school.
  2. Proximity of the new elementary school.
  3. Bordering neighborhoods with concerns regarding noise and additional crime that will come to the neighborhood.
  4. Access to an adjacent unmarked trail adjacent - Horse Lovers Trail.

Fireside proposes that the alignment go west of the high school to relieve the schools of additional traffic and safety concerns.

- To the west of the high school, the Bureau of Reclamation has a detention basin which cannot be disturbed without reworking the flood zone and retention basin. There is also substantial coordination with Federal Highway Administration and City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation.

- Traffic is especially heavy surrounding the high school before school in the morning and after students are released in the afternoon. Additional traffic in the area due to an eastern alignment needs to be considered.

- Is it possible to change access to and from the high school to prevent additional congestion if the alignment is to the east of the high school? There are several safety concerns with increased traffic.

- To clarify this is not a freeway as stated years ago. It was originally classified as a freeway and since has been downgraded to a parkway, and finally a boulevard.
Traffic/Noise

• Sounds walls or landscaping should be considered to help reduce the additional noise from the roadway.
• Speed of traffic is an existing issue near the high school. It should be lowered before any new roadways are constructed.
• In the Aviano development there is a lot of cut through traffic in the neighborhoods. Traffic uses the neighborhood to travel between Pinnacle Peak and the high school to avoid congestion on Tatum Boulevard. Signage should be installed to discourage cut through traffic.
• If Black Mountain Boulevard is constructed, there should be a connection to Western Wildcat Ridge to discourage cut through traffic in the Fireside community.
• A secondary access point to Pinnacle High School from Deer Valley should be considered.
• Westbound Deer Valley should be widened to two lanes between Cave Creek and Black Mountain Boulevard.

Pedestrians

• A pedestrian tunnel should be considered to keep students from having to cross a highly traveled roadway.
• Tunnels are not safe for students. Tunnels provide students with a more private space to do things that are bad.
• There is a desire to maintain existing trail access (east and west) under/over Black Mountain Blvd.
• During busy times at the high school, it is difficult for traffic to move through the area when pedestrians are crossing at intersections.

Parking

• There is great need for additional parking for the high school.

Regional Mobility

• We need to be conscious of traffic exiting the neighborhoods in addition to the traffic that will be generated from the roadway. The development pending for the group in Desert Ridge, will bring additional traffic. This roadway will be just as much of a benefit as a problem. The advantages and disadvantages of this should also be considered.

Other

• There have been several comments from the communities that they do not want the funding to be redistributed to another jurisdiction within the region.

The project’s environmental manager explained that several traffic models will be developed to show what traffic volumes would look like with and without the Black Mountain Boulevard at several different timeframes (short-term, mid-term, long-term, and ultimate buildout). The traffic modeling process will help determine mitigation measures that can be taken in the interim (2014/2015).
The project’s public involvement manager thanked attendees again for their participation and reminded them that this study will not be influenced by a vote. The preferred alternative will be selected based on an evaluation. Input from the community is essential to the success of the project.

She commented that the alignment in the north would be constructed once the land develops and most likely funded by developers. She concluded the meeting by discussing the public meeting notification efforts to be implemented including advertisements in the newspaper, distribution of doorhangers and notification posters to highly visible locations in the community.

The meeting concluded at 7:16 p.m.
Stakeholder Meeting #2 Summary

Date: Tuesday, March 13, 2012
Time: 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.
Location: Pinnacle High School - Cafeteria
3535 E. Mayo Boulevard
Phoenix, AZ 85050

Participants

Ron McCally, Arizona Department of Transportation
Jennifer Kasten, Aviano HOA
Donnie Price, Aviano HOA
Scott McKenzie, AZTEC Engineering
Jim Romero, AZTEC Engineering
Mike Shirley, AZTEC Engineering
Marvin Small, AZTEC Engineering
Dave Webb, AZTEC Engineering
Ashley Bunch, City of Phoenix – Councilmember’s Office District 2
Jim Waring, City of Phoenix – Councilmember District 2
Genel Burwell, City of Phoenix – Reach 11 Park Manager
Shane Silsby, City of Phoenix, Deputy Street Transportation Director
Leticia Vargas, City of Phoenix, Project Manager
Doug Dickson, Desert Ridge Community Association
Chris Jenness, Desert Ridge Community Association
Dan Oseran, Desert Ridge Community Association
Alicia Saxton, Desert Ridge Community Association
Claudia Garza, Desert View Village Planning Committee
Lynn Pleskoff, Desert View Village Planning Committee
Greg Abrams, Fireside HOA
Amy Rosar, KDA Creative
Jason Reynolds, Pinnacle High School
William Dinneen, Ridgeview Property
Kim Carroll, Stanley Consultants
Shelly Sorensen, Stanley Consultants
Holly Talbot, Tatum Highlands Association
Carl St. John, Tatum Highlands Association
Dean Butler, Tatum Highlands Association
Kevin Hufnagel, Tatum Highlands Association
Tracy Kennedy, Tatum Highlands Association
John Dingeman, Wildcat Ridge HOA
Tim Lacy, Wildcat Ridge HOA
Summary

Jim Romero, AZTEC Engineering Design Project Manager, welcomed participants and thanked them for their attendance. He briefly explained that this was the second stakeholder meeting and that the first one was held in January, along with a round of public scoping meetings. He then introduced Councilman Waring who again thanked participants for their attendance. Shane Silsby, City of Phoenix Deputy Street Transportation Director, provided a brief background of the study and the purpose.

Amy Rosar, KDA Creative Public Involvement, reviewed the Stakeholder Charter Statement and reviewed the roles and responsibilities of a stakeholder. She then passed around a copy of the charter for new participants to sign that states the following:

As a participant representing my organization in the Black Mountain Boulevard stakeholder group during the Preliminary Design and Environmental Study, I agree to adhere to the established roles and expectations, and work together with the City of Phoenix team to reach a consensus on the preferred roadway alternative.

A copy of the signed charter can be found attached to the summary notes. Ms. Rosar then turned the presentation back to Mr. Romero who continued by reviewing progress to date and the area that the study encompasses.

He turned the presentation over to David Webb, AZTEC Engineering Environmental, who reviewed the three areas and their environmental considerations, including 100-year floodplain, land ownership, known hazardous material areas, drainage, and existing utilities. He then turned the presentation to Marvin Small, AZTEC Engineering, to review the draft alignment alternatives and the features of each one.

The following is a summary of questions asked and answers provided during and after the presentation.

Q: Are the boundaries shown on the maps owned by the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) set in stone? Can those boundaries change?
A: The boundaries of the ASLD properties shown on the study area map are correct. The boundaries do not change, but ownership will change as ASLD sells off the lands.

Q: Does ASLD own the land on the southwest corner of 32nd Street and Deer Valley Road?
A: No, that land has been sold and is now owned by a private party.

Q: Does ASLD own the land on the southeast corner of 32nd Street and Deer Valley Road and what are the plans for that land?
A: Yes, ASLD currently owns this property, however, there is development planning currently under consideration for residential housing for a portion of this property.

Q: What is the landownership on the southeast corner of 40th Street and Deer Valley Road?
A: This property was previously sold by ASLD to a private party, but development failed to occur due to the downturn in the housing development.
Q: Can you consider adding to the map the approved lot outlines for the residential east of Black Mountain Boulevard, south of Deer Valley Road and north of Mayo Boulevard.
A: Yes, the development lots lines will be included on the project maps.

Q: In the large ASLD parcel north of Deer Valley Road and west of Aviano Community, what will typically be done when a new roadway crosses a natural drainage wash?
A: From the engineering perspective, the flow of water must be allowed to pass beneath the new roadway. To accomplish this, a pipe or a culvert is used. Additionally, impacts resulting from these disturbances to the natural drainage system would be evaluated to determine if a Clean Water Act permit is required.

Q: Under the Clean Water Act permitting process, how is it determined which drainage washes can be disturbed?
A: Each drainage wash is evaluated separately. Then, in consultation with the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE), a determination is made for which washes require permits to allow them to be disturbed.

Q: As you apply for a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit, how far out do you consider beyond the study area?
A: It is the area of permanent loss to the natural drainage system that is considered.

Q: Do you have a map showing City zoning for ASLD parcels?
A: Yes, the City of Phoenix General Plan that is available on the City’s website. This includes the zoning for all vacant land within the City. Additionally, the representative of ASLD that is in attendance has a map to share of the ASLD future development plans for Desert Ridge and the Azara planned development.

Q: What is the density in the Tatum Highlands community?
A: The zoning is for R-2, R1-6, R1-8, and R1-10. Generally, this equates to 3 to 6 homes per acre.

Q: There is a large wash that flows through the Tatum Highlands Community. Will the project study consider this wash?
A: No direct impacts will occur to drainages within the Tatum Highlands Community.

Q: Many of the residents of Tatum Highlands pay flood insurance. Will the study consider improvements to change this condition?
A: Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC) is conducting a study to look at this particular floodplain. The study, known as Pinnacle West Area Drainage Master Study, will use the most current technology and data to identify the extent of flooding hazards based on existing conditions in portions of northeastern Phoenix, northern Scottsdale, Cave Creek, and Carefree. The results of the study will include recommendations for potential future flood hazard mitigation projects.

Q: What are the plans, if any, for Cave Creek Road? I heard it would be expanded.
A: The street classification map describes what is planned. At this time, there no planned capital improvement projects along Cave Creek Road. Cave Creek Road is ultimately planned for six lanes.
The following summarizes the questions asked regarding specific alternative alignments.

**Southern Section**

**SR 51 to Deer Valley Road - Alternative 1 (east of Pinnacle High School):**

**Q:** Will there be a traffic signal at Deer Valley Road?
**A:** Yes, both existing traffic signals at Mayo Boulevard and at Deer Valley Road will remain in place.

**Q:** Are there plans for an additional lane on the proposed Black Mountain Blvd ramp to make a total of 2 for southbound traffic transitioning onto SR 51?
**A:** Two lanes will be provided as far south as possible prior to reaching the SR 51 and then merge into one lane as it enters onto SR 51.

**Q:** This alternative does not accommodate access from Black Mountain Boulevard to SR 101L.
**A:** That is correct.

**SR 51 to Deer Valley Road - Alternative 2 (east of Pinnacle High School):**

**Q:** Has there been consideration of additional parking in the Reach 11 land north of SR 101L?
**A:** Future improvements within Reach 11 will be consistent with the City of Phoenix recreation master plan and do include parking.

**SR 51 to Deer Valley Road - Alternative 3 (west of Pinnacle High School)**

**Q:** Is Alternative 3 at grade or above grade?
**A:** As described, the majority of Alt 3 would be 25 feet above grade and constructed on structure (bridge).

**Q:** How much money is available for construction?
**A:** There is approximately $28.5 million budgeted for construction and right-of-way for improvements between SR 51 and Deer Valley Road. Alternative 3 is estimated at $57 million and would require approximately twice the available funds.

**Q:** Does the cost of Alternative 3 include right-of-way acquisitions costs?
**A:** Yes

**Q:** Is there any provision in the existing budget for going over that $28.5 million?
**A:** No, the available funds are limited to $28.5 million.

**Q:** Alternative 3 depicts a bridge to span the drainage mitigation corridor. In another variation of this alternative, the alignment was routed around the boundary of the mitigation corridor and the wash was spanned with a box culvert. Why not use that option for this alternative?
**A:** The option that would move the alignment west of the mitigation corridor results in impacts to the adjacent private property and their corresponding development plans, and further impacts the planned improvements for the Reach 11 Park Facilities. These impacts would further increase the cost of Alternative 3.

**Q:** Are the owners of the property at the southwest corner of 32nd Street and Deer Valley aware of this alignment?
**A:** Yes, the owner is in attendance this evening.
Q: What is the City of Phoenix citywide annual capital budget for transportation and street development?
A: The City of Phoenix citywide has approximately $20 million, but the State takes about approximately $12 million per year. The City is left with approximately $8 million per year for capital improvements citywide. With only $8 million per year, the City could not fund this project. That is why regional funding is important.

Alternative 4 – No ramp connections to SR 51

Q: With this alternative, will Black Mountain Boulevard be six lanes south of Deer Valley Road?
A: Black Mountain Boulevard could be up to six-lanes between Deer Valley Road and Mayo Blvd and will likely be four-lanes south of Mayo Boulevard; essentially as it exists today.

Comment: In the no-ramp connections to SR 51 option, traffic on the current roadways throughout the Desert Ridge area will become more and more congested in the future knowing that there is so much development planned for the area. Black Mountain Boulevard will still be built with planned development north of Deer Valley Road, according to the City’s General Plan.

Q: It was mentioned that Black Mountain Boulevard north of Deer Valley Road will be constructed as developments occur, and that it is likely several years in the future. Why would the City continue to study this if the funding could be used for multiple improvements around the City?
A: The funding that is earmarked for construction of the ramp connections to and from SR 51 is from regional funds approved by Maricopa County voters in 2004. If we were to abandon this study the City would lose the regional funds and would be unable to fund the project solely from its capital project budget. The regional funds are not available for multiple improvements around the City.

Q: If the no-ramp connections to SR 51 option would be determined as the preferred alternative, is it correct that the federal funds are gone?
A: Yes, that is correct. Please keep in mind that Black Mountain Boulevard north of Deer Valley Road up to the connection with Cave Creek Road would still be built by developers as the ASLD property is sold and developed.

Q: Many of us see that alternative 2 will most likely be the preferred alternative. The concern is to extend Black Mountain Boulevard through to Pinnacle Peak Road with this initial project and not stop at Deer Valley Road in order to provide better traffic relief for the neighborhoods.
A: Extending Black Mountain Boulevard up to Pinnacle Peak Road with the initial construction of the ramp connections to SR 51 will be considered based on funding availability and evaluated with the study.

Q: If Black Mountain Boulevard would to initially dead-end at Deer Valley Road or Pinnacle Peak Road it would create additional traffic problems that will need to be addressed. We need to improve the entire network to help move traffic through the area before we build more roadways. How about consider widening Pinnacle Peak Road; extending 56th Street north; and widening Deer Valley Road?
A: As indicated previously, the regional funding for the Black Mountain Boulevard ramp connections to SR 51 are specific to only those improvements, and are not available for other capital street improvements. Widening of Pinnacle Peak Road, extending 56th Street and widening of Deer Valley Road will each take place as development occurs in the ASLD land, which is adjacent to these roadways mentioned. The traffic analysis, which will be performed as part of this project study, will provide us a better understanding of
what the traffic challenges will be with the initial project as well as with traffic patterns and volumes when the entire street network is completed in the future.

**Deer Valley Road to Pinnacle Peak Road Alternatives**

No additional Questions or Comments

**Pinnacle Peak Road to Cave Creek Road Alternatives**

**Q:** How close is the Black Mountain Boulevard 40th Street alignment to the Tatum Highlands homes? And can the alignment be moved approximately 100 feet to the east to allow more space between the road and the homes?

**A:** The east-half (two traffic lanes) of the Black Mountain Boulevard 40th Street alignment is already constructed in place. It was constructed by the Tatum Highlands builder. The distance from the edge of roadway to the block wall of the Tatum Highland homes is approximately 25 feet. There is sidewalk and landscaping within the existing 25-foot area. There is at least one additional alignment west of the 40th Street alignment (approximately ¼ mile away), which will be evaluated through the project study.

**Q:** Can you consider a third alternative pushed west approximately 100 feet? We don't expect it to split the desert, as the furthest west alternative reflects, but we would like to see it pushed over so that it would create a visual difference.

**A:** Yes, this will be discussed with the ASLD.

**Q:** Will you have an exhibit that shows what this distance and buffer will look like?

**A:** Yes, exhibits showing what the planned roadway will consist of and buffer distances will be developed and shared with the community later in the project study.

**Q:** When Black Mountain Boulevard is constructed it appears that there would ultimately be two six-lane roadways (Cave Creek Road and Black Mountain Boulevard) less than one mile apart at the Jomax Road location?

**A:** Yes, that is correct and is due to Cave Creek Road being a diagonal roadway, traversing easterly as you move to the north.

**Q:** How long did it take to get the existing Clean Water Act Section 404 permit for the Azara planned development area?

**A:** It took several years.

**Comment:** It would really help to have a park or something visually pleasing in that area.

**Q:** There are impacts that could be reduced with the FCDMC project to flood control, what can be done with that floodplain mitigation to work to straighten out Black Mountain Boulevard?

**A:** There are several reasons the roadway alignments are not straight. First, there is the existence of a dyke. Second, Cave Creek Road is not on a normal alignment and it would come too close to another road. Finally, the boundaries of the FCDMC study could change and not all issues addressing the alignments will...
be solved. However, local drainage projects can be addressed by the City. The County will help with anything more major.

Q: Can the FCDMC study affect the outcome of this study?
A: No, this roadway plan is independent of the floodplain.

Q: Is the goal of ASLD to develop all surrounding land prior to selling more land?
A: That is correct. ASLD will not sell land until the rest of the Desert Ridge area is developed. The goal is to increase the value of the land and sell to the highest bidder.

Q: Mathematically, you know how much give and take in terms of drainage will be required with the 40th Street alignment alternative. Can you determine the major cost to construct a roadway over the dyke?
A: A new roadway over the existing drainage dyke will likely require it to span over and across the dyke with a bridge structure which would be very costly. The cost would be a function of how long and how high the bridge would need to be, and those exact details are not available at this time.

Q: Will you please consider putting the costs of the alternatives on the slides for the March public workshops? We believe it is important to share that information with the public.
A: Based on the request, yes we will include the costs of the alternatives in the presentation material for the March public workshops. We will also indicate that there are several other considerations that will be evaluated other than cost.

Q: Will City Council vote on the proposed alignments?
A: No the City Council will not vote on the alignment alternatives. A Council action/vote is required before any construction can take place in order to authorize the City on expending funds.

Q: Will the traffic volume analysis study take into consideration the future land use planning within the ASLD and other vacant land?
A: Yes, projected future densities and the ultimate number of traffic lanes for each roadway are populated into the Regional Maricopa Association of Governments traffic model, which is the basis for the future traffic volumes. We also take into consideration the traffic coming and going from areas surrounding the study area.

Q: Will you show Jomax Road traffic counts for the current timeframe and the future?
A: Yes, those traffic volumes will be provided.

The meeting concluded at 8:30 p.m.
Stakeholder Meeting #3 Summary

Date: Thursday, August 23, 2012
Time: 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Location: Explorer Middle School - Cafeteria
22401 N. 40th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85050

Participants

Ron McCally, Arizona Department of Transportation
Felicia Calderon, Arizona Department of Transportation CCP
Ruben Ojeda, Arizona State Land Department
Mark Edelman, Arizona State Land Department
Marsha Hove, Aviano – Community Manager
Marvin Small, AZTEC
Scott McKenzie, AZTEC
Jim Romero, AZTEC
Mike Shirley, AZTEC
Karim Dada, AZTEC
David Webb, AZTEC

Councilman Jim Waring, City of Phoenix Council District 2
Brian Schmitt, City of Phoenix Council District 2
Ashley Bunch, City of Phoenix Council District 2

Shane Silsby, City of Phoenix Street Transportation Deputy Director
Leticia Vargas, City of Phoenix Project Manager
Genel Burwell, City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation - Reach 11 Park Manager
Alyssia Saxton, Desert Ridge Community Association – Rossmar & Graham
Doug Dickson, Desert Ridge Community Association – President
Dan Oseran, Desert Ridge Community Association board member
Dan Francis, Desert Ridge Community Association board member
Tricia Gomes, Desert View Village Planner
Kim Rinehart, Fireside community manager
Marsha Miller, KDA Creative, Public Involvement Manager
Kim Carroll, Stanley Consultants

Carl St. John, Tatum Highlands – President
Dean Butler, Tatum Highlands – Vice President
Kevin Hufnagel, Tatum Highlands resident
John Dingeman, Wildcat Ridge – President
Tim Lacy, Wildcat Ridge board member

Summary

Marsha Miller, KDA Creative Public Involvement Manager, welcomed participants and thanked them for their attendance. She began the meeting with introductions around the room and reviewed the participant ground rules. Then she asked each homeowner’s association representative to provide an update of their community’s general perspective of the project between SR 51 and Mayo Boulevard.
Community updates:

**Wildcat Ridge**: residents are generally not supportive of building the ramps

**Fireside**: HOA has not taken a position on the project. Comments from residents indicate concern over traffic patterns, the new elementary school, safety and noise

**Aviano**: concerns with traffic and noise Requested that BMB be extended from Rough Rider to Pinnacle Peak to address potential for cut-through at Aviano

**Tatum Highlands**: no changes to comments expressed at previous meetings

**Desert Ridge Community Association**: traffic; increased crime; east of Tatum is in favor of SR 51 connection to relieve Tatum Blvd; west of 40th Street (Fireside, Aviano) have some support for the project but are concerned with safety for the schools (PHS, new Elementary) and increased traffic on Deer Valley Road. Suggested to extend BMB from Rough Rider to Pinnacle Peak to help Deer Valley. Like the roundabout and any other traffic calming that can slow traffic in front of Pinnacle HS; want a pedestrian overpass bridge included with the project; reduce noise

Shane Silsby, City of Phoenix Street Transportation Deputy Director, explained that the purpose of the project is to: 1) provide direct access to SR 51; 2) reduce congestion by improving routes and the local street network; and 3) accommodate projected population and employment growth. Mr. Silsby explained the efforts completed to date have included extensive public and agency involvement; environmental analysis; preliminary engineering; and alternatives analysis. Efforts completed to date involves the screening of alternatives north of Deer Valley Road and south of Deer Valley Road for further consideration and work toward selection of a preferred alternative to present at the public hearing near the end of 2012. Final design would follow from mid-2013 to early 2014 and construction would occur in 2014-2015.

Ms. Miller then explained the plan for the night was to discuss the public open house format; the original alternatives studied; evaluation criteria and evaluation matrix summary; the alternatives moving forward; and potential mitigation features. She discussed the room layout for the public open house.

Mr. Silsby went on to explain the original alternatives studied, which were Alternatives 1, 2, 3, a quarter-mile west of 40th Street north of Pinnacle Peak Road and 4 (no connection to SR 51). The evaluation criteria were shown and the summary of alternatives north and south of Deer Valley Road was discussed showing the scores for each and the alternatives recommended moving forward for further evaluation. The alternatives moving forward are 1A, 2, 1-N (which would only be built in the future by developers who purchase land parcels from the Arizona State Land Department) and 4 (no connection to SR 51, but will be constructed as mentioned in 1-N).

Mr. Silsby presented potential mitigation features, which are seven features that the stakeholders were asked to rank (1-7) based on their preferences. These mitigation features include:

1. Pedestrian overpass for access for Pinnacle High School and Reach 11
2. Landscape and median island improvements
3. Traffic calming (Roundabout)
4. Pinnacle High School access to Deer Valley Road
5. Deer Valley Road improvements west of Black Mountain Boulevard
6. Parking for Pinnacle High School
7. Black Mountain Boulevard improvements from Rough Rider Road to Pinnacle Peak Road

That concluded the presentation. The team then answered questions about the potential mitigation features prior to stakeholders ranking their preferences. The following is a summary of questions asked and answers provided after the presentation.

**Q:** Will Mayo Boulevard be extended west to connect with Deer Valley Road?
**A:** No. Mayo Boulevard will not be extended to Deer Valley Road. What appears to be a “dirt road” is actually a scarring from past underground utility installation.

**Q:** Is there another way for Wildcat Ridge residents to enter/exit?
**A:** Wildcat Ridge access will not be changed by this project. Wildcat Ridge opposes a direct connection to BMB from their subdivision.

**Q:** Is Pinnacle High School in favor of selling the southwest corner piece for the roundabout?
**A:** The school is in favor of the roundabout and will be contacted to coordinate traffic circulation and the acquisition of the piece of property.

**Q:** What is the set back change for the roundabout on the east side near Wildcat Ridge?
**A:** The roundabout fits within the existing area/drainage tract.

**Q:** What other benefit than speed is the roundabout?
**A:** Improves Pinnacle High School access by facilitating a u-turn. The existing PHS driveways to BMB will be right-in/out when the improvements are constructed. It also provides access opportunity for Reach 11 Park and possible future PHS additional parking areas.

**Q:** What would the pedestrian bridge look like?
**A:** It would likely be a steel truss bridge; however, the bridge type is yet to be determined.

**Q:** What does alternative 4 mean?
**A:** Alternative 4 means that Black Mountain Boulevard would not have a connection to SR 51, but the roadway would be built north of Deer Valley Road by developers who purchase land parcels from the Arizona State Land Department in the future. If the connection to SR 51 is not made then the currently programmed federal funds will be lost.

Comment: Concerned with alternative 2 that the 90-degree turn onto SR 51 would be difficult for drivers going too fast and missing the turn. Alternative 1 is preferred.

Comment: Add a link on the project website home page to go directly to the alternatives simulation videos.

Comment: Councilman Waring asked the HOA stakeholders to inform him of their community’s position on the alternatives by spring 2013. He asked that even if the community didn’t support the build alternative to please provide specific feedback/comments on the alternatives.

The meeting concluded at 8:00 p.m.
ADDITIoNAL PROJECT FEATURES BEING CONSIDERED

- PHS access onto Deer Valley Rd
- Parking for PHS
- Deer Valley Rd Improvements West Leg of Intersection
- Pedestrian Overpass
- Traffic Calming with Access to Future Reach 11 Recreation Area
- Black Mountain Blvd Improvements to Pinnacle Peak Rd
- Landscape & Median Island Improvements

Ph: (602) 506-3200 Fax: (602) 956-8390
175 N 2nd St., Phoenix, AZ 85004
www.aazdot.gov
A-Z/P
Black Mountain Blvd Improvements to Pinnacle Peak Rd
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Stakeholder Ranking (08/23/12)</th>
<th>Description of Feature</th>
<th>Public Right-of-Way Land Available</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
<td>YES/NO - The west portion of the Traffic Calming Feature (traffic roundabout) requires the purchase of 36,000 sf of property from the PHS (furthest southeast corner where no improvements exist).</td>
<td>$250K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS Access to Deer Valley Road</td>
<td>NO - This is Arizona State Land and the land transaction must be consistent with State Law.</td>
<td>$400K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pedestrian Overpass</td>
<td>YES - The Overpass and ramp landings can be accommodated within the existing dedicated public R/W for Black Mtn Blvd.</td>
<td>$1.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Landscape &amp; Median Island Improvements</td>
<td>YES - The Landscape and Median Island improvements can be accommodated within the existing dedicated public R/W for Black Mtn Blvd.</td>
<td>$200K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Parking for PHS</td>
<td>NO - This is Arizona State Land and the land transaction must be consistent with State Law.</td>
<td>$2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Black Mtn Blvd Improvements from Rough Rider Road to Pinnacle Peak Road</td>
<td>NO - A portion is Arizona State Land and the land transaction must be consistent with State Law. The other landowners are the Arizona National Cemetery and the Pinnacle West Equestrian Center. At present there are ongoing discussions between COPhx and the National Cemetery for the land exchange. No land is anticipated from the Equestrian Center for these interim Improvements.</td>
<td>$2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Deer Valley Road Improvements</td>
<td>No - This is Arizona State Land and the land transaction must be consistent with State Law.</td>
<td>$2M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 is highest and 7 is lowest.
Fireside Homeowner’s Association

Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: 10/24/2011
Meeting Time: 5:30 PM
Location: Fireside Community Center
3775 E Lone Cactus Drive, Phoenix, AZ
Subject: Fireside HOA Update Meeting – Q&A
Attendees: Homeowners
Community Management Staff
D2 Councilman
Deputy City Manager
Deputy Street Transportation Director
AZTEC

Questions & Answers

Q: *Mayo/BMB is already congested during the arrival/departure of students at the Pinnacle High School. How will connecting BMB to SR 51 improve this congestion?*
A: This needs to be evaluated. The traffic models that will be prepared as part of the study for this project will look at the school generated traffic and the traffic to/from SR 51.

Q: *The presentation shows Right-of-Way (ROW) funds programmed at $3.6M. What are these funds going to be used for?*
A: The ROW funds are programmed for the purchase of land from Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) through Reach 11.

Q: *Is there a potential to consider connecting BMB to 101L in addition to SR 51?*
A: There is no funding for a connection to 101L but the alternate concept shown in the presentation could possibly allow a 101L connection.

Q: *What is the plan for the ultimate build-out for Mayo Boulevard to the east and south?*
A: The street classification map shows that Mayo Boulevard is planned to cross 101L between the 40th Street and Tatum Boulevard alignments and connect to Mayo Boulevard south of 101L. There is no connection between Mayo Boulevard and 101L planned. The Mayo Boulevard crossing of 101L is unfunded.

Q: *What other uses are planned for Reach 11?*
A: Copy of Reach 11 Master Plan was circulated. Parks Department will be asked to place this on the City website. High-density recreational facilities are not envisioned in this part of Reach 11. Plans are for more passive uses such as open grass areas or trails. There could be some additional ball fields.

Q: *Will there be a traffic study to look at 101L connections to BMB versus the connection to SR 51?*
A: A traffic study will be performed for the project by AZTEC using 2035 traffic volumes. The study will evaluate current and future volumes along both Cave Creek Road (CCR) and Tatum Boulevard along with any proposed build or the no-build alternatives. Connections to 101L are not in the current scope of the project.
**Q:** If we are truly looking at the future, isn’t it more realistic to assume BMB is an interim step to extending SR 51 north as a freeway to Sonoran Boulevard.

**A:** BMB is planned as an arterial street. There are no plans to extend SR 51 north of its current location. The City has decided that they do not want a freeway connection to/thru Sonoran Boulevard and the surrounding preservation areas.

**Q:** Are there any plans to connect 40th Street over/under 101L?

**A:** No. Mayo Boulevard would be the future street crossing over 101L. The alignment of Mayo Boulevard would not be on the 40th Street alignment. It will be east of 40th Street.

**Q:** Can Deer Valley Road (DVR) to the west of BMB handle the additional traffic once the BMB/SR 51 connection has been made? DVR is one lane each way west of BMB.

**A:** This will be evaluated in the traffic model as part of this project. There is no funding for widening DVR from BMB to CCR currently. The ultimate build out of DVR in this location would be by adjacent developments when they build.

**Q:** A 2nd comment to above bullet – At a recent meeting we heard the PHS principal state that PHS is considering closing open enrollment. If the school boundaries are modified how will this affect the traffic? Would students from south of the SR 101L still be within the school boundaries?

**A:** COP is meeting with the school district next week and will ask for confirmation on any proposed changes to enrollment and district boundaries so we will have that information for the traffic study.

**Q:** How would traffic congestion on Tatum Boulevard be alleviated in the interim condition (construction of SR 51 ramps to Mayo) without the ultimate build-out to the north to CCR? Wouldn’t the traffic using the SR 51 NB ramp to BMB be forced to go east or west on DVR?

**A:** The project traffic model will evaluate BMB and the volumes on DVR, CCR and Tatum Boulevard.

**Q:** Have we had problems in other areas with random kidnappings/security issues for schools with close freeway access?

**A:** The City will ask the school district for input and pull crime statistics to determine whether this is a potential concern.

**Q:** How many parking spaces would be added to PHS based on the land area identified in the slide of the presentation showing the alternate concept?

**A:** Exact number of parking spaces is not known at present because the parking layout has not been prepared. Estimate approximately 100. This land area is included in the environmental clearance area. Considering using project funds to develop this parking area as a mitigation measure.

**Q:** I would request that a better visual presentation of alternatives, such as renderings, be provided at the next meeting(s) to help us visualize how the alternatives will look.

**A:** This meeting is the first of a series of meetings. The study has not yet started so the graphic provided today are quite basic.

We plan to hold a series of meetings as follows:

1. Review a map with issues/data/constraints. No alignments just issues.
2. Add conceptual alignment alternatives to map.
3. Narrow alternatives and provide stronger visual presentations.
Q: Is the PHS access road shown in the alternate concept slide of the presentation able to be connected to DVR?
A: Current concept is to connect this access road to Mayo Boulevard. The City stated that it would be possible to look at a DVR connection for this access road.

Comment: The portion of Mayo Boulevard from BMB to 40th Street is currently a “drag strip”. Connecting BMB to SR 51 may invite/encourage this as there would be an exit/escape from enforcement.

Adding to 16) are there plans to do something with the signal at BMB/Mayo to help address this?
There are 3 approaches to dealing with the speed issue
Road Context. Create driver perspective through physical features to control speed.
Alignment. Consider curvature/features to control speed.
Enforcement.

Q: What would be the height of the ramps over 101L and how can we get a visual representation of how this would look?
A: Future meetings will provide enhanced visuals including 3D presentations. Crossings of 101L will need to provide 16.5-ft vertically over the freeway. The ramps would be approximately 30-ft above the 101L.

Q: Can the Ramps/BMB alignment be moved to the west side of PHS?
A: This can be considered.
Anticipate this will cause Reach 11 issues and possibly issues with the cemetery.
Under this scenario, PHS would have a major street on the east and west side of their property.

Q: Is PHS going to be represented at future meetings?
A: PHS is a key stakeholder and will be engaged/included in this study.

Q: Procedurally how will the decisions be made by Council as to whether/how this project will go forward to construction?
A: Process is to evaluate alternatives and issues, then go to FHWA for environmental clearance and their sign-off.
Will need to go to Council for IGA for final design and administration of construction.
There will be Council actions required before going to final design.
If there is a change to the alignment it would need to go back through Desert View Village and then any changes would need to be agreed to by Council.

Q: I understand there is a planned Park and Ride at Tatum/DVR area. Where in the process is this facility relative to the study for this project?
A: We will need to check with Transit Department on this.

Q: What is the status of City North and what would be its impact on this project?
A: Project has been impacted by the economy and build-out is not as expected currently. When it develops it is expected to increase traffic on Tatum Boulevard and 56th Street.

Q: What alternative alignments for BMB have been studied previously?
A: Planning work in 1990 identified the current general plan alignment.
This study will consider other alignment options/refinements, however the general plan alignment has been set based on the street grid.
Comment: Please consider the elementary school so they have an opportunity to have input on safety.
   The City is meeting with the school district next week and will ask about the elementary school and their
   input.
   COP Streets has a dedicated group engaged in school/street safety and will be involved in this project.

Comment: Consider safety of children. Consider traffic impacts in neighborhood. Consider moving BMB
   alignment to the west of PHS.
   Will do all three. Traffic models will show expected traffic patterns.
   Will review alignment west of PHS.
Fireside
HOA
October 24, 2012
INTRODUCTIONS

• Introductions
PROJECT HISTORY

• 1990 – Desert Ridge Specific Plan includes N/S Connector in Master Streets Plan
• 1994 – Added to City of Phoenix Street Classification Map
• 2000 – Ramp Connections to SR51 Designed with SR51/SR101L Interchange Project
• 2004 – Funding for BMB (SR51/SR101L Interchange to Deer Valley Road) Approved by Voters (Prop 400)
• 2006 – Preliminary Engineering Scoping Report Prepared for BMB (SR51/SR101L to Deer Valley Road)
• 2011 – Prop 400 Federal-Aid Funding Authorized for Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Study
WHY DO THE PROJECT

• Provide Direct Access to SR51
• Reduce Congestion by Improving Routes and Local Street Network
• Reduce Commuter Travel Trip Time
• Accommodate Projected Population and Employment Growth
EFFORTS COMPLETED TO DATE

• Extensive Public & Agency Involvement
  – Community & HOA Meetings – 2011 & 2012
  – Public Scoping Meetings – January 2012
  – Public Workshops – March/April 2012
  – Project Stakeholder Meetings – January/March/August 2012
  – Public Open House – August 2012
EFFORTS COMPLETED/ON-GOING

• Environmental Analyses
  – Biological Resources
  – Cultural Resources
  – Noise & Air Quality
  – Land Use
  – Hazardous Materials
  – Clean Water Act
  – Social Economic

• Preliminary Engineering

• Alternatives Analysis
ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS

BLACK MOUNTAIN BOULEVARD
SR51/Loop 101 Interchange to Cave Creek Road

IMPROVING COMMUNITY ACCESS
# Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

## Evaluation Matrix Summary - SR 51 to Deer Valley Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Importance Factor</th>
<th>ALT 1 (original 1999 AECOM concept)</th>
<th>ALT 1a (original concept with 30-40 mph northbound and 45 mph southbound radii and considers traffic calming)</th>
<th>ALT 2 (resembles a half-diamond TI and considers traffic calming)</th>
<th>ALT 3 (west of PHS and incorporating 32nd Street alignment)</th>
<th>ALT 4 (no SR 51 ramp connections to BMB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Considered but eliminated from further study</td>
<td>Considered for further study</td>
<td>Considered for further study</td>
<td>Considered but eliminated from further study</td>
<td>Considered but eliminated from further study</td>
<td>Considered for further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorist Safety</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Input</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Input</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Mobility/Linkage to Arterial &amp; Freeway Roadway Systems</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Access</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Phoenix General Plan Consistency</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach 11 Recreation Master Plan Consistency</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLD Development Plans Consistency</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) Resources</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Noise</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Right-of-Way Costs</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment Geometry</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic operations of existing ramps of the SR 51/SR 101 TI</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage (outside of the Reach 11 area)</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage (within the Reach 11 Area)</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Conflicts</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Additional Parking at PHS</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources (floodplains and jurisdictional Waters of the US)</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Continuity and Community Cohesion</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights: Title VI and Environmental Justice</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity to existing or future employment centers</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Score | +19 | +26 | +25 | -18 | -2 |
| Recommendations | Considered but eliminated from further study | Considered for further study | Considered for further study | Considered but eliminated from further study | Considered for further study |

## Legend

Relative Performance to Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighting Factor for Each Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2x</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Black Mountain Boulevard**

SR51/Loop 101 Interchange to Cave Creek Road

**Improving Community Access**
ALTERNATIVES
MOVING FORWARD
SR51 TO DVR
(ALT 1A)
ALTERNATIVES
MOVING FORWARD
SR51 TO DVR
(ALT 2)
POTENTIAL MITIGATION FEATURES

1. Traffic Calming with Access to Future Reach 11 Recreation Area
2. PHS access onto Deer Valley Rd
3. Pedestrian Overpass
4. Landscape & Median Island Improvements
5. Parking for PHS
6. Black Mountain Blvd Improvements to Pinnacle Peak Rd
7. Deer Valley Rd Improvements West Leg of Intersection
INITIAL FEEDBACK
AUGUST 2012
PUBLIC OUTREACH

• Alternative 1A
• Traffic Calming Roundabout
• DVR Connection to PHS
• Landscape-Median Improvements
WHERE ARE WE NOW

• Alternatives Screened for Further Consideration:
  – South of Deer Valley Road
  – North of Deer Valley Road

• Status of Project Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING &amp; ENVIRONMENTAL</th>
<th>FINAL DESIGN</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late 2011</td>
<td>Early 2013</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

• Project Websites:
  www.blackmountainblvd.com
  http://phoenix.gov/streets/construction/bmb.html

THANK YOU
Aviano Homeowner’s Association

Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: 11/08/2011      Meeting Time: 6:30 PM

Location: Aviano Community Clubhouse
22,500 N. Aviano Way, Phoenix, AZ

Subject: Aviano HOA Meeting – Q&A

Attendees: Homeowners
Donnie Price, Aviano Community Manager
D2 Councilperson
Project Manager
Deputy Street Transportation Director
AZTEC

Comments/Questions & Answers/Responses:

Q: What improvements are planned for Deer Valley Road (DVR) between Black Mountain Boulevard (BMB) and Cave Creek Road?
A: As adjacent development occurs along this segment of DVR, those developments will fund the expansion of the road to its ultimate 6-lane configuration.

Q: DVR should be improved (widened) west of BMB as a requirement of this project.
A: Until the traffic study is conducted and a more thorough analysis of the redistribution of traffic that would result from this project is understood, it cannot be ascertained if DVR west of BMB would require widening as a condition of the BMB project.

Q: DVR cannot handle the increased traffic that the proposed BMB ramps from SR 51 would bring into the area. Furthermore, the existing segment of BMB north of DVR is inadequate to handle increases in traffic. Constraints created by the National Cemetery and horse property to the north would create a cul-de-sac. This project would increase traffic by 50,000 cars daily in our neighborhoods. How will these vehicles get to Pinnacle Peak Road and won’t this traffic also back up onto the freeway?
A: Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) traffic models show that the proposed ramps from SR 51 to BMB would handle traffic to and from the freeway. In the future, residential development will include developer-funded improvements to the arterial street network that will meet traffic demand. Residential development will inevitably resume in this area, and participants are encouraged to consider future traffic conditions without this project being constructed.

Q: When will BMB between Rough Rider and Pinnacle Peak Roads be constructed?
A: This segment is not currently programmed for construction, and would occur sometime after 2016. The demand for this segment of BMB would depend on when future development occurs. The City is in discussions with the cemetery to obtain the right-of-way needed between the cemetery and the horse property. It is estimated that acquiring this right-of-way will take 12- to 18-months.

Q: The segment of DVR between BMB and Cave Creek will only be three lanes wide (two travel lanes) when BMB improvements are constructed; how will this work?
A: Developers will fund the construction of the other three lanes (northern half of roadway) when adjacent neighborhoods are constructed.
**Q:** **It will take too long for developers to widen DVR.**  
**A:** This problem will manifest to a lesser degree because the traffic in the area will mostly be traveling on the eastern segment of DVR between BMB and Tatum Boulevard where the development associated with Desert Ridge is located. The traffic modeling that will be performed as part of this project will evaluate traffic volumes on DVR.

**Q:** **The congestion at the intersection of DVR and Tatum Boulevard is caused by the lengthy gap between ingress/egress points on SR 101. There is a 3.5-mile gap between Tatum Boulevard and Cave Creek Road that is a contributing factor to this congestion. BMB improvements should be extended north of DCR to Pinnacle Peak Road as part of this project.**  
**A:** The gap in exits along Loop 101 is a known problem in this area that causes traffic to be overly concentrated at the limited access points.

**Q:** **Has some portion of the BMB right-of-way adjacent to the National Cemetery already been acquired?**  
**A:** Yes

**Q:** **Pinnacle High School was constructed after awareness of the BMB. Is it possible to route BMB west of the High School?**  
**A:** An alignment that is west of the High School is being examined. Complications from this alignment are impacts to Reach 11 Recreation Area, an arterial street on both sides of the school, changes to Arizona State Land Department land planning, and the associated land acquisition costs that were not originally anticipated. The study team will be considering safety and access to PHS as part of this project.

**Q:** **How many people are involved in the decision to construct the BMB improvements? Is it beyond the sole discretion of the District 2 Councilperson?**  
**A:** In many cases, the other council members would defer to the councilperson whose district is impacted by the decision, but not always and no guarantee could be made this would occur for decisions regarding BMB. The suggestion that the National Cemetery should be impacted rather than residences because it only displaces graves would not be considered.

**Q:** **What are the boundaries of City Council District Number 2?**  
**A:** Councilperson Waring gave a description of District Number 2’s boundaries. The audience is encouraged to provide reasons why they are in opposition to the project, not just that they oppose it.

**Q:** **Is there another example of a freeway with exit ramps leading directly to the entrance of a high school?**  
**A:** The safety implications of this scenario are important to the project team. Paradise Valley High School is an example of a school in close proximity to a freeway’s exit ramps.

**Q:** **What are the plans for Mayo Boulevard as it relates to this general vicinity?**  
**A:** To the east of BMB, the City plans (currently unfunded) to connect Mayo Boulevard north and south of Loop 101 by constructing an overpass. The overpass would not, however, have ramps to provide ingress/egress for Loop 101 traffic. To the west of BMB, Mayo Boulevard may be curved to the north and connected to DVR.

**Q:** **I reside on the west edge of Aviano just south of Rough Rider near the BMB alignment and I am concerned with safety and improvements providing additional access for criminals to reach our neighborhood.**  
**A:** Safety and crime are important considerations for this project.
Q: What are differences between a parkway and a boulevard?
A: The term “parkway” became a synonym with “freeway” because of what is now the Piestewa Freeway. To avoid similar confusion, the City of Phoenix ceased to refer to the proposed Black Mountain roadway as a “parkway,” which could imply that the City intended to construct a freeway. The City now refers to the future Black Mountain roadway as a “boulevard” to denote that it will be a divided arterial street with landscaping.

Q: What measures will be taken to reduce traffic noise and provide safety for children and residents that reside next to BMB?
A: Noise and other neighborhood impacts will be studied.

Q: When I purchased my home, the sales agent did not disclose that BMB would be constructed. I do not support this project.
A: Although the agent did not disclose BMB, the developer that constructed the homes was aware of BMB, because it was part of neighborhood’s master plan that the City approved. Lack of disclosure to a homebuyer can be caused by a lack of communication between the developer and the buyer through the agent.

Comment: I support the alternative from the slideshow that depicts ramps with 90-degree corners to slow traffic as it exits SR 51 to BMB.
Noted

Comment: I commute to work using SR 51 and exit at Northern Avenue. It takes motorists a half-mile to slow from freeway to arterial street speeds. I support the alternative with 90-degree corners to slow traffic as it exits SR 51 to BMB.
Noted

Q: This project will not help traffic on SR 101 access neighborhoods north of SR 101. Loop 101 traffic still only has the option of using Tatum Boulevard after BMB improvements are constructed.
A: The BMB ramp alternatives that have the 90-degree turns, if implemented, could possibly be adapted to include ramps to and from Loop 101 in the future. However, this has not been studied to date.

Q: Will the City of Phoenix extend 56th Street north to connect with Pinnacle Peak Road?
A: Yes, this is in the City’s program (Fiscal Years 2013, 14, and 15).

Q: Will a connection road be constructed by the City of Phoenix between DCR and Scottsdale Road?
A: This would be developer funded when adjacent land is developed. The City only funds the construction of roads at locations where they cannot be funded through adjacent land development.

Q: Conditions are unsafe on 40th Street in the Vicinity of where BMB improvements would be constructed. Will BMB project make any safety improvements to 40th Street?
A: 40th Street improvements are beyond the scope of the BMB project. The traffic modeling as part of the BMB study will examine any impacts to 40th Street to see if traffic is predicted to use 40th Street to get from DVR to Pinnacle Peak Road. The regional modeling performed to date shows that the traffic that will use the BMB ramps is from the existing built out neighborhoods in the local area.

Q: The BMB project will create more through-traffic on DVR. I feel that BMB should be extended north to Pinnacle Peak Road.
A: BMB improvements are intended to handle local traffic coming or going to SR 51 and are not intended to create traffic increases on DVR. The City does not have funding allocated at present to extend BMB to Pinnacle Peak Road. The City will discuss this further internally.
Q: **Will the BMB segment constructed adjacent to Pinnacle High School be subject to 15 M.P.H. school zone limits?**
A: No, 15 M.P.H. limits are only used for elementary schools.

Q: **Will consideration be given to the students that travel to Pinnacle High School by bicycle?**
A: Yes, the study will consider travel by bicycle and pedestrians.

Q: **A comment was made regarding the consideration of elevating or depressing the BMB vertical alignment in the vicinity of the Pinnacle High School frontage.**
A: Options to construct the BMB roadway beneath/above the elevation of the surrounding landscape and creating pedestrian overpasses/underpasses will be explored during the study. There are existing washes that cross BMB, which may make this problematic.

Q: **Do the project planners have ways to prevent through-traffic on secondary roads, i.e. motorists using residential streets as shortcuts?**
A: Signage can be used to discourage motorists from doing this.

Q: **Motorists will use the improved BMB facilities as an alternative to freeways. Is there a way to prevent this?**
A: The improvements being made to the regional freeway system will largely address this by making the freeways the preferable alternative to arterial streets.

Q: **The greatest potential impacts from this project are not endangered species or archaeological concerns, for example, but the impacts to the existing residents in the neighborhoods that have already been built.**
A: The existing neighborhoods were planned and designed with the streets, including BMB. The street system is an aspect of the neighborhood planning and is not a subsequent addition to the planning of this area. The environmental studies are needed to comply with the requirements of receiving federal funding.

Comment: *I am in support of the project but I want safety to be a predominant concern of the project.*
Noted

Q: **I am in support of the alignment that is west of Pinnacle High School. Is the High School in support of the project? Please also consider the Elementary School currently under construction.**
A: Yes

Q: **Will the traffic models reflect traffic conditions just prior to school beginning and immediately after school is released?**
A: Yes, the traffic modeling will capture periods of peak use and will take the school's hours into consideration. Another issue related to the High School is the lack of parking on campus. Many students drive to school and when the parking lots are full, students park in the adjacent neighborhood. This issue is known by the project team and will be a consideration in the study.
Questions & Answers

Q: Will there be an air study?
A: Yes

Q: What about a connection to the Loop 101?
A: A connection with the Loop 101 is not currently funded.

Q: When will 56th Street extend north?
A: COP Capital Improvement Program shows 2015 construction with design beginning in 2013.

Q: What will happen to our property values?
A: Black Mountain Boulevard (BMB) has been identified in the City of Phoenix (COP) Street Classification Plan since 1994. Your public reports for each development should have the BMB improvements identified.

Q: I bought my home in 1997 and Continental did not show BMB as a planned facility?
A: BMB has been identified in the COP Street Classification Plan since the 1994. Your public reports for each development should have the BMB improvements identified.

Q: Is the Pinnacle High School parking tied to the BMB project?
A: This project is the mechanism to potentially add additional parking.

Q: SR 51/101 at rush hour is basically a parking lot. People will use BMB to get to Deer Valley Road (DVR) dumping all of that traffic in to our neighborhoods.
A: Will be analyzed by traffic model.

Q: What is the plan for DVR west of BMB? Can DVR handle the additional traffic?
A: Road improvements are development driven. As development comes along, the project owners are responsible for building the half street improvements. The COP does not currently have funding for DVR. The traffic model will confirm volumes along DVR.
Q: Has an alternative west of Pinnacle High School been considered?
A: The project team will look at alternatives west of the high school.

Q: Concerned about safety of students near the High School? Would like to see the project include extending BMB to Pinnacle Peak Road initially instead of stopping it at Mayo or DVR. This would eliminate issues with excessive cut through or over crowded streets such as DVR.
A: To be evaluated.

Q: Questioned whether main destination is north-south to SR 51 or east-west to Loop 101?
A: The project traffic model will evaluate.

Q: Will 56th Street be included in the traffic model?
A: Yes

Q: Why not build out 56th and 64th Streets?
A: The COP does not have the funding to build all roads throughout the city. We rely on developers to build. The COP builds roads where the developers cannot.

Q: Question on funding
A: COP presented a slide on funding from the power point presentation.
Desert Ridge Community Association
October 9, 2012
INTRODUCTIONS

• Introductions
PROJECT HISTORY

• 1990 – Desert Ridge Specific Plan includes N/S Connector in Master Streets Plan
• 1994 – Added to City of Phoenix Street Classification Map
• 2000 – Ramp Connections to SR51 Designed with SR51/SR101L Interchange Project
• 2004 – Funding for BMB (SR51/SR101L Interchange to Deer Valley Road) Approved by Voters (Prop 400)
• 2006 – Preliminary Engineering Scoping Report Prepared for BMB (SR51/SR101L to Deer Valley Road)
• 2011 – Prop 400 Federal-Aid Funding Authorized for Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Study
WHY DO THE PROJECT

- Provide Direct Access to SR51
- Reduce Congestion by Improving Routes and Local Street Network
- Reduce Commuter Travel Trip Time
- Accommodate Projected Population and Employment Growth
EFFORTS COMPLETED TO DATE

• Extensive Public & Agency Involvement
  – Community & HOA Meetings – 2011 & 2012
  – Public Scoping Meetings – January 2012
  – Public Workshops – March/April 2012
  – Project Stakeholder Meetings – January/March/August 2012
  – Public Open House – August 2012
EFFORTS COMPLETED/ON-GOING

• Environmental Analyses
  – Biological Resources
  – Cultural Resources
  – Noise & Air Quality
  – Land Use
  – Hazardous Materials
  – Clean Water Act
  – Social Economic

• Preliminary Engineering

• Alternatives Analysis
ALIGNMENT
ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS
WHERE ARE WE NOW

- Alternatives Screened for Further Consideration:
  - South of Deer Valley Road
  - North of Deer Valley Road
- Status of Project Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING &amp; ENVIRONMENTAL</th>
<th>FINAL DESIGN</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping (Late 2011)</td>
<td>Public Hearing (Mid 2013)</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Development (Preferred Alternative)</td>
<td>Early 2013</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EVALUATION MATRIX SUMMARY - SR 51 TO DEER VALLEY ROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Importance Factor</th>
<th>ALT 1 (original 1999 AECOM concept)</th>
<th>ALT 1a (original concept with 30-40 mph northbound and 45 mph southbound radii and considers traffic calming)</th>
<th>ALT 2 (resembles a half-diamond Ti and considers traffic calming)</th>
<th>ALT 3 (west of PHS and incorporating 32nd Street alignment)</th>
<th>ALT 4 (no SR 51 ramp connections to BMB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Score Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>Considered but eliminated from further study</td>
<td>Considered for further study</td>
<td>Considered for further study</td>
<td>Considered but eliminated from further study</td>
<td>Considered for further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorist Safety</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Input</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Input</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Mobility/Linkage to Arterial &amp; Freeway Roadway Systems</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Access</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Phoenix General Plan Consistency</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach 11 Recreation Master Plan Consistency</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLD Development Plans Consistency</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) Resources</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Noise</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Right-of-Way Costs</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment Geometry</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic operations of existing ramps of the SR 51/SR 101 Li Ti</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage (outside of the Reach 11 area)</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage (within the Reach 11 Area)</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Conflicts</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Additional Parking at PHS</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources (floodplains and jurisdictional Waters of the US)</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Continuity and Community Cohesion</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights: Title VI and Environmental Justice</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity to existing or future employment centers</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEGEND:

**Relative Performance to Evaluation Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weighting Factor for Each Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2x</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALTERNATIVES
MOVING FORWARD
SR51 TO DVR
(ALT 1A)
ALTERNATIVES
MOVING FORWARD
SR51 TO DVR
(ALT 2)
POTENTIAL MITIGATION FEATURES

1. Traffic Calming with Access to Future Reach 11 Recreation Area
2. PHS access onto Deer Valley Rd
3. Pedestrian Overpass
4. Landscape & Median Island Improvements
5. Parking for PHS
6. Black Mountain Blvd Improvements to Pinnacle Peak Rd
7. Deer Valley Rd Improvements West Leg of Intersection
INITIAL FEEDBACK
AUGUST 2012
PUBLIC OUTREACH

• Alternative 1A
• Traffic Calming Roundabout
• DVR Connection to PHS
• Landscape-Median Improvements
COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

• Project Websites:

  www.blackmountainblvd.com
  http://phoenix.gov/streets/construction/bmb.html

THANK YOU
Desert View

Village Planning Committee

October 2, 2012
INTRODUCTIONS

• Introductions
PROJECT HISTORY

• 1990 – Desert Ridge Specific Plan includes N/S Connector in Master Streets Plan
• 1994 – Added to City of Phoenix Street Classification Map
• 2000 – Ramp Connections to SR51 Designed with SR51/SR101L Interchange Project
• 2004 – Funding for BMB (SR51/SR101L Interchange to Deer Valley Road) Approved by Voters (Prop 400)
• 2006 – Preliminary Engineering Scoping Report Prepared for BMB (SR51/SR101L to Deer Valley Road)
• 2011 – Prop 400 Federal-Aid Funding Authorized for Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Study
WHY DO THE PROJECT

• Provide Direct Access to SR51
• Reduce Congestion by Improving Routes and Local Street Network
• Reduce Commuter Travel Trip Time
• Accommodate Projected Population and Employment Growth
EFFORTS COMPLETED TO DATE

• Extensive Public & Agency Involvement
  – Community & HOA Meetings – 2011 & 2012
  – Public Scoping Meetings – January 2012
  – Public Workshops – March/April 2012
  – Project Stakeholder Meetings –
    January/March/August 2012
  – Public Open House – August 2012
  – Desert View Village Planning Committee –
    December 2011 & October 2012
EFFORTS COMPLETED TO DATE

• Environmental Analyses
  – Biological Resources
  – Cultural Resources
  – Noise & Air Quality
  – Land Use
  – Hazardous Materials
  – Clean Water Act
  – Social Economic

• Preliminary Engineering

• Alternatives Analysis
## EVALUATION MATRIX SUMMARY - SR 51 TO DEER VALLEY ROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Importance Factor</th>
<th>ALT 1 (original 1999 AECOM concept)</th>
<th>ALT 1a (original concept with 30-40 mph northbound and 45 mph southbound radii and considers traffic calming)</th>
<th>ALT 2 (resembles a half-diamond TI and considers traffic calming)</th>
<th>ALT 3 (west of PHS and incorporating 32nd Street alignment)</th>
<th>ALT 4 (no SR 51 ramp connections to BMB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>Considered but eliminated from further study</td>
<td>Considered for further study</td>
<td>Considered for further study</td>
<td>Considered but eliminated from further study</td>
<td>Considered for further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorist Safety</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Input</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Input</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Mobility/Linkage to Arterial &amp; Freeway Roadway Systems</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Access</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Phoenix General Plan Consistency</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach 11 Recreation Master Plan Consistency</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLD Development Plans Consistency</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) Resources</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Noise</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Right-of-Way Costs</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment Geometry</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic operations of existing ramps of the SR 51/SR 101L TI</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage (outside of the Reach 11 area)</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage (within the Reach 11 Area)</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Conflicts</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Additional Parking at PHS</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources (floodplains and jurisdictional Waters of the US)</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Continuity and Community Cohesion</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights: Title VI and Environmental Justice</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity to existing or future employment centers</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Considered but eliminated from further study</th>
<th>Considered for further study</th>
<th>Considered for further study</th>
<th>Considered but eliminated from further study</th>
<th>Considered for further study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEGEND:

- **Relative Performance to Evaluation Criteria**
  - Poor: -1
  - Neutral: 0
  - Good: +1

- **Weighting Factor for Each Criteria**
  - More Important: 2x
  - Important: 1x

---

**BLACK MOUNTAIN BOULEVARD**

SR51/Loop 101 Interchange to Cave Creek Road

**IMPROVING COMMUNITY ACCESS**

Page 1 of 1
# Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

## Evaluation Matrix Summary - Deer Valley Road to Cave Creek Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Importance Factor</th>
<th>Alternative 1-N (36th Street alignment from Deer Valley to Pinnacle Peak, and 40th Street alignment from Pinnacle Peak to Cave Creek)</th>
<th>Alternative 2-N (offset 150 feet West of Alternative 1-N alignment between Pinnacle Peak and Cave Creek)</th>
<th>Alternative 3-N (offset 1,320 feet West of Alternative 1-N alignment between Pinnacle Peak and Cave Creek)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>Considered for further study</td>
<td>Considered but eliminated from further study</td>
<td>Considered but eliminated from further study</td>
<td>Considered but eliminated from further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorist Safety</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Input</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Input</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Mobility/Linkage to Arterial &amp; Freeway Roadway Systems</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Access</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Phoenix General Plan Consistency</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach 11 Recreation Master Plan Consistency</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLD Development Plans Consistency</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4F Resources</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Noise</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Right-of-Way Costs</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment Geometry</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic operations of existing ramps of the SR 51/SR 1011 TI</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage (outside of the Reach 11 area)</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage (within the Reach 11 Area)</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Conflicts</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Additional Parking at PHS</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources (Floodplains and jurisdictional Waters of the US)</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Continuity and Community Cohesion</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights: Title VI and Environmental Justice</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity to existing or future employment centers</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>Considered for further study</td>
<td>Considered but eliminated from further study</td>
<td>Considered but eliminated from further study</td>
<td>Considered but eliminated from further study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- Relative Performance to Evaluation Criteria
- Weighting Factor for Each Criteria
  - Poor: -1
  - Neutral: 0
  - Good: +1
  - More Important: 2x
  - Important: 1x

---

**Black Mountain Boulevard**
SR51/Loop 101 Interchange to Cave Creek Road

---

**Improving Community Access**
Page 1 of 1
WHERE ARE WE NOW

- Alternatives Screened for Further Consideration:
  - South of Deer Valley Road
  - North of Deer Valley Road
- Status of Project Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING &amp; ENVIRONMENTAL</th>
<th>FINAL DESIGN</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing (Preferred Alternative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Late 2011 → Early 2013 → Mid 2013 → Early 2014 → 2014
ALTERNATIVES
MOVING FORWARD
(ALT 2)
ALTERNATIVES MOVING FORWARD (ALT 1-N)
ALTERNATIVES MOVING FORWARD (ALT 4 - NO CONNECTION TO SR51)

Black Mountain Blvd will still be built by future development (Deer Valley Road to Cave Creek Road)
POTENTIAL MITIGATION FEATURES

1. Traffic Calming with Access to Future Reach 11 Recreation Area
2. PHS access onto Deer Valley Rd
3. Pedestrian Overpass
4. Parking for PHS
5. Deer Valley Rd Improvements West Leg of Intersection
6. Black Mountain Blvd Improvements to Pinnacle Peak Rd
7. Pedestrian Overpass

BLACK MOUNTAIN BOULEVARD
SR51/Loop 101 Interchange to Cave Creek Road
INITIAL FEEDBACK
AUGUST 2012
PUBLIC OUTREACH

• Alternative 1A
• Traffic Calming Roundabout
• Deer Valley Road Connection to Pinnacle High School
COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

• Project Websites:

   www.blackmountainblvd.com
   http://phoenix.gov/streets/construction/bmb.html

THANK YOU
Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: 01/03/2012
Meeting Time: 6:00 PM
Location: Phoenix Fire Station #52, 21,650 N. Tatum Blvd., Phoenix, AZ 85050
Subject: Tatum Highlands HOA – Q&A
Attendees: Members of the HOA Board
D2 Councilperson
City of Phoenix Project Manager
AZTEC
KDA Creative

Comments/Questions from the HOA Board & Answers/Responses

Q: Is it true that the City is in negotiations with the owner of the equestrian property to acquire right-of-way for BMB?
A: Talks with this landowner have been initiated, but no final outcome or decision has been made regarding the alignment at the location of the equestrian property.

Q: What will the configuration of BMB be when it is finished?
A: Three lanes in each direction with a raised median. There would also be bicycle lanes and sidewalks for non-motorized traffic. This would be the ultimate configuration; there may be segments that are only two lanes in each direction until traffic demand requires the additional third lanes to be constructed.

Q: Is the jog to the east depicted on preliminary alignments necessary to avoid the dam?
A: Yes.

Q: What will happen at major intersections to control traffic as BMB is constructed to the north?
A: All four legs of intersections will be signalized to control traffic.

Q: Will Sonoran Boulevard meet with the northern terminus of the BMB project at Cave Creek Road?
A: Yes, Sonoran Boulevard is currently under construction and will intersect Cave Creek Road at the north BMB study limit.

Q: Will BMB be constructed of asphalt?
A: Yes.

Q: What will the speed limit be on BMB?
A: 45 m.p.h.

Q: Will the BMB project cause changes to zoning?
A: The BMB project is not intended to directly cause zoning changes, although changes could occur as a result of the project.
Q: **Will walls be constructed to address increased traffic noise?**  
A: Future traffic noise levels will be modeled as part of the environmental study to determine if walls are warranted. This aspect of the study will occur this summer.

Q: *Prior to the collapse of the housing market, 40th Street was planned as an arterial street in the vicinity of the current study area.*  
A: Noted.

Q: **Preservation of the viewshed is important to the community.**  
A: Noted. These impacts will be considered in the selection of the preferred alternative.

Q: **Will the planning of the BMB project take into consideration that other arterial streets, such as Happy Valley Road, will be improved within the BMB study area?**  
A: Yes, the traffic study will consider these other arterial improvements and their influence on the regional traffic demands and patterns.