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## INTRODUCTION

The Piestewa Peak Freeway Specific Plan is a policy plan which addresses the impacts of the freeway on adjacent neighborhoods. The plan proposes ways to maximize the compatibility of the freeway with adjacent and nearby land uses. The plan will be a guide for the City Council and the community, encouraging neighborhood cohesion and stability.

## A. CITY OF PHOENIX FREEWAY MITIGATION POLICY

The Piestewa Peak Freeway Specific Plan helps implement the City Council's adopted policy for expenditure of Freeway Mitigation bond funds. Council's adopted policy requires that freeway mitigation projects be identified in a City Council adopted Specific Plan. Council adopted, at their June 27, 1989 meeting, criteria for the use of Freeway Mitigation funds.

The Piestewa Peak Freeway Specific Plan is a non-regulatory plan which makes recommendations to improve freeway/land use compatibility in accordance with these adopted criteria. These recommendations take the form of action statements which describe what should be accomplished at specific locations. Where the City of Phoenix can more directly implement the action to mitigate (make less severe) the freeway's effects, mitigation program charts are included. These charts describe: specific action steps; estimated schedules; and management responsibilities listing the lead agency before the other assisting agencies.

Where measures require City of Phoenix funds, those costs are described in Chapter XI, Summary of Mitigation Measures With Estimated Costs (1991 dollars) to the City. City of Phoenix mitigation funds may be used to improve freeway/land use compatibility within the designated freeway corridor.

## B. GEOGRAPHIC AREA OF FREEWAY CORRIDOR

This plan covers the Piestewa Peak Freeway Corridor from Glendale Avenue to the future Pima Freeway (Outer Loop), near Beardsley Road, a distance of 10.2 miles. A vicinity map is shown in Figure 1 and a designated corridor map in Figure 2. The half-mile wide freeway planning corridor passes through four urban villages. It begins in the Camelback East Village at Glendale Avenue, goes into the North Mountain Village, then crosses Paradise Valley Village. The final two-thirds of a mile, after crossing the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal, lies within the Desert View Tri-Villages. South of this study area, from Glendale Avenue south to Interstate 10, a separate plan, the Piestewa Peak Parkway Specific Plan, was adopted by City Council June 20, 1990.

## C. GENERAL GOALS

The basic purpose of the Piestewa Peak Freeway Specific Plan is to enhance the compatibility of the freeway with adjacent land uses and to preserve residential neighborhoods. The plan accomplishes this by helping to fulfill many General Plan goals and policies dealing with: quality of life; neighborhood stability and enhancement; noise abatement; effective circulation; recreation trail and bicycle path continuity; safety; and compatibility of land uses.

Additional goals of the Piestewa Peak Freeway Specific Plan include:

- Reduce harmful effects of the freeway on residential neighborhoods from noise, changed street patterns, increased traffic, and loss of privacy.
- Preserve and protect residential neighborhoods.
- Devise a pattern of land uses and streets that will be stable and workable in the presence of the freeway.
- Continue the existing recreational trail and bicycle path network as much as possible along the route of the freeway using freeway rights-of-way wherever possible.
- Coordinate extensively with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) who is designing and constructing the freeway. See ADOT's letter dated May 22, 1991 in the Appendix. This explains how ADOT views this adopted plan. Intergovernmental agreements with ADOT should be used extensively to effect implementation projects.
- Retain the Paradise Valley Village Core as the commercial/office center of the village by discouraging inappropriate increases in land use intensity along the freeway corridor.
- Encourage economic development opportunities which are consistent with neighborhood compatibility and the General Plan.


FIGURE 1
VICINITY MAP


FIGURE 2
PIESTEWA PEAK FREEWAY PLAN BOUNDARIES AND SEGMENTS

## BACKGROUND

## A. HISTORY OF THE FREEWAY PLAN

In 1960 a major street and highway plan for the Phoenix urban area was prepared by the consulting firm, Wilbur Smith and Associates. This plan proposed a metropolitan system of freeways similar to the Maricopa Association of Governments' and ADOT's current overall plan. That plan showed a freeway along the current Piestewa Peak route as far north as Thunderbird Road. The plan was supported by the federal, state, and local governments.

By 1980, the plan had been amended several times. One deletion depicted the Piestewa Peak along its current alignment through the Dreamy Draw, but ending at Shea Boulevard somewhere between 32nd and 40th Streets. However, in 1982 the State deleted the entire Piestewa Peak Freeway from the State Highway System. The Piestewa Peak did remain on the adopted regional MAG Transportation System Plan.

As a result of this deletion, the Phoenix City Council appointed a committee which undertook a study which concluded that a road following the Piestewa Peak alignment was essential. Subsequently, the City of Phoenix voters approved bonding to finance the Piestewa Peak Parkway between the Interstate 10 alignment and Glendale Avenue. In 1983, at a projected cost of more than $\$ 150$ million, Phoenix began building the Piestewa Peak Parkway to extend only to Glendale Avenue.

By 1984 traffic congestion had become a critical regional issue. After being lobbied by several groups, the state legislature passed a bill in May 1985 that allowed a referendum on freeway funding in Maricopa County. This referendum, whether to fund a county freeway system by raising the County sales tax rate by one-half cent for twenty years, went to a vote in October 1985. It passed with a decisive "yes" vote of seventy-two percent. It was expected to raise between five and six billion dollars, although revenues are now running below that estimate. All but a few million dollars, allocated for county-wide regional public transit planning and operations, was to pay for a regional system of freeways as delineated on the ballot. The Piestewa Peak was one of those freeways, extending from Glendale Avenue to the Pima Freeway (Outer Loop). The Piestewa Peak north of Glendale was placed on the State Highway system in 1985.

ADOT later hired the engineering firm of Michael Baker Jr., Inc. to prepare a General Plan for the freeway. Their preliminary design plans, completed in the fall of 1989, were used extensively in the formation of this specific plan and in meeting with the public.

## B. PIESTEWA PEAK EXTENSION CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The City Council appointed an advisory committee, the Piestewa Peak Extension Citizens' Advisory Committee, in July 1985. Their mission was to obtain input from the public on the freeway alignment between Glendale Avenue and the Pima Freeway and to recommend an alignment and basic design features to the City Council.

After many public meetings and two public forums, the Committee published its report to the Council on May 7, 1987. They recommended the alignment now adopted for the freeway. There were seventeen design recommendations in their report. Most of them were accepted by the City Council, and later by ADOT and the State Transportation Board. Some of the more significant recommendations were:

- Include partial interchanges south of Shea Boulevard, namely to and from the north at 32nd Street, and to and from the south at 26th Street. (The connection from the south to 26th Street was later deleted to reduce traffic into the residential neighborhoods north of the freeway's future connection to 26th Street.)
- Build full interchanges at major streets every mile and design these interchanges and the connecting streets to operate at level of service " D " or better.
- Devise a land use plan to mitigate the negative effects of the freeway on the surrounding neighborhood and community at large.


## C. FREEWAY MITIGATION FUNDS

The voters of Phoenix approved a freeway mitigation bond issue program in April 1988. In Proposition 17 was a proposal for eighteen million dollars for "freeway mitigation" to lessen the freeway's impact on adjacent neighborhoods and prevent any spread of slums or blighted areas.

Mitigation funds are limited, and much of the actual freeway construction will not take place until after 1997 which is the conclusion of this bond program. Therefore, staff recommends that projects in this plan be funded from this bond program only if they are on portions of the freeway to be completed by 1997. The balance of projects would be funded by future mitigation bonds, if approved. In this way, the bond program can have the maximum effect for those neighborhoods to be affected first by the freeway.

## D. PLAN INITIATION

The Phoenix Planning Commission initiated two specific plans to cover the Piestewa Peak Transportation Corridor at their September 14, 1988 meeting. The Piestewa Peak Parkway Specific Plan (adopted by City Council June 20, 1990) was to address the freeway corridor between Interstate 10 (Papago Freeway) and Glendale Avenue. The Piestewa Peak Freeway Specific Plan (this plan) would address the remainder of the freeway corridor between Glendale Avenue and the future Outer Loop (Pima Freeway).

## E. PIESTEWA PEAK EXTENSION DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

The City Council appointed another advisory committee, the Piestewa Peak Extension Design Review Committee (SPEDRC), in May 1988. Their mission was to study and make recommendations on the design of the freeway, adjacent land uses, and mitigation issues. This committee met between June of 1988 and June of 1990 when they completed their review and recommendations.

The committee presented twenty-four specific freeway design recommendations to the City Council in May of 1989. The City Council and City Staff were in agreement with almost all of the recommendations made by SPEDRC. SPEDRC land use and mitigation recommendations were also used as input by staff in preparing this plan.

## F. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Public involvement in the Piestewa Peak Freeway Specific Plan has been extensive. The zoning ordinance requires that at least two public meetings be held from plan initiation to completion. Since the first required public meeting on November 3, 1988, there have been:

- Dozens of meetings of the Piestewa Peak Extension Design Review Committee with an average public attendance of approximately thirty persons.
- A special meeting in July 1989 to discuss the 32nd Street slip ramp to Northern Avenue, a halfdiamond interchange at 26th Street, and design options for the drainage channel between Shea Boulevard and Sweetwater Avenue. Three to four hundred people attended this meeting.
- Four open house sessions in April 1990. Each covered a different segment of the freeway and lasted more than six hours. A cumulative total of about five hundred people attended.
- Hundreds of private meetings and telephone calls between members of the planning staff and citizens.


## LAND USE

## A. INTRODUCTION

The Land Use Element describes existing land uses in the Piestewa Peak Freeway Specific Plan corridor (approximately $1 / 4$ mile on each side of the freeway). The corridor contains largely developed land, with some scattered vacant sites. Between Northern Avenue and 26th Street is the natural desert of the Phoenix Mountain Preserve. Between Shea Boulevard and Greenway Road, the freeway corridor consists of mainly single-family residential neighborhoods. North of Greenway Road, there is more vacant land. North of Bell Road the freeway will be bounded for $3 / 4$ of a mile by a golf course and the Paradise Valley Park. Then it will cross the CAP Canal, the Reach 11 floodway and end at the future Outer Loop (Pima) freeway, where the land is currently vacant. The land use element also makes recommendations for land use changes, due to the estimated impact of the freeway.

## B. OVERALL LAND USE/DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

The freeway will create many new edges and alter neighborhood boundaries. Recognizing this, an important goal is to devise a pattern of land uses that will be stable and workable in the presence of the freeway. Another important goal is to conserve and stabilize residential neighborhoods. Some overall Land Use Policies help to fulfill these two goals as they apply to the entire Piestewa Peak Freeway Corridor. They are as follows:

- Conserve neighborhoods by retaining the pre-freeway land use and zoning patterns in all possible situations. The City of Phoenix will propose an increase in intensity of land use only where it is appropriate and freeway effects cannot be reduced by mitigation efforts. Intensity increases should be considered only after ADOT's pre-construction land acquisition.
- The City of Phoenix will consider buying houses with freeway mitigation funds only when they are in a permanently untenable situation (as determined by the Phoenix City Council).
- Existing and proposed express bus routes along the Piestewa Peak Freeway make the corridor a potential location for park-n-ride lots.
- As conditions of rezoning or site plan/subdivision plat approval, all new developments adjacent to the freeway should be required to use features in their site plans and building designs that will mitigate noise and reduce other harmful effects of the freeway. These features may include:

1. Siting buildings and outdoor living areas as far from the freeway as possible.
2. Utilizing landscaping, walls and fences, elevation differences, and so on to screen the freeway from view and attenuate noise.
3. Designing buildings to have fewer, smaller windows facing the freeway and use double-glazed windows, extra insulation, and solid exterior doors to reduce noise from the freeway.

- Designate parcels purchased by ADOT, but not needed for construction, for uses to buffer the freeway impact on residential neighborhoods. These remnant parcels usually fall into one of four categories:

1. ADOT may dedicate some remnant parcels for additional parkland.
2. Small remnant parcels contiguous to access control to be used for trails, paths or landscaping. Some parcels, or portions of parcels in categories 3 or 4 may also be set aside to ensure continuity of recreational trails and bicycle paths.
3. Parcels which ADOT will sell for development.
4. Small remnant parcels contiguous to larger lots. The City may purchase some of these parcels from ADOT and offer to sell them to owners of the larger contiguous lots in accordance with the following process:

As ADOT completes roadway construction and landscape design for each segment, initiate this chart.

|  | ACTION | ESTIMATED <br> SCHEDULE | MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. | Approach property owners to determine their interest in purchasing contiguous remnant parcels | 1 month | Real Estate/Planning |
| b. | City of Phoenix sends letter to ADOT expressing interest in purchasing specific remnant parcels | 1 month | Real Estate/Planning |
| c. | Land appraisals completed by ADOT and City of Phoenix | 2 months | Real Estate/Planning , |
| d. | City of Phoenix and ADOT agree on value and ADOT does legal descriptions, including any needed easements | 4 months | Real Estate/Planning |
| e. | City of Phoenix notifies property owners of price of land. If property owner agrees in writing to purchase, proceed with next step | 2 months | Real Estate/Planning |
| f. | ADOT drafts a purchase agreement with Phoenix, all remnant(s) enter into escrow | 2 months | Real Estate/Planning |
| g. | ADOT signs a Quit Claim Deed | 1 month | Real Estate/Planning |
| h. | Escrow closes, City of Phoenix pays price of land to ADOT and ADOT trasnfers land to City of Phoenix | 1 month | Real Estate/Planning |
| i. | City of Phoenix sells parcel(s) to contiguous property owner(s) at agreed-upon price | 1 month | Real Estate/Planning |

## C. ACTION AND MITIGATION FOR SPECIFIC SEGMENTS

The remainder of the land use policies and action statements are grouped by segments. Each segment contains approximately a one-mile length of the half-mile wide freeway corridor.

## Segment 1

## Glendale Avenue to Northern Avenue (Figure 3)

This segment consists mostly of single-family homes. Sumida Park is on the east side of 17th Street between Northview and Gardenia Avenues and there are apartments between Gardenia and Morten Avenues. East of the freeway for about three-fourths of a mile north of Glendale Avenue is predominately single-family housing. Madison Heights Elementary School is at the southwest corner of 22nd Street and Myrtle Avenue, and there is a church at the northeast corner of 21st Street and Lincoln Drive (Glendale Avenue). The Phoenix Mountain Preserve east of the freeway begins north of the single- family housing.

## 1. Glendale Homes: Remove Homes (Alternative A)

If a price acceptable to both the City and the property owners is achieved, purchase the five lots on the north side of Glendale Avenue, between the freeway and 20th Street and remove the two existing homes, Provide a twenty-foot deep landscaped buffer along the north side of Glendale Avenue. Offer to sell the remainder of the land to the adjacent homeowners fronting on Cactus Wren Drive for additions to their backyards.

| ACTION | ESTIMATED <br> SCHEDULE | MANAGEMENT <br> RESPONSIBILITY |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| a.Obtain appraisals, make offers and purchase <br> existing homes | Second Quarter <br> 1991 | Planning/Real Estate |
| b.Discuss City's desire to sell excess land with the <br> owners of lots fronting on Cactus Wren Drive | Fourth Quarter <br> 1991 | Planning/Real Estate |
| c. Contract for home removal and landscape plans | First Quarter <br> 1992 | Planning/Real Estate/ <br> Street Trans. |
| d. Contractor removes homes | Second Quarter <br> 1992 | Real Estate |
| e. Change order for existing landscape contractor | Third Quarter <br> or let new contract for landscape improvements | Planning/Street Trans. |
| f. Contractor installs landscaping | Fourth Quarter | 1992 |

## 1. Glendale Homes - Develop Homes (Alternative B)

If the homeowners to the north, fronting Cactus Wren Drive, do not want the additional property for their lots, then redevelop the purchased area to mitigate the negative impacts and to create useable, liveable properties. Redevelopment would include: rehabilitating the existing homes, adding a third home, providing better driveway access, and adding screen walls and landscaping to buffer the impacts of Glendale Avenue.

| ACTION | ESTIMATED <br> SCHEDULE | MANAGEMENT <br> RESPONSIBILITY |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| a.Analyze alternatives and develop plan for <br> redevelopment | Fourth Quarter <br> 1991 | Planning |
| b. Re-subdivide, if needed | Fourth Quarter <br> 1991 | Planning/Real Estate, |
| c.Use home improvement contracts to rehab <br> existing homes and/or contract with <br> homemovers to move third home to site | First \& Second <br> Quarters 1992 | Real Estate/Planning |
| d. Contractor accomplishes work | Third \& Fourth <br> Quarters 1992 | Planning/Real Estate |
| e. Final inspection of work | Fourth Quarter | Planning/Real Estate |

## 2. Future Residential Office

Allow a transition to residential-scale offices for the land bounded by 17th Street, the freeway right-of-way line, Glendale Avenue and Cactus Wren Drive. This area should develop under unified master site plans with enough lots assembled for viable development. These master plans should reflect the following design considerations:

- Access to the development should only be from Glendale Avenue.
- Ample landscape areas with screen walls along 17th Street and Cactus Wren Drive to buffer the adjacent residential neighborhoods.
- Development of a scale and design to be compatible with the adjacent residential neighborhoods.


## Segment 2

Northern Avenue to 26th Street (Figure 4)
Most of this segment lies in the Phoenix Mountain Preserve, which is a natural boundary between residential areas north and south of it. Within the segment are two churches. There are also two roughly triangular shaped vacant tracts of land on either side of 26th Street on the northwest side of the freeway.

## 1. Uses Near 26th Street

Retain the single-family residential use designation for the vacant tracts of land on the east and west sides of 26th Street on the northwest side of the freeway. Potential uses for this property are residential support uses such as churches (possibly an expansion of the existing churches), a community center or a dependent care center.


| PiESTEimA PEAK FREEWAY FIGURE 3 | LEGEND |  | $W_{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXISTING AND PROPOSED LAND USE | \% \% \% SINGLE FAMILY | \#ixikit PUBUC/QUASI-PUBLC | 1 |
| SEGMENT 1 Glendale Avenue to Northem Avenue | MULTIFAMILY | च-: | $\because$ |



## Segment 3

## 26th Street to Shea Boulevard (Figure 6)

After passing through the mountain preserve the freeway will re-enter developed areas. On the northwest side, the freeway will pass Mercury Mine Elementary School and one-story offices. Then, as the freeway alignment begins turning northward, it goes by a single-family residential subdivision, crosses beneath 32nd Street and goes past a single-family neighborhood to Shea Boulevard. Shea Boulevard and 32nd Street near the intersection are lined with offices and commercial uses.

## 1. Scottsdale Christian Academy Site

This action statement references the former site of the Scottsdale Christian Academy on the northeast corner of 32 nd Street and Mountain View Road. It is recommended that the existing zoning on this parcel be changed to that of a low-density, patio-home district. A narrow strip on the east side of this parcel is presently zoned for single-family residential, but almost three-fourths of this parcel is zoned for commercial use. This zoning allows for general commercial uses such as: restaurants, bars, automobile services, grocery stores, and general retail uses. These types of uses would be incompatible with this otherwise residential area. A low-density, patio-home project at this intersection would be a desireable land use and would help stabilize the edge of the neighborhood. ADOT states they will not oppose a rezoning from a commercial to a residential designation. The conceptual site plan (Figure 5) shows a 4.34 acre development at approximately $10 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$. However, this parcel will most likely not be available for development for several years because of its intended use by ADOT as a construction office site.

| ACTION | ESTIMATED <br> SCHEDULE | MANAGEMENT <br> RESPONSIBILITY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| a.Work with ADOT to request the Planning <br> Commission to initiate a rezoning to R-2 for the <br> site | First Quarter <br> 1993 | Planning |
| b. Process the application and conceptual site plan | Third Quarter <br> 1993 | Planning |



FIGURE 5
MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

## 2. Cheryl Drive Property

Allow the private property bounded by the Cheryl Drive alignment on the north, the freeway on the east and south, and 32nd Street on the west to transition from a single-family residential to a commercial designation. This may be an expansion of the existing commercial development to the north. Only consider this change in conjunction with an overall site plan. If consolidation occurs, the City recommends that ADOT transfer the excess right-of-way to the owners for assemblage.

The City shall consider an offer to purchase only the currently impacted residential property at the SEC of 32nd Street and Gold Dust Avenue. The purchase price shall be determined by an appraisal of the property in its current (July 1991) condition and as a single-family residential unit. The City shall pay only the appraised value of the property and normal purchaser closing costs. All other costs are to be borne by the seller. The City shall consider the purchase of the property only if these conditions are acceptable to the seller.

## 3. The Wedge - Redevelopment Alternative

The City will purchase up to 14 residential lots in the "wedge." The wedge is bounded by the freeway on the east, the Cheryl Drive alignment on the south, and on the north and west by commercial properties fronting Shea Boulevard and 32nd Street. ADOT will reimburse to the City construction savings resulting from the City purchasing the lots. ADOT will give the City the first right of refusal to obtain the excess right-of-way to add to the parcel size.

| ACTION | ESTIMATED <br> SCHEDULE | MANAGEMENT <br> RESPONSIBILITY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| a. Purchase property | Second Quarter <br> 1991 | Planning/Real Estate |
| b.Obtain excess right-of-way from ADOT and <br> make other needed agreements through an <br> IGA | Third Quarter <br> 1991 | Planning |
| c. $\quad$Upon vacation of homes, contract to demolish <br> the existing homes, clear and restore the site | Fourth Quarter <br> 1991 | Planning/Real Estate |
| d. $\quad$Determine a redevelopment and marketing <br> strategy* <br> *(all revenues will be returned to the Freeway <br> Mitigation Fund) | First Quarter <br> 1992 |  <br> Economic <br> Development/Real <br> Estate |

## 4. Uses Near 26th Street

Refer to Segment 2, Action 1, "Uses Near 26th Street" for this land use recommendation.


## Segment 4

## Shea Boulevard to Cactus Road (Figure 9)

This segment consists of mostly single-family residential with some retail commercial and office uses. A neighborhood shopping center in excess of 10 acres occupies the northeast comer of 32nd Street and Shea Boulevard. A large discount department store and a supermarket occupy approximately a 10 -acre site at the southeast corner of 32nd Street and Cactus Road. A four-acre office site lies just east of the freeway on the north side of Shea Boulevard. There are four large vacant tracts and the remainder of this segment is single-family housing.

The general area surrounding the intersection of 32 nd Street and Shea Boulevard is the main retail/office/ employment center in the southwest quadrant of the Paradise Valley Village. All four corners of the 32nd Street/Shea Boulevard intersection make an important contribution to this center. Conduct a marketing study of this general area to facilitate its stabilization and expansion.

The existing development on the northeast corner should be upgraded and expanded to fill the vacant land to the north up to the rear of the lots on the south side of Desert Cove Avenuie. This will help stimulate and preserve the significance of this area.

## 1. Shopping Center and ADOT Land

The City will work with ADOT to give the shopping center owner on the northeast corner of Shea Boulevard and 32nd Street the first right-of-refusal to purchase any excess freeway right-of-way, to the east of the shopping center. Retain adequate right-of-way or easements to ensure the room needed for necessary maintenance and repair of the adjacent drainage channel.

## 2. Shopping Center Expansion

Encourage commercial and office expansion on the remaining vacant land between the shopping center at the northeast corner of 32nd Street and Shea Boulevard, and the single-family lots on the south side of Desert Cove Avenue. Integrate future development on this vacant land with stabilization of the existing commercial center to the south. If viable, multifamily development may also be considered for this vacant land. In either case, attach rezoning and development plan stipulations to adequately buffer the homes on the south side of Desert Cove. (See Figure 7.)

(1) Existing commercial development.
(2) Possible future shared access.

Existing single family residential.

Landscaping and screen wall to buffer project from neighborhood.
(5) Access provided from proposed to existing development.

FIGURE 7
COMMERCIAL OFFICE

## 3. Vacant Land Along 32nd Street, North of Cholla Street

Retain a single-family residential designation on the vacant 16 acres at the northeast corner of $32 n d$ and Cholla Streets. Any future subdivision of this site should be designed with landscaping to buffer the site from traffic on 32nd Street. Patio homes at 4-5 du/ac may also be considered if the residential lots to the east are properly buffered. (See Figure 8.)


FIGURE 8

## SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

## 4. Desert Cove Lots

Encourage single-family residential development on the vacant land on the north side of Desert Cove Avenue, east of 32 nd Street. The density should not exceed that of the existing homes across the street, on the south side of Desert Cove Avenue.
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Segment 5<br>Cactus Road to Thunderbird Road (Figure 11)

Segment 5 consists of mostly single-family homes with extensive park land and two small commercial centers. Roadrunner Park occupies approximately 33 acres on the northwest corner of Cactus Road and 36th Street. Improvements for a long stretch of the Indian Bend Wash are to be designed in 1996-97 and constructed in 1997-98. This stretch of the linear park will run between Sweetwater Avenue and 36th Street to the Thunderbird Road/freeway interchange. A concrete drainage channel empties storm water into the Indian Bend Wash. The channel originates on the south at Shea Boulevard and on the north at Venturoso Park. There is a commercial development at the northeast corner of Cactus Road and 32nd Street, and another at the southeast corner of Thunderbird Road and 32nd Street.

At the time of writing this plan, ADOT is conducting a value engineering study regarding the freeway corridor between Sweetwater Avenue and Acoma Drive or Hearn Road. Changes may be needed to this plan based on the results of that study.

## 1. Indian Bend Wash Development

The City may acquire and develop as park land the vacant land on the northwest corner of Sweetwater Avenue and 36th Street, and on the north side of Sweetwater Avenue between 34th and 35th Streets. These areas are included in the Indian Bend Wash Master Plan.

## 2. Indian Bend Wash Expansion

The City requests that ADOT dedicate any excess freeway right-of-way, outside access control, east of the freeway between Thunderbird Road and where 34th Street is shown to terminate in a cul-de-sac to the City. This land would integrate well with the Indian Bend Wash Linear Park.

|  | ESTIMATED | MANAGEMENT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ACTION | SCHEDULE | RESPONSIBILITY |

a. Arrange for the transfer of ownership of this excess right-of-way from ADOT to the City, through an IGA if needed
b. Amend the Indian Bend Wash Master Plan to include this area
c. Improve when Indian Bend Wash is constructed in this area

First Quarter 1996
(to coincide with freeway construction schedule)

Second and Third Quarter 1996

Time of Park
development
estimated, 1997-98

Real Estate/Parks, Recreation \& Library/ Planning/ADOT

Parks, Recreation \& Library/Planning

Parks, Recreation \& Library

## 3. Residential Office, South Side of Thunderbird Road

Allow the four lots on the southwest corner of Thunderbird Road and the southbound freeway on-ramp (diamond interchange) to transition from single-family residential to residential scale offices. The four lots should be developed under a unified master site plan and lots assembled as required for a viable development. The site could develop, for example, with: one building and one parking area, two buildings and one parking area, or two buildings and two parking areas. The site plan should also show appropriate buffers for the homes to the south. (See Figure 10.)


1 Project utilizes existing homes.
2. Landscaping and screen wall to buffer project from adjacent neighborhood.
(3) Landscape buffer between project and freeway.


## RESIDENTIAL OFFICE
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## Segment 6

Thunderbird Road to Greenway Road (Figure 13)
This area is primarily single-family residential with Venturoso Park at the southeast corner of Acoma Drive and 32nd Street. There is a small commercial center at the northeast corner of Thunderbird Road and 32nd Street, and a utility substation south of the southeast corner of Greenway Road and 33rd Place.

## 1. Residential Office, North Side of Thunderbird Road

Allow the four lots at the northwest corner of Thunderbird Road and the freeway southbound off-ramp to transition from single-family residential to residential office. The offices should be of a residential scale and compatible with the adjacent neighborhood. The four lots should be developed under a unified master site plan and enough lots assembled for a viable development. There should be adequate buffering for the lot to the north and the two lots to the west. (See Figure 12)


FIGURE 12
RESIDENTIAL OFFICE
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## Segment 7

Greenway Road to Bell Road (Figure 15)
Segment 7 contains a variety of land uses including: commercial development; two churches; scattered multifamily residential housing; large areas of vacant land; single-family residential housing; a small office development; a large mobile home park; and other public/quasi-public uses. The 80 -acre mobile home park is bounded by Edna Lane, Paradise Lane, 32nd Street and 36th Street.

## 1. Future Subdivision at Tierra Buena Lane

The City recommends that ADOT sell any excess right-of-way east of the freeway between Tierra Buena Lane and Paradise Lane for development. The developer could subdivide the land for single-family residential lots except for the northern approximate 300 feet which is too narrow for development. The developer could sell this narrow strip to the owner of the land to the east. (See Figure 14)


FIGURE 14
SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
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## Segment 8

## Bell Road to Union Hills Drive (Figure 17)

Segment 8 contains a mix of City park land, a golf course, a single-family residential development, a high school and a small commercial development. Paradise Valley Park and golf course, taken together, comprise over one half of Segment 8 . About $1 / 3$ of the remaining land is occupied by the Paradise Valley High School, with the other $2 / 3$ in single-family residential development. A small 3 -acre commercial development is on the northeast corner of Bell Road and 34th Way.

## 1. Potential Park Expansion

City Parks, Recreation and Library Department will consider purchasing the vacant land between the freeway and the Paradise Valley Park/Community Center.

## 2. Future Office Development Contiguous to High School

This action statement refers to vacant land, zoned multifamily residential between the high school and the future freeway. The City recommends a transition from a multifamily land use designation to an office land use designation to match that along Bell Road for that portion outside the freeway. (See Figure 16)


FIGURE 16
COMMERCIAL OFFICE
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## Segment 9

Union Hills Drive to the Outer Loop (Figure 19)
Segment 9 is divided into two different areas by the Central Arizona Project (CAP) Canal. South of the canal and west of the freeway are subdivisions approximately 70 percent built out, and a private club. South of the canal and east of the freeway is vacant, potentially developable land. North of the CAP is the Reach 11 drainage area and native desert land. Any development in Segment 9 should take place with appropriate allowance for the Probable Maximum Flood and the 100-year flood plain limits.

## 1. Equestrian Lots at Union Hills Drive and Freeway

Develop the vacant area bounded by the CAP canal, Union Hills Drive, the freeway and 40th Street into large lot (0-2 du/ac) subdivisions. These lots could have horse privileges. (See Figure 18)

## 2. Proposed Land Use Within Reach 11

Development between the Central Arizona Project Canal and the future Outer Loop (Pima) Freeway should reflect the adopted General Plan for Peripheral Areas $C$ and D. Retain the land between the CAP (Bureau of Reclamation) property line and the CAP Canal, as a Bureau of Reclamation Flood Plain/ Detention Basin and Reach 11 District Park.

## 3. Proposed Land Uses North of the CAP/Bureau of Reclamation Land

Consider the land between the CAP property line and the Outer Loop for "mixed use" as defined in the Area C and D Plan.


FIGURE 18
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## CIRCULATION

## A. INTRODUCTION

The Circulation Element addresses issues resulting from major traffic changes caused by the construction of the Piestewa Peak Freeway. The freeway will help reduce traffic volumes on arterial streets and shorten many travel times in northeast Phoenix. However, many neighborhoods will be divided by the freeway and east/west streets will be terminated. As a result there will be changes in access to neighborhoods, in travel patterns on collector and major streets, and possible new cut through traffic situations.

## B. OVERALL CIRCULATION POLICIES

The plan's goal is a safe and effective circulation system which minimizes as much as possible the freeway's impact on adjacent neighborhoods. To achieve this goal some overall circulation policies apply to the entire Piestewa Peak Freeway Corridor.

- Assure suitable access and maneuvering room for public safety and refuse collection vehicles.
- Street and alley terminations must meet City standards and maintain neighborhood circulation as much as possible.
- Assure safety and convenience in the design of pedestrian/bicycle crossings and include adequate handicapped access.
- Use loop streets, when possible, to preserve ease of access and internal neighborhood circulation where the freeway has bisected local east/west streets. The City of Phoenix and ADOT worked closely in planning the location of loop roads. Create cul-de-sac streets no more than 400 feet beyond an intersection.
- Provide adequate neighborhood circulation while discouraging cut-through traffic.
- Coordinate scheduling all needed traffic measures into the City's six-year major street program.
- Existing and proposed express bus routes along the Piestewa Peak Freeway makes the freeway corridor a desirable location for park-n-ride lots. The general vicinity of Shea Boulevard and 32nd Street and Bell Road and 36th Street are areas to be investigated further, through alternatives by the City of Phoenix Public Transit Department.
- The City recommends that ADOT replace street lights removed due to freeway construction, as needed, to illuminate streets, sidewalks, parks and neighborhoods to current City standards.


## C. ACTION AND MITIGATION FOR SPECIFIC SEGMENTS

The freeway corridor is discussed by segments of approximately one mile. Continuing an evaluation by freeway segments, following are the proposals for each:

## Segment 1

Glendale Avenue to Northern Avenue (Figure 20)

## 1. Glendale Avenue/16th Street Intersection

The City Street Transportation Department will investigate measures to improve traffic operation at the intersection of Glendale Avenue and 16th Street. Some local residents stated during the plan's public participation process that left turns are difficult because of long lines of vehicles during rush hours.

## 2. Lincoln Drive/22nd Street Intersection

The City Street Transportation Department will investigate measures to improve traffic operation at the intersection of Lincoln Drive and 22nd Street. Some local residents stated during the plan's public participation process that they thought the left-turn arrow was not long enough.

## 3. Aurelius Avenue and 20th Street Circulation

The City of Phoenix will improve traffic access to 22 nd Street in the vicinity of Aurelius Avenue and 20th Street by connecting nearby streets. Alternative A is to extend Aurelius Avenue from where it dead ends at 20th Street to where it dead ends at 21st Street. Alternative B is to extend 19th Street from where it dead ends at Aurelius Avenue to connect to Myrtle Avenue. Alternative C is to extend 20th Street north to intersect with Myrtle Avenue. The selected alternative for this connection shall be made after evaluation of each of the three alternatives by interested neighborhood residents and the affected school district.

| ACTION | ESTIMATED SCHEDULE | MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Study the costs/benefits of each of the alternatives | Fourth Quarter 1991 | Planning/Real Estate/ StreetTransportation |
| b. Meet with interested parties to obtain input on the desired alternative | First Quarter 1992 | Planning |
| c. Notify property owners of intent to purchase additional right-of-way | Third Quarter 1992 | Planning/Real Estate/ Street Transportation |
| d. Coordinate improvements with COP departments | First Quarter 1993 | Planning/Street Transportation |
| e. Design and construct improvements | Fourth Quarter 1993 | Street Transportation |

## 4. Glendale Avenue Homes/20th Street to Freeway

The City of Phoenix will offer to purchase the homes and residential lots on the north side of Glendale Avenue between the freeway and 20th Street at appraised market value and redevelop according to Alternative A or B . Both alternatives are explained in greater detail in the Land Use Element.

Alternative A is to remove the existing homes, landscape a 20 -foot strip along Glendale Avenue, sell the remaining land to the respective owners to the north, and encourage them to fence it in. There are no circulation changes needed for Alternative A. The land use mitigation chart is in the Land Use Element, Segment 1, Action 1-Alternative A.

Alternative $B$ is to continue to use the land north of Glendale Avenue between the freeway and 20th Street for single-family residential uses. The existing homes may be retained or removed, but in any case these five lots would probably be developed with three homes. A driveway would be extended south from the Cactus Wren Drive/19th Street intersection to provide improved access for the home on the northeast corner of the freeway and Glendale Avenue. A "T" driveway would be built for the homes nearer 20th Street to preclude having to back out onto Glendale Avenue.

The City of Phoenix will construct these traffic improvements to improve safety and convenience of access. These driveway improvements should be coordinated with the redevelopment to continue single-family uses as described in the Land Use Element, Segment 1, Action 1, Alternative B.

## Segment 2

Northern Avenue to 26th Street (Figure 21)

## 1. Paradise Valley Access Relief Road

ADOT will recontour and revegetate the Paradise Valley Access Relief Road at their expense, consistent with their commitment to the Parks, Recreation and Library Department, and conform with approved Dreamy Draw Bikeway Plans.
2. Dreamy Draw Park Access

Northern Avenue east of the freeway will serve as part of the access road to the Dreamy Draw Park.



## Segment 3

26th Street to Shea Boulevard (Figure 24)

## 1. Frontage Road Connection at 32nd Street

ADOT will connect 32nd Street and 26th Street with a freeway frontage road which will continue past 26th Street to merge with the southbound freeway lane. This frontage road will make a direct connection off of 32nd Street. (See Figure 22.)

ADOT will construct an additional access point between the existing frontage road and the new Northern Avenue frontage road.

FREEWAY FRONTAGE ROAD 32nd STREET TO 26th STREET

FIGURE 22

## 2. Cheryl Drive Connection

Extend Cheryl Drive on the east side of 32nd Street to provide access to the southern end of the "wedge". Retain Thirty-third Street south from Shea Boulevard to the rear of the adjacent commercial properties to provide access to the northern end of the "wedge". ADOT will acquire the right-of-way for the new Cheryl Drive alignment. The City of Phoenix will assist ADOT in negotiations for this acquisition. Upon completion of this alignment, Gold Dust Avenue may be abandoned to assist in any land assemblage. (See Figure 23.)

| ACTION | ESTIMATED <br> SCHEDULE | MANAGEMENT <br> RESPONSIBILITY |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| a. Work with ADOT and the adjacent property |  |  |
| owners to secure the alignment for Cheryl <br> Drive and abandon Gold Dust Avenue | Third Quarter <br> b. Coordinate improvements with appropriate <br> departments | First Quarter <br> 1992 |
| c. Design and construct improvements | In conjunction with <br> freeway design and <br> construction | Street Transportation/ |
| ADOT |  |  |



FIGURE 23

## 3. "Wedge" Street Abandonments

The City of Phoenix will abandon all streets but the north and south ends of 33rd Street in "the wedge." The "wedge" is bounded by the freeway on the east, by the Cheryl Drive alignment on the south, and by commercial properties (which front Shea Boulevard and 32nd Street) on the north and west.

## 4. Intersection of Mountain View Road and 32nd Street

The Street Transportation Department will monitor traffic operations at the intersection of Mountain View Road and 32nd Street, to ensure proper operation of this intersection after the freeway is constructed.


## Segment 4

Shea Boulevard to Cactus Road (Figure 25)

## 1. Cholla Street - Traffic Conditions

The City of Phoenix will monitor traffic conditions along Cholla Street east and west of the freeway (after construction).

## 2. Shea Boulevard Traffic Study

Conduct a study of the impacts and benefits of widening Shea Boulevard between 34th and 40th Streets to six lanes.

## Segment 5

Cactus Road to Thunderbird Road (Figure 26)

## 1. Sweetwater Avenue - Traffic Conditions

The City of Phoenix will monitor traffic conditions along Sweetwater Avenue east and west of the freeway (after construction).

## 2. Neighborhood Connections to Sweetwater Avenue

ADOT will connect the east end of Captain Dreyfus Avenue to Sweetwater Avenue to the south. The City of Phoenix Planning Department will survey the residential property owners in the area to see if they desire an additional street connection to Sweetwater Avenue.

## 3. Future Abandonment of a Portion of 35th Street

The Parks, Recreation and Library Department and the Street Transportation Department will consider abandoning 35th Street between Sweetwater Avenue and a point approximately 650 feet north of Sweetwater Avenue. This may take place in conjunction with the future construction (scheduled 1997-98) of the Indian Bend Wash Linear Park in this location.

## Segment 6

Thunderbird Road to Greenway Road (Figure 27)

## 1. Hearn Road Abandonment

The City of Phoenix will abandon Hearn Road between 34th Street and the Freeway, and add the land to Venturoso Park.

## Segment 7

Greenway Road to Bell Road (No Map)
No circulation mitigation measures proposed.

## Segment 8

Bell Road to Union Hills Drive (No Map)
No circulation mitigation measures proposed.

## Segment 9

Union Hills Drive to the Future Outer-Loop Freeway (No Map)
No circulation mitigation measures proposed.
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## RECREATIONAL TRAILS AND BICYCLE PATHS

## A. INTRODUCTION

The Trail Element locates and describes bicycle paths, recreational trails and pedestrian crossings along the Piestewa Peak Freeway. The trails and paths, with one minor exception discussed in Segment 6, are consistent with the adopted Phoenix Bikeway System, and the plans of the City of Phoenix Parks, Recreation and Library Department. The General Plan for Phoenix 1985-2000 contains many policies in support of bicycle paths and recreational trails.

Bicycle paths help to achieve important objectives. When commuters use bicycles to travel to and from work, they also help to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality. This plan proposes a continuity of bike paths which is important to both the commuter bicyclist and the recreational rider.

Recreational trails are an important part of the City's recreation system. Recreational trails can accommodate horseback riding, hiking, running and mountain biking. This plan proposes a recreational trail system that connects several open space and recreation areas and ensures trail continuity adjacent to the Piestewa Peak Freeway.

ADOT will construct bike paths and recreational trails in accordance with two letters of agreement (see copies in Appendix). The first is a December 13, 1989 letter from Charles L. Miller, former Director of ADOT, to Marvin A. Andrews, former Phoenix City Manager. The second is a December 22, 1989 letter from Rosendo Gutierrez, ADOT Urban Highway Engineer, to James H. Matteson, Phoenix Street Transportation Director.

## B. OVERALL TRAIL/PATH POLICIES

Some overall policies apply to the entire Piestewa Peak Freeway. The goal is to continue trails through the freeway corridor and integrate with trail systems along the length of the corridor. Policies to help achieve this goal are:

- ADOT will fund construction of designated bike paths and recreational trails outside of the access control but within ADOT right-of-way for the Piestewa Peak Freeway. The City recommends that ADOT's responsibilities include, but not be limited to, paths/trails, grade separated crossings, signs, signals, lighting, and connections to adjacent local streets.
- Provide safe crossings of major streets for the bicycle paths and recreational trails at freeway interchanges.
- As conditions of rezoning or site plan/subdivision plat approval, require new development to construct any adjacent bike paths/ways and recreational trails not developed by ADOT and ensure continuity through new or redeveloped areas.
- Install adequate lighting in accordance with widely accepted standards along all trails and paths. Where recreational trails, bike paths or bike lanes are on, or adjacent to City streets additional lighting may not be required. Underpasses will be lighted 24 hours a day with high pressure sodium lighting.
- Trails for horses and bicycle paths will be separated wherever possible.
- Use freeway right-of-way for needed recreational trails and bicycle paths, whenever possible.
- Design and construct recreational trails and bicycle paths in accordance with widely accepted standards. Provide measures to preclude access, as much as possible, to unauthorized vehicles.
- Make appropriate connections, where needed, between adjacent local streets and adjacent bike paths.
- After the City accepts the bicycle path and recreational trail system from ADOT as complete, the City will maintain that system.


## C. ACTION AND MITIGATION FOR SPECIFIC SEGMENTS

## Segment 1

## Glendale Avenue to Northern Avenue (Figure 28)

## 1. Underpass/Bridge Network at Glendale Avenue and 17th Street

The City of Phoenix will make needed improvements to ensure a safe and effective bicycle/pedestrian/ equestrian crossing at Glendale Avenue. Although lying west of the plan boundary, this connection is necessary to ensure continuity of the trail which parallels the freeway, as a crossing of Glendale at the freeway is not feasible. Enlarge and improve the existing equestrian tunnel and ramps under Glendale Avenue at the Arizona Canal to properly accommodate bicycle, equestrian and pedestrian traffic. Locate bicycle path/recreational trail bridges on the north side of Glendale Avenue over the Arizona Canal and the Arizona Canal Diversion Channel. This will allow bicycle/pedestrian traffic to access the bikeway on 17th Street (Dreamy Draw Drive).

| ACTION | ESTIMATED <br> SCHEDULE | MANAGEMENT <br> RESPONSIBILITY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| a. Move used pedestrian canal bridges to Glendale <br> Avenue and 17th Street | Third Quarter <br> 1991 | Engineering/Planning/ <br> Street Transportation/ <br> Parks, Recreation and <br> Library |
| b.Prepare plans for tunnel improvements, bridge <br> supports and railings | Fourth Quarter <br> 1991 | Street Transportation/ <br> Planning/Parks, |
| c. Select a contractor and follow-up on the project |  |  |
| to completion | First Quarter | 1992 |

## 2. Horse Loading/Unloading Area

ADOT will build a decomposed granite loading/unloading area for horses at the west entrance to the equestrian tunnel under the freeway at Myrtle Avenue. They will also build a parking area south of the tunnel entrance. Rolled curbs will be added to the cul-de-sac at the end of Myrtle Avenue to permit additional parking. After construction ADOT will transfer the Myrtle Avenue equestrian tunnel and parking area to the City to maintain. This facility will tie into the overall trail system.

| ACTION | ESTIMATED <br> SCHEDULE | MANAGEMENT <br> RESPONSIBILITY |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| a.Construct the parking area (tunnel already <br> constructed) | First Quarter <br> 1991 | ADOT/Parks, <br> Recreation and Library |
| b. Maintenance responsibility is identified by a |  |  |
| Master Maintenance Agreement |  |  |

## 3. Bike Path Overpass

The City of Phoenix will construct a bike path overpass over the Northern Avenue southbound freeway on ramp. The bike trail will enter the Mountain Preserve from the west side of the freeway by travelling along the south side of Northern through the Northern interchange. The free right turn onto the southbound freeway ramp poses a safety concern for bicyclists crossing the ramp. The bike overpass will use existing berming on the freeway and along Dreamy Draw Drive to minimize visibility to adjoining neighborhoods.

| ACTION | ESTIMATED <br> SCHEDULE | MANAGEMENT <br> RESPONSIBILITY |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| a. Develop an RFP for the overpass design | Fourth Quarter |  |
| b. Select a bridge designer |  | Engineering/Street <br> Transportation/Parks, <br> Recreation and Library/ <br> Planning |
| c. Select a contractor and follow up until project | First Quarter |  |
| completion | Third Quarter | 1992 |



## Segment 2

## Northern Avenue to 26th Street (Figure 29)

Segment 2 Map shows the approximate location of the future bike path and recreational trails going through the Phoenix Mountain Preserve. The bike path will swing to the north to enter the freeway right-of-way approximately 1,000 feet south of the partial interchange at 26th Street.

The City of Phoenix Parks, Recreation and Library Department will pay for the design and construction of the bike path through the Dreamy Draw. ADOT will recontour and revegetate the PVARR at their expense, consistent with their commitment to the Parks, Recreation and Library Department, and will conform with approved Dreamy Draw Bikeway Plans.

## Segment 3

26th Street to Shea Boulevard (Figure 30)
ADOT will construct a pedestrian bridge for the Mercury Mine School over the freeway at approximately 29th Street. The bridge will be a distinctive gateway marker noting entrance into the Paradise Valley Village. It will be constructed in conjunction with the freeway at this location. ADOT will install a privacy wall for the two homes backing onto the south side of the freeway and nearest the bridge. ADOT will also construct a sidewalk along the northeast property line of the lot at 2836 East Malapai to continue pedestrian access to 29th Street.

ADOT will make a bike path connection from the northwest end of the new Mercury Mine Bridge to the school's entrance sidewalk. The City Parks, Recreation and Library Department will continue the bike path southwest from that point.

Additionally, great care should be taken to make a safe transition from the bike path ending on the west side of 32nd Street to the Mountain View Road Bikeway.

## Segment 4

Shea Boulevard to Cactus Road (Figure 31)
No freeway/trail-related mitigation measures are needed. There will be bikeways on 36th Street between Mountain View Road and Greenway Road and on Cholla Street between 32nd Street and 36th Street.

## Segment 5

## Cactus Road to Thunderbird Road (Figure 32)

Bicycle path and recreational trail configurations in Segment 5 and 6 will be in accordance with the Indian Bend Wash Master Plan. At the time of this writing a value engineering study is being conducted regarding the Thunderbird Road/Freeway interchange and adjacent areas. The recommendations for Segments 5 and 6 may need to be updated to reflect the results of that study.

Continue the Indian Bend Wash recreation trails underneath the freeway at Thunderbird Road in a smooth transition to Venturoso Park. Ensure the following connections where the freeway, Thunderbird Road, and Indian Bend Wash come together:

- Provide bike path and recreational trail access to both sides of the channel south of Thunderbird Road, and separate trails from the drainage facility unless the drainage facility is maintained at grade.
- The trails will continue along Indian Bend Wash, underneath the freeway and Thunderbird Road on the east side of the freeway.
- Provide a 35 -foot wide graded area for trails on each side of Thunderbird Road as it passes under the freeway.
- If possible provide for a linear view corridor under the freeway bridge by lengthening the bridge and constructing the support columns on a skew angle. However, trail continuity remains a higher priority than visual continuity.
- Incorporate the Indian Bend Wash Master Plan into the freeway and interchange plans and locate the channel as the plan designates.

ADOT will provide two grade-separated crossings of the freeway ramps for paths and trails at the Thunderbird Road interchange; the first is under the northbound off-ramp and the second under the southbound off-ramp. The City recommends that ADOT construct a grade-separated crossing for paths and trails under Thunderbird Road, east of the freeway. The length of these underpasses will require openings be made at all possible locations to provide direct outside air and daylight to trail users.

## Segment 6

Thunderbird Road to Greenway Road (Figure 33)
Connect the trails and open space along the Indian Bend Wash to the Venturoso Park. Also, incorporate Venturoso Park plans and improvements into the freeway working drawings.

ADOT will construct a pedestrian/bicycle bridge over the depressed freeway at Nisbet Road. This is a minor change from the Phoenix City Bikeway System which presently shows the crossing and bikeway to the east at Acoma Drive, rather than Nisbet Road. This change is based on recommendations from schools in the vicinity.
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SEGMENT 4 Shea Boulevard to Cactus Road

## LEGEND

|  | BRIDGE．OVERPASS | ニニニ＝ | UNDERPASS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| －$\quad$－ | RECREATION TRAIL <br> （Natural surlace for pedestrians and horses） |  | BIKEWAY <br> （May be painted lane，palh，or bikeable street，but ahways a paved surface） |



PIESTEWA PEAK FREEWAY FIGURE 32
RECREATIONAL AND BICYCLE TRAILS
SEGMENT 5 Cactus Road to Thunderbird Road

LEGEND

[^0]

## Segment 7

Greenway Road to Bell Road (Figure 34)

ADOT will construct underpasses for a bike path and a recreational trail on the west side of the Greenway Road interchange and for a bike path on the east side of the Bell Road interchange. In order to maintain recreational trail continuity, an underpass under Bell Road on the west side of the freeway interchange should be constructed. This underpass is currently unfunded. ADOT will also install a pedestrian/bicycle overpass over the depressed freeway at Paradise Lane. The north/south bike path along the west side of the freeway will end at Paradise Lane.

## Segment 8

Bell Road to Union Hills Drive (Figure 35)
ADOT will continue the bike path north along the east side of the freeway and construct an underpass to' cross under Union Hills Drive. In order to maintain recreational trail continuity, an underpass under Union Hills Drive on the west side of the freeway interchange should be constructed. This underpass is currently unfunded. ADOT will also construct a pedestrian/bicycle crossing over the freeway at Grovers Avenue.

Designate Grovers Avenue as a bikeable street connecting the neighborhood west of the freeway to the park, library, and schools east of the freeway.

## Segment 9

Union Hills Drive to the Outer Loop (Figure 36)
The City recommends that ADOT follow the existing Reach 11 Park and Recreation Plan where possible, and in addition, do the following:

- Specify the route for the bicycle path on the east side of the Piestewa Peak Freeway to continue north beyond the Central Arizona Project Canal. Future plans for the Piestewa Peak Freeway to continue north beyond the Outer Loop should also show continuation of this bike path.
- Coordinate the plan with the Bureau of Reclamation.
- Ensure continuity of visual access and open space under the freeway in Reach 11.
- Specify the number, location and width of pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle underpasses (or a similar facility to ensure trail and path continuity) from the east to the west side of the freeway at Reach 11. The underpasses will also serve as culverts for flood water flow, and permit access for motorized park maintenance vehicles.

ADOT will construct whatever bridges, underpasses or other facilities that are needed to ensure convenient recreational trail and bike path continuity at the intersection of the future Piestewa Peak Freeway with the CAP and Reach 11. Trail or path users coming from the north, south, east or west will be able to easily proceed to the north, south, east or west, as they may choose.




## LANDSCAPE ENHANCEMENT

## A. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this program is to lessen impacts of the freeway on neighborhoods through which it passes with a program of enhanced landscaping. Enhanced landscaping is defined as additional plant materials installed outside of access control by the City of Phoenix to supplement that which has been planned or planted by ADOT. This objective will be accomplished with the effective use of plant materials, planting designs, and landscape policies. The construction of screen walls or earth berms will also help achieve this objective. The program will have two distinct areas of concentration: landscape character and implementation.

## General Landscape Character

Landscape character will be influenced by the existing landscaping and by the type and intensity of land uses adjacent to the freeway. The freeway passes through three distinct character areas. The first is primarily a pristine mountain preserve. The second area is mostly single-family residential neighborhoods. Finally, the third area moves from developed residential neighborhoods to developing areas and large scale open and recreation areas.

Such diverse corridors will inspire different landscape characteristics. The mountain preserve corridor should be enhanced with native plant materials. At the convergence of the freeway with equestrian/bicycle/ pedestrian trails, landscaping could be used to create "gateway" statements. In areas where the freeway interfaces with residential neighborhoods, the more traditional "buffer" landscaping could be utilized. At places where the freeway creates a distinct corridor, with existing development backing onto it, a combination of the gateway and buffering treatments may be appropriate.

## Implementation

The recommended method of implementing the proposed landscape character and policies is a joint City of Phoenix/ADOT design and installation process. This method will allow for the most effective use of plant materials, irrigation systems, and landscaping funds. A joint design effort will also help prevent duplication of effort.

Landscaping on a Segment-by-Segment Basis

|  | ACTION | ESTIMATED SCHEDULE | MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. | ADOT and City meetings to establish joint design guidelines and implementation procedures through an IGA | 2 months | Planning/ADOT/Street Transportation |
| b. | Send out RFP for consultants | 2 months | Planning |
| c. | Select landscape design consultant | 1 month + 1 month for council | Planning |
| d. | Consultant prepares plans, specifications and cost estimates | 8 months | Planning/Street Transportation |
| e. | Review of consultant plans | 2 weeks | Planning/ADOT/Street Transportation |
| f. | Submission of consultants plans to ADOT | 1 week | Planning/Street Transportation |
| g. | Execution of IGA with ADOT for installation of landscape | 6 months | Planning |

## B. LANDSCAPE POLICIES

## Overall Policies

The following policies have been developed to ensure landscape continuity and overall benefit from the Landscape Enhancement Program:

Policy 1: Address the needs of the residents with planting designs.
Policy 2: Landscape selected remnant parcels with an appropriate mix of trees, shrubs, and groundcover.
Policy 3: Provide the highest degree of variety possible when selecting landscape materials.
Policy 4: Plant materials should be low water use and suitable for an arid environment.
Policy 5: Landscape efforts within the Phoenix Mountain Preserve should reflect a native desert theme with special attention paid to reclamation of previously disturbed lands.
Policy 6: Provide for landscape theme continuity when transitioning from ADOT to City of Phoenix installed landscaping.
Policy 7: Retain or relocate significant, existing plant material.
Policy 8: If desired by residents, appropriate remnant parcels may be landscaped to provide neighborhood gathering places.

## General Design Policy Concepts

The visual effectiveness of a landscaped area is dependent upon many factors. These factors include but are not limited to:

- the degree of variety of color, form, and texture in materials,
- distance it is viewed from, and
- speed it is viewed at- pedestrian to vehicular.

Each of the above will affect how the viewer group (the person or persons observing the landscape) perceives the landscaped area.

In order to accommodate varying existing characteristics, satisfy overall landscape policies, and provide for visual effectiveness, the freeway corridor was examined for typical conditions which could generate design policy to identify appropriate areas for landscaping enhancements. Three distinct field conditions were identified. These were termed terminus, continuous and stationary conditions. Their definitions and policy concepts are listed on the following pages.

TERMINUS: Occurs when a street has been terminated at the freeway. The viewer group is either at rest (a nearby house) or in motion (an approaching automobile) but viewing the freeway -or wall- as a stationary object.

Policy Concepts: There should be a moderate degree of variety in color and form to prevent monotony. The landscape elements selected should create a sense of place and make a visual statement of significance, often emphasizing vertical elements.


FIGURE 37
CONCEPTUAL: TERMINUS

CONTINUOUS: Occurs when a street parallels the freeway, such as a frontage road, a local street, or a loop road connecting two local streets. The primary viewer group is in motion.

Policy Concepts: In selecting the landscape elements, there should be a moderate to high degree of variety in color and form. Fine textures should be avoided as they will not be readily discernible from a moving viewpoint. Planting patterns should vary as permitted by space constraints. This variety will help reduce visual monotony as experienced from a moving viewpoint.


STATIONARY: The primary viewer group is either at rest (adjacent residents) or in pedestrian scaled motion (an individual passing through the landscape). Similar to Terminus in that it is focal in nature, similar to Continuous in that it is usually linear in shape, the Stationary condition is unique because it is participatory in nature. This means its design may allow for the inclusion of paths, trails, or seating areas within the landscape.

Policy Concepts: The selected landscape elements should provide the highest degree of variety of any of the treatments. This variety can include the use of color, fine textures, detail emphasis, and highlight plantings. This is done to prevent visual monotony to a stationary viewer group.


FIGURE 39
CONCEPTUAL: STATIONARY

## View Preservation

Whether preserving existing corridors or eliminating undesirable views, view preservation is an important aspect of the Landscape Element. Existing views can be affected by the location of new walls and structures constructed because of the freeway. Undesirable views are created by inadequately screening the freeway and its structures. The use of chain link fence material at access control locations does not provide adequate visual screening. The following policies address the issue of view preservation.

- The City recommends that ADOT preserve existing view corridors to the highest possible degree through the careful siting of all walls, berms and structures.
- Where negative view corridors are created, construct screen walls in lieu of chain link fence at access control locations.
- Where appropriate, earth berms shall be constructed to prevent undesirable views.


## C. ACTION AND MITIGATION FOR SPECIFIC SEGMENTS

The following issues require specific action or mitigation:
Segment 2 The use of untreated galvanized chain link fence material in the Phoenix Mountain Preserve is not acceptable. ADOT will treat the fence with a desert varnish to match the existing environment.
Segment 2 ADOT will make cuts into the mountains in a natural way. Slopes will be cut back in benches to allow vegetation growth in them.
Segment 2 Areas that are reclaimed from the removal of the northbound lanes of Northern Avenue and the Paradise Valley Access Relief Road should be revegetated and returned to a natural state by ADOT. This action should be consistent with ADOT's commitment to the Parks, Recreation and Library Department and conform with the approved Dreamy Draw Bikeway Plan.
Segment 2 The City recommends that ADOT construct berms in the vicinity of the Butler Drive and 19th Street alignments, west of the freeway, to shield the residential neighborhood from vehicle headlight beams.
Segment 4 The City of Phoenix will construct screen walls from Cholla Street to between Altadena Street and Sunnyside Drive, east of the freeway.
Segment 4 ADOT will construct a screen wall along the west side of the drainage channel that will be located west of the freeway.
Segment 5 ADOT will construct a screen wall along the west side of the drainage channel that will be located west of the freeway.
Segment 5 The City of Phoenix will construct screen walls from Windrose Drive to Sweetwater Avenue, east of the freeway.
Segment 5 ADOT will construct a screen wall on the north side of Sweetwater Avenue, east of the freeway, on the south side of the concrete drainage channel.
Segment 5 ADOT will construct berms in the area that is south of Thunderbird Road, west of the southbound on-ramp, and east of the homes that front onto 33rd Street.
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SEGMENT 5 Cactus Road to Thunderbird Road
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SEGMENT 6 Thunderbird Road to Greenway Rd.
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SEGMENT 8 Bell Road to Union Hills Drive
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NOISE

## A. INTRODUCTION AND OVERALL NOISE POLICIES

This element establishes policies and action statements to limit noise impacts on adjacent residential neighborhoods. The Land Use element presents development and rezoning stipulations to mitigate noise effects. ADOT will design and construct noise walls and berms. Maps in this plan show preliminary noise wall and berm locations based on a computer model which predicts noise levels along the projected route for the year 2010 (except Figure 49 which shows actual locations). Actual locations may vary in final design plans. Policies which apply to the entire corridor are as follows:

- ADOT will determine the specific location and size of noise walls and berms needed to meet the 67 $\mathrm{dB}(\mathrm{A})$ Leq guideline during the design phase of each freeway segment. See the Appendix for ADOT's "Noise Abatement Policy for State-Funded Projects".
- Use berms to attenuate sound in lieu of noise walls wherever possible. Berms add more variety and interest and are more easily integrated with landscaping than noise walls.
- Minimize openings in noise walls for drainage and fire hose access. Where such holes are needed, mitigate the noise coming through them. Use underground pipes for drainage, where economically feasible.
- Minimize the tunnel effect by proper design and placement of noise walls and berms.
- Changes in freeway design or construction may require ADOT to install additional noise walls/ berms. If there are changes in freeway design or construction from the approved plans, ADOT will reanalyze the noise impact and provide mitigation measures, as needed, to achieve the $67 \mathrm{~dB}(\mathrm{~A})$ Leq guideline. This will be required if there are areas where the noise prediction computer model shows that the 67 Leq $\mathrm{dB}(\mathrm{A})$ guideline is not achieved anytime prior to the year 2010.
- ADOT will affect their standard rustication on the noise walls to avoid long stretches of plain, unattractive walls.


## B. ACTION AND MITIGATION FOR SPECIFIC SEGMENTS

## Segment 1 <br> Glendale Avenue to Northern Avenue (Figure 49)

Segment One, between Glendale and Northern Avenues, will be addressed in greater detail because the freeway and noise walls have already been constructed in that area.

## 1. Properties Between the Freeway and 20th Street

ADOT will consider additional mitigation measures for properties between the freeway and 20th Street, between Orangewood and Belmont Avenues. The modeled Leq $\mathrm{dB}(\mathrm{A})$ in some of these locations exceeds 67. ADOT will continue to work with the affected residents to solve the noise problem.

## 2. Wall Height Increase Near Pleasant Drive

An Intergovernmental Agreement provided for ADOT to increase, by two feet, the height of the last 100 feet of the noise wall adjacent to Pleasant Drive. The City of Phoenix will pay for this increase with mitigation funds.

## 3. Berms West of Freeway

ADOT will complete reconfiguring the berms west of the freeway between Northem Avenue and Pleasant Drive, and continue the berms south to the Belmont Avenue alignment. The City of Phoenix will fill in the drainage swales in these berms to prohibit noise from channeling into the residential neighborhood.

## 4. Berms East of Freeway

The City recommends ADOT investigate raising the berm between the freeway and the ends of Gardenia and State Avenues.

## Segment 2

Northern Avenue to 26th Street (No Map)
The Phoenix Mountain Preserve segment consists of mostly undeveloped, natural desert hills. No noise walls are proposed in Segment Two because it contains no residential areas where the noise level exceeds the abatement guideline for mitigation. Also, noise walls would block views of this beautiful area.

## Segment 3

26th Street to Shea Boulevard (Figure 50)
Segment Three, between 26th Street and Shea Boulevard, begins the transition from the Phoenix Mountain Preserve back to a residential character where noise walls are appropriate, in some locations.

Segment 4 through 9
(Figures 51 through 54)
Segments Four through Nine are mostly residential and vacant with supporting neighborhood commercial and some park land. ADOT proposes no noise walls or berms in Segments Seven and Nine so there are no maps for these segments.
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SEGMENT 6 Thunderbird Road to Greenway Rd.


## NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION

Freeways can impact a neighborhood in many ways. Impacts can be positive or negative, short term or long term. Construction noise and dust are short term. Bisection of existing neighborhoods or visual impacts are long term. Fluctuation of property values can be short or long term. The combination of these impacts can have a destabilizing effect upon neighborhoods. As a result, citizens can have fears of isolation, loss of neighborhood identity, and devaluation of property. The purpose of this plan is to reduce those fears and to lessen the impacts of the freeway to the greatest possible degree. The neighborhood stabilization element consists of programs and policies which promote the conservation and stabilization of residential neighborhoods.

## A. NEIGHBORHOOD IDENTITY

Isolation and the loss of neighborhood identity are caused by a freeway dividing what was once a cohesive neighborhood into two or more smaller segments sometimes with a loss of access within the neighborhood, introduction of new edges or boundaries, or making access to schools or services more difficult. These segments must then function as their own "neighborhoods". Isolation and loss of identity can be mitigated through improved surface street circulation (see Circulation Element.), which will allow the cut-off segments to relate to the remainder of the existing neighborhood. The following policies will also help alleviate the feeling of isolation and loss of identity:

- Where appropriate, develop remnant parcels into community gardens, rest areas, neighborhood gathering places, etc. (through the Landscape Element) to provide residents with their own "space".
- Residents should be encouraged (through the Public Art Element) to develop their own unique, neighborhood identity.
- During normal acquisition of right-of-way, after purchase of improved parcels, ADOT should promptly demolish homes in blocks of property, and secure the area if construction does not start immediately, to limit the impacts upon the residents remaining in the neighborhood.


## B. RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY VALUES

The devaluation of property is perhaps the most wide-spread concern of citizens living adjacent to a freeway. This concern has been great enough that several studies throughout the United States have been conducted over the years to determine what changes in property value actually take place. A compilation of these studies has shown:

- Residents' perception of residential property value impacts from freeways are more pessimistic than reflected by actual selling prices.
- Most property value changes occur during construction and the initial period of operation of the freeway.
- As the freeway usage stabilized, property values actually increased due to improved accessibility to the area.

While it is clear that residential property values do fluctuate with the construction of a freeway, these changes are short term, and property values should stabilize or increase with time.

## C. NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

The City of Phoenix Neighborhood Improvement and Housing Department has several programs that may be available to assist citizens in stabilizing their neighborhoods. These programs require active participation by residents of the area.

## Major Home Repair Program

Grants are available for occupant home owners who have an income equal to or less than 50 percent of the Phoenix median income. This program provides a one-time maximum allocation of up to $\$ 5,000$ to bring selected items (i.e. electrical, plumbing, heating, cooling, roofing) up to housing safety standards (minimum code requirements). All qualified participants are required to complete the city's Home Maintenance Training Program which consists of four 2-hour sessions. A code violation must be in evidence to qualify for assistance. During the first four months of each fiscal year, 75 percent of the allocated funds are earmarked for neighborhood improvement areas and 25 percent is available citywide. If neighborhood improvement area funds are not utilized during the four-month period, then the remaining funds are open for citywide distribution.

## Operation Paint Brush

A $\$ 250$ maximum one-time rebate is provided for the purchase of paint and supplies to restore the exterior of owner-occupied homes. Owners must submit original receipts as proof of purchase of materials. Owner's income must be equal to or less than 80 percent of the Phoenix median income. During the first four months of each fiscal year, 75 percent of the allocated funds are earmarked for neighborhood improvement areas and 25 percent is available citywide. If neighborhood improvement area funds are not utilized during the four-month period, then the remaining funds are open for citywide distribution.

## Rehab Program

A one time, deferred loan for owner/occupants up to $\$ 15,000$ is available. A lien is attached. In the event the property is sold, transferred, or vacated, the lien must be satisfied. An eligible owner/occupant must satisfy the qualifying criteria of having equal to or less than 50 percent of the Phoenix median income. The residence must be brought completely into compliance with current housing safety standards. All qualified participants are required to complete the City's Home Maintenance Training Program which consists of four 2-hour sessions. A code violation must be in evidence to qualify for assistance. During the first four months of each fiscal year, 75 percent of the allocated funds are earmarked for neighborhood improvement areas and 25 percent is available citywide. If neighborhood improvement area funds are not utilized during the four-month period, then the remaining funds are open for citywide distribution.

## Hardship Assistance Program

Assistance is provided to very low income home owner/occupied residences which have an income level equal to or less than 65 percent of the Phoenix median income and who have been cited under the Property Maintenance Ordinance. Minor violations of the exterior premises can receive up to $\$ 500$ in aid. Violations requiring major repair can receive up to $\$ 2,000$ in aid. This is a last resort funding program for those items which cannot be addressed/funded by other Departmental programs. Appropriate referrals will be made.

## Home Improvement Revenue Bond Program(s)

Owner/occupants will be able to make major renovations to their property by taking advantage of an FHA Title I insured loan not to exceed $\$ 15,000$ for a 15 -year term. Moderate income applicants not exceeding gross family income of $\$ 39,330$ and fulfilling underwriting and bond requirements will be eligible for approximately an 8.5 percent loan. Moderate and low income applicants having equal to or less than 80 percent of the Phoenix median income and fulfilling underwriting and bond criteria will be eligible for a 5 percent loan. Applicants with a gross family income up to $\$ 47,880$ will be eligible for the 8.5 percent loan if the homes requiring improvement are located in the Internal Revenue Service's designated areas. The City will conduct a property evaluation to ensure the properties will comply with the City's Property Maintenance Ordinance. The program's life expectancy is based on availability of loan funds.

## PUBLIC ART

The Public Art Element identifies and creates opportunities for the development of public art projects along the Piestewa Peak Freeway. The focus of the art will be towards the communities and neighborhoods adjacent to the freeway. This program will develop strategies to improve the freeway's compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods by involving artists to identify issues and themes relevant to the residents.

The objectives of this program are: (1) create art projects that address significant points where the freeway visually and/or psychologically interfaces with the community; and (2) involve community residents as active participants in art projects that impact their neighborhoods. In order to meet these objectives, the following policies have been established:

- Art projects should emphasize themes of visual unity and community identity among freeway neighborhoods.
- Projects should be developed that address sociological and psychological concerns of communities impacted by the freeway.
- Project artists will work with neighborhoods to identify ways that public art may be able to reduce the negative impacts of the freeway.
- Art projects should be integral to the Piestewa Peak Freeway environment and the communities it adjoins.

The Planning Department and the Phoenix Arts Commission will appoint a community-driven task force to assess the needs and concerns of freeway area neighborhoods and make recommendations for public art sites and themes. In addition to community residents, the task force may include artists, a landscape architect, and an urban historian. Following this process, the Planning Department and the Arts Commission will administer a public selection process to identify and retain artists to implement the task force's recommendations. The selected artists will involve the community in the development of their design concepts and may involve them in the construction of the actual artworks. All artworks will be on the neighborhood side of the freeway.

| ACTION | ESTIMATED SCHEDULE | MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Appoint public art task force, inventory needs and recommend sites for artworks | Second Quarter 1992 | Planning/Arts Commission |
| b. Begin a public selection process to choose artist(s) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fourth Quarter } \\ & 1992 \end{aligned}$ | Planning/Arts Commission |
| c. Commission artist(s) | First Quarter 1993 | Planning/Arts Commission |

## NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY

Neighborhood safety is important to all citizens. This concern for safety is not only physical, but also emotional. The neighborhood safety element is brief because any permanent changes in police beat boundaries or fire/emergency service areas would have to be determined after portions of the freeway are constructed.

The construction of a freeway or highway introduces a new, major, physical edge into a community. This edge will alter travel patterns within certain neighborhoods. This alteration will require those public services, whose efficiency in part relies on accessibility, to reexamine their response areas.

## A. POLICE DEPARTMENT

The Piestewa Peak Freeway travels through six beat areas. Each of these beat boundaries encompasses varying degrees of public, residential and commercial land uses. These various land uses require different types of patrol coverage. After construction of the Piestewa Peak Freeway, the beat boundaries will be realigned, using the freeway as an edge, to offer the best level of patrol coverage.

## B. FIRE DEPARTMENT

Adequate fire and emergency service protection is also important to citizens. A major component of protection is the response time, which is a function of accessibility to the subject areas. The closure, at the freeway, of two half-mile streets north of Thunderbird Road will cause the fire department to seek alternative routes into these areas. These routing changes are currently being investigated. Any plans for new facilities should reflect the accessibility requirement of the affected subject areas.

There are currently two fire stations located in the plan area. Station No. 27 is located near 32nd Street and Cactus Road and Station No. 37 is located near 40th Street and Bell Road. Four other stations provide assistance as required. They are Stations No. 7,31,35, and 36. These stations act as secondary stations, responding when the primary stations are already in service.

# SUMMARY OF MITIGATION <br> MEASURES 

## XI. SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES WITH ESTIMATED COSTS (1991 DOLLARS) TO THE CITY

Table A describes mitigation measures and estimated costs for the area between Glendale Avenue and Thunderbird Road, the portion of the freeway that may be constructed during the term of the Freeway Mitigation Bond program. Any construction between Thunderbird Road and the future Outer Loop will likely be after 1997 which is the conclusion of the present bond program. A future mitigation bond or other funding would be needed for mitigation measures north of Thunderbird Road. These are described in Table B.

Table A. Glendale Avenue to Thunderbird Road (Segments 1 through 5)

| ELEMENT | SEGMENT \& ITEM | MITIGATION MEASURES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ESTIMATED } \\ & \text { COSTS } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Segment 1 Item 1 | Purchase the 5 lots and 2 homes on the north side of Glendale Avenue between the freeway and 20th Street. Remove the existing homes and sell most of the land at a nominal cost to the respective land owners to the north. Put in a 20 -foot deep landscape strip adjacent to Glendale Avenue. | \$ 300,000 |
| Land Use | Segment 3 Item 2 | Purchase the currently impacted residential property at 32 nd Street and Gold Dust Avenue. | \$ 90,000 |
| Land Use | Segment 3 Item 3 | Purchase and remove the homes in the "wedge", which is southeast of the southeast corner of Shea Boulevard and 32nd Street. <br> *(The total cost would be $\$ 1,600,000$ but ADOT will be requested to reimburse the City $\$ 300,000$ which ADOT saves by not putting in noise walls and other construction costs.) | *\$1,300,000 |
| Land Use | Segment 3 and 4 | Conduct a market study of the general area around 32nd Street and Shea Boulevard. | \$ 10,000 |
| Circulation | Segment 1 Item 3 | Purchase the ROW needed to eliminate the gap on Aurelius Avenue, between 20th and 21st Streets, and construct the street connection. | \$ 90,000 |
| Circulation | All | Fund neighborhood circulation modifications and traffic mitigation devices as needed. | \$ 50,000 |

Table A (Continued)

| ELEMENT | SEGMENT \& ITEM | MITIGATION MEASURES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ESTIMATED } \\ & \text { COSTS } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recreational Trails and Bicycle Paths | Segment 1 Item 1 | Improve the underpass under Glendale Avenue between 16th and 17th Streets for recreational trail and bicycle path use. Locate bridges over the Arizona Canal and future ACDC on the north side of Glendale Avenue. The total cost is $\$ 145,000$ but $\$ 45,000$ will come from bicycle bonds. There will still be additional costs, not from mitigation funds, to bring the bicycle path from Ocotillo Road north to Glendale Avenue. Some of the total cost may come from grant-funded sources. | \$ | 100,000 |
| Recreational Trails and Bicycle Paths | Segment 1 Item 3 | Construct a bicycle path overpass over the Northern Avenue southbound freeway on ramp. <br> ** (The total cost is $\$ 150,000$ but $\$ 50,000$ will come from bike bond funds and another $\$ 20,000$ from Parks, Recreation and Library funds, with $\$ 30,000$ currently unfunded. Some of the total cost may come from grant-funded sources.) | ** | 50,000 |
| Landscape <br> Enhancement <br> Element | Segments 4 and 5 | Construct approximately 2,500 lineal feet of six-foot high screen wall to visually buffer residential areas from the freeway and associated drainage channels. | \$ | 145,000 |
| Landscape <br> Enhancement <br> Element | $\begin{gathered} \text { Segments } 1,3, \\ 4 \& 5 \end{gathered}$ | Enhance the landscaping in neighborhood areas within public right-of-way, but outside access control. | \$ | 900,000 |
| Noise | Segment 1 Item 2 | Increase in height, by two feet, the existing noise wall adjacent to Pleasant Drive. This only applies to approximately the northern 100 lineal feet of this wall. | \$ | 10,000 |
| Public Art | Segments 1 thru 5 | Enhance the freeway corridor with neighborhood art projects at highpedestrain activity areas where the freeway visually interfaces with the adjacent neighborhood. | \$ | 300,000 |

Table B. Thunderbird Road to the Future Outer Loop (Segments 6 through 9)

| ELEMENT | SEGMENT \& ITEM | MITIGATION MEASURES | ESTIMATED <br> COSTS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Circulation | All | Add neighborhood circulation <br> modifications and traffic mitigation <br> devices as needed | $\$ 25,000$ |
| Landscape | All | Enhance landscaping outside access <br> control <br> Construct screen walls as required | $\$ 700,000$ |
| Landscape | All | Add to ADOT's noise walls, if needed | $\$ 145,000$ |
| Noise | All | Enhance the freeway corridor with art <br> projects | $\$ 300,000$ |
| Public Art |  |  | TOTAL |

(Potential mitigation measures for the northern one-half of the freeway corridor are more general. Final engineering plans for the area between Thunderbird Road and the future Outer Loop Freeway have not yet been prepared. Construction in this area is not estimated to begin until after 1997.)

## ESTIMATED MITIGATION COSTS FOR ENTIRE PLAN AREA

| Glendale Avenue through Thunderbird Road | $\$ 3,345,000$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Thunderbird Road through the Future Outer Loop | $\$ 1,180,000$ |

TOTAL \$4,525,000*
*Flexibility is authorized within individual expenditure items so long as the total expenditures do not exceed this amount.

Deposit any revenues resulting from freeway mitigation actions into the freeway mitigation account. These funds will only be used for future, Council-approved freeway mitigation plans and actions.

A separate action would be taken by City Council to ensure the appropriate use of any funds resulting from freeway mitigation.

APPENDIX

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 

December 13. 1989

```
Mr. Marvin A. Andrews
251 West Washington
9th Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85003
RE: Right-of-Way
    Piestewa Peak Highway SR 51
    Glendale Avenue to 29th Street
    Segments l and 2
    H 0835 01D
Dear Mr. Andrews:
This letter is to confirm that the City of Phoenix (City), for
the purpose of our pending condemnation action, has agreed to
set the value of right-of-way for the Piestewa Peak Highway
from Station 52+00\pm to Station 151+00\pm at your purchase price
plus a 15% administrative fee. This valuation follows precedent
set on earlier right-of-way exchanges on the Piestewa Peak.
In return for such an agreement, the Arizona Department of
Transportation (ADOT) agrees to incorporate the following items
requested by City into upcoming construction projects.
```


## Thunnderbird Crossing

O Bridge spans at Thunderbird Road will be extended to provide space for pedestrian trails and for an open space continuity with Venturoso and Indian Bend Wash Parks.
o A signalized crossing for bike/pedestrian trail at Thunderbird will be coordinated/provided by City Street Transportation to allow trails continuation from Indian Bend Wash to Venturoso Park.
o Provide at Sweetwater a pedestrian/bike path crossing of the highway to access Indian Bend Wash to the east.
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o Provide two (2) grade separated crossings of on/off ramps at Thunderbird/Piestewa Peak interchange.

Reach 11
o At Piestewa Peak/Reach 11 intersection additional bridge length will be provided to allow recreation facilities to pass under freeway south of CAP canal. Facilitieswill be able to pass under freeway north of the canalunder the floodway bridge required by the Bureau of Reclamation.

## Bike Paths/Horse Trails

o Add an overpass at Paradise Lane for pedestrian/bike paths.
o Underpasses parallel to the highway mainline at Greenway, Bell and Union Hills for north/south trails.
o Provide for trail crossing of CAP Canal and associated Reach ll dike where Piestewa Peak crosses Coordination with same.U. S. Bureau of Reclamation required
o Fund construction of bike path outside of the control of access but within ADOT right-of-way for Piestewa Peak Parkway including: grade separated crossings, s ignage and signals.
o Bike paths to be 4" concrete or $2^{n \prime}$ asphalt over 4" ABC, nominal ten (10) feet wide.
o 2' minimum width graded shoulder area each side of path.
o 5. minimum horizontal separation between bike path and top of embankment.
o Minimum 4.5' high divider between bike path and adjacent highway or street.
o Minimum design speed of 20 mph or 30 mph where grades exceed 4\%.

- Cross slope: minimum 2\%, maximum 5\%.
- Standard bicycle and equestrian symbol signage.

0 Underpasses to be $10^{\circ} \mathrm{X}$ 10 with electrical lighting.

MARVIN A. ANDREWS December 13, 1989
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o Ramp to underpasses or overpasses 5\% slope desirable. Greater than 5\% and maximum 10\% possible if trail width is widened to $12^{\circ}$ and length does not exceed 500'.

## Ventilation

o Underpasses at Myrtle Wash, Pleasant Run and Charles Christiansen Trail are to have light wells installed for lighting and ventilation. Structures are $10^{\circ} \mathrm{X} 10^{\circ}$ except Myrtle Wash 10' X 14'. Underpasses will be provided with electric lighting.

## Street Transportation

- Grade separated crossing for Cholla Street.
o Grade separated crossing for Sweetwater Avenue.

As in the past, maintenance of these extras, outside of the ADOT control of access, will be the City's responsibility. These features will be included in the current and future ADOT Five Year Construction programs subject, of course, to final approval by the ADOT Board.


## CLM:AVM:vlb

cc: James H. Matheson, P. E.
James A. Colley

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007

ROSE MOFFORO
Governor
CHARLESL MILLER
Director

HOMAS A BRYANT II State Ençumetu

Mr. James H. Matteson, P. E.
Street Transportation Director
125 East Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
RE: Piestewa Peak Highway, State Route
51 City Council Recommendations
H 0835 O1P
Dear Jim:

Thank you for your letter of August 22, 1989 transmitting the Phoenix City Council's recommendations from the report prepared by the Piestewa Peak Fetfegioneview Committee (SPEDRC). Let me apologize for the delay in responding, however, the extended interval has allowed resolution of almost all of the SPEDRC issues. I understand the Committee has heard and addressed many controversial issues during their tenure and their membership is to be commended. We stand ready to continue to support SPEDRC upon your request.

The "City Council Recommendations" attached to your letter contain the final general plan design comments from the City. I would like to briefly comment on the twenty-four items included.

The Arizona Department of Transportation concurs with your recommendation items numbered $2-8,11,15-17,20$ and 21.

Items 4 and 5 - City participation will be required for local street mitigation measures and for construction of a bikepath through the Mountain Preserve.
"Item 1. Landscaping Specifications" Landscaping on the Piestewa Peak Highway will be designed according to Landscape Design Guidelines for Urban Highways which set specific limits on the plant species and intensity for the entire MAG Urban Freeway System. Our design concept calls for a transition from the City's landscaping at Glendale Avenue to a predominantly native desert theme which will be carried through the Mountain Preserve. North of the Preserve, we will transition back to the normal MAG guidelines.
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"Item 12. 33rd Street Connection at Cheryl Drive" We agree this work may be desirable, but ADOT cannot clear the right-of-way necessary to construct this local street. Construction of this segment is scheduled for October 1990. If $y$, ADOT will construct the the City can acquire the necessary right-of-wa necessary connection to line up with Cheryl Drive.
"IItem 13. Ma of Service of "D" or better within a half mile of the highway. Current
laneage for Cactus Road and Shea Boulevard is inadequate for projected 2010 traffic demand whether the highway is constructed or not.
"Item 18. Pedestrian Acçess to Paradige Valley Park" We were not able to verify this access exists today. If such documentation exists or if legal access is established prior to construction ADOT will provide the crossing at project expense.
"Item 22. Prefered Location for a Transit Route in this Area" The 46-foot median of the piestewa peak Highway is reserved for future development as HOV or mixed traffic lanes as the need develops. There is not currently any similar expansion capability south of Glendale Avenue, so it may not ever be possible
or advisable to construct HOV lanes to the north. Ramps will be designed to allow priority metering of HOV traffic.
"Item 23. Pedestrian Bridge near Nisbet Road" Since construction of this segment io oeverol yeors in the future, we witl coordinate with the Paradise

Valley School District and your Parks Department during final design to assure the crossing is appropriately located for their needs.
 studied this connection and we do not recommend its construction. We are currently awaiting formal response from the City on our recommendation.

ADOT agreed to items numbered 2, 9, 10,14 and 19 as part of our settlement on the cost of right-of-way for the City owned highway between stations 52 and 151. The elements will be constructed as agreed. ADOT will expect the City to maintain those elements outside the ADOT control of access.
Again, thank you for your input on this important regional transportation project. We look forward to continuing to work with your staff towards a successfully completed highway project.


RG:AVM:vlb
cc: Gary K. Robinson

## PIESTEWA PEAK EXTENSION DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

On May 19, 1988 the Phoenix City Council established the Piestewa Peak Extension Design Review Committee (SPEDRC). The committee was established to review design, land use and mitigation issues regarding the Piestewa Peak Freeway between Glendale Avenue and the Pima Freeway.

This dedicated committee fulfilled City Council's charge to them. Their accomplishments included:

1. SPEDRC reviewed the work and recommendations of the Arizona Department of Transportation and its consultants, the City of Phoenix staff, and Regional Public Transit Authority, and others relative to the Piestewa Peak Extenstion Corridor.
2. SPEDRC provided opportunities for attendance at committee meetings and received input from public agencies, consulting firms, citizens, and members of the business community.
3. SPEDRC prepared and presented to the Council a preliminary and final report containing findings and specific recommendations concerning the design of the freeway from Glendale to the Outer Loop.
4. SPEDRC reviewed land use proposals and mitigation actions for the freeway, received public comment and made recommendations on specific issues.
5. SPEDRC reviewed these reports with the Village Planning Committee and the Planning Commission to receive comments before submission to the City Council.

Members of the Piestewa Peak Extension Design Review Committee included.

Mr. Mike Milillo, Chair<br>Mr. Guy Loehnis, Vice-Chair<br>Mr. Dan Carroll<br>Mr. Eugene Cetwinski<br>Mr. David Clymer<br>Mr. Stephen Copley<br>Ms. Sharon Del Duca-France<br>Ms. Penny Howe<br>Mr. Hugh Hull<br>Mr. Gabor Lorant<br>Ms. Mike Pehlam<br>Mr. Rich Perry<br>Mr. Leon Reivitz<br>Mr. Ken Volz

# PIESTEWA PEAK EXTENSION DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE LAND USE RECOMMENDATIONS DRAFT 

## ITEM \#1

Location: Between Glendale Avenue and Cactus Wren, from 17th Street to the Freeway.
Issues: - Appropriate land use for this area.

- Recent rezoning requests have been approved for residential offices (R-O zoning).
- Homes have begun to deteriorate along Glendale Avenue.
- Traffic levels are currently 67,000 average weekday trips.

Recommendation: Residential scale garden offices.

## ITEM \#2

Location: Between Glendale Avenue and Cactus Wren, from 21st Street to the Freeway.
Issues: - Appropriate land use for this area.

- Homes have begun to deteriorate along Glendale Avenue
- Traffic levels are currently 67,000 average weekday trips.
- Current zoning in this area is R1-10.

Recommendation: Medium Density Residential (5-15 du/ac.).

## ITEM \#3

Location: On the east and west side of 26th Street, northwest of the Freeway.
Issues: - Appropriate land use for this area.

- Two vacant parcels and two churches are located just north of the Freeway. The remainder of the uses along 26th Street are single family residences.
- 26th Street is a collector Street with approximately 7,000 Average Weekday Trips (AWT) currently. Projected traffic in 2010 is 10,000 AWT.
- Maintenance of stability and viability of existing single family residential area.
- Commercial rezoning requests have been applied for on the two vacant parcels. Commercial uses are not desireable on these sites due to the impacts commercial uses would have on the nearby residential uses.

Recommendation: Institutional uses such as child care, community center, church or similar use.

## ITEM \#4

Location: East of 26th Street, southeast of the Freeway.
Issues: - Appropriate land use for this area.

- Access to the site.
- Is ADOT going to request a full take of this property?

Recommendation: Develop in accordance with the General Plan (Residential 2-5 du/ac).

## ITEM \#5

Location: Northeast corner of 32nd Street and Mountain View Road (Scottsdale Christian Academy)
Issues: - Appropriate land use for this area.

- Current zoning is $\mathrm{C}-2$.
- The site is surrounded by single family residences.

Recommendation: Decrease zoning to allow medium density residential uses ( $5-15 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ) with the southeast edge less intense and stepped back.

## ITEM \#6

Location: South of Shea Boulevard and east of 32nd Street (the wedge).
Issues: - 17 single family homes have been left as a result of the Freeway alignment.

- Commercial uses are located along 32nd Street and Shea Boulevard.
- Access into and out of this area is difficult.

Recommendation: Mixed use, large scale service center, to include institutional, office, and retail uses, with the incorporation of a park and ride if possible.

## ITEM \#7

Location: Between Shea Boulevard and Desert Cove, from 32nd Street to the Freeway.
Issues: - Appropriate land use.

- Existing commercial center is located on the northeast corner of Shea Boulevard and 32nd Street. The current commercial center is underutilized. An existing patio home development was started on the south side of Desert Cove.
- A large tract of vacant property is located south of the Desert Cove patio homes.

Recommendation: Commercial, enhanced neighborhood center.

## ITEM \#8

Location: Northeast corner of Desert Cove and 32nd Street.
Issues: - Appropriate land use.
Recommendation: Residential 2-5 du/ac.

## ITEM \#9

Location: Northeast corner of 32nd Street and Cholla Street.
Issues: - Appropriate land use.

- This tract of land has been through a couple of rezoning attempts. The most recent request was withdrawn prior to Council action.
- Concern is for the single family residential neighborhood to the east.
- Paradise Valley Village has more than enough commercially zoned land already.

Recommendation: Residential $6.10 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ with the overall density not to exceed $8 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$. Development is to incorporate special design elements such as an access road with a landscape separator to buffer the site from 32nd Street traffic.

## ITEM \#10

Location: Northeast corner of Sweetwater Avenue and the Piestewa Peak Freeway.
Issues: - Appropriate land use for this area.

- The possibility of the Parks Department using this site in conjunction with the Indian Bend Wash improvements. Consideration is for using the site as a parking lot.
- The site is currently zoned R1-6.

Recommendation: Parking lot for Indian Bend Wash recreational area.

## ITEM \#11

Location: The four quadrants at the interchange of the Freeway and Thunderbird Road.
Issues: - Appropriate land use for this area.

- Traffic on Thunderbird Road is currently 17,000 AWT, projected level of traffic is 35,000 AWT in 2010.
- The removal of existing residential access roads on Thunderbird will reduce privacy and may hamper ingress and egress to the residences.

Recommendation: Residential offices at the northwest corner of Thunderbird Road and the freeway, and continue to study the other three corners. The residential offices are to be of a residential scale and compatible with the adjacent neighborhood, and for every three lots assembled for redevelopment, one must be used for parking.

ITEM \#12
Location: Northeast corner of Tierra Buena Land and the Freeway.
Issues: - Appropriate land use for the large remnant parcel.

- The parcel is surrounded by single family residential developments.

Recommendation: Low density residential. If low density residential uses are not feasible, a pocket park would be appropriate.

ITEM \#13
Location: Between 32nd and 36th Street at Phelps Road.
Issues: - This property is the site of a rezoning request. The application is for R1-6 zoning and R3-A (approximately 379 units).

- The development in this area is mixed with a trailer park to the south, multifamily residential to the west and commercial and residential uses to the north.

Recommendation: Single family residential and multiple family residential, consistent with recent rezoning request.

## ITEM \#14

Location: North side of Bell Road, east of the Freeway.
Issues: - Appropriate land use for this area.

- This is a long narrow site which will be difficult to develop.
- Access to the site may be difficult given traffic on Bell Road and the interchange adjacent to this site.
- The site is located between a high school and the Freeway.

Recommendation: Commercial Recreational.

## ITEM \#15

Location: North side of Bell Road, west side of the Freeway.
Issues: - Appropriate land use for this area.

- The side is currently zoned C - 0 .
- Traffic on Bell Road is heavy.

Recommendation: Office uses that are to be of a residential scale.

## ITEM \#16

Location: Between Union Hills Drive and the Central Arizona Project on the east side of the Freeway.
Issues: - Appropriate land use for this area.

- Current zoning is $\mathrm{S}-1$.
- At-grade and elevated freeway adjacent to this site.

Recommendation: Residential, $1 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$.

## ITEM \#17

Location: South of the Pima Freeway on the east and west side of the Freeway.
Issues: - Appropriate land use for this area.

- The interchange at the Pima Freeway and Piestewa Peak will be elevated.
- The Desert Ridge Master Plans show low density residential adjacent to this site.

Recommendation: Residential, $2 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$.

Office Memo
Environmental Planning Services
May 24. 1988

```
IO: DISTRICT ENGINEERS
    GROUP HEADS
    SECTION HEADS
    SERVICE HEADS
    CONSULTANTS
frOM: HILLIAM P. BELT, Manager
    Environmental Plannlng Services
RE: Nolse Abatement Pollcy for State-Funded Projects
```

Enclosed for your Information and use is a revised Molse Abatement Policy for State-Funded projects.

Changes from the previous policy, revision of January 26. 1987. Include clarification of criterla used. It has been our intention that the ADOT Nolse Abatement Pollcy replace paragraph 4(g). "Trafflc Nolse Impacts" of F $Н$ PM 7-7-3.

In addition, Section II, paragraph 3 has been added for further conslderation if nolse barriers are recommended.

Thls pollcy supersedes the pollcy dated January 26. 1987. effectlve May 20. 1988.

HPB:RT:Ch
Enclosure

## arizona depariment of transporiation

## "NOISE ABATEMENT POLICY FOR STATE-FUNDED PROJECTS"

## 1. BACKGROUND

Since 1972, nolse mitigatlon measures have been Included with new highway construction or reconstruction projects where the nolse levels wll exceed the Federal Hlghway Adminlstration (FIHA) nolse abatement criteria for varlous category of activitles. These criterla and categorles are noted in the Federal Highway Adminlstration Federal-Ald Highway Program Manual. Voliume 7. Chapter 7. Section 3 (FIIPM 7-7-3). The Incluslon of these nolse mitigation measures are required by the FHWA If any federal funds are used to finance the project.

The federal document FHPM 7-7-3 specifles a nolse abatement criteria Leq* level of 67 dBA for exterlor nolse levels in residential areas factivity Category 8). Thls category also Includes plenlc areas, recreation areas. playgrounds, parks, motels, hotels, schools, churches, llbrarles. and hospltals.

Another class of activity listed in FHPM 7-7-3 is Category C with a nolse abatement criterla of 72 dBA Leq for exterlor nolse levels. Included in thls category are commercial and Industrial uses.

The Arlzona Department of Transportation has provided nolse attenuatlon along its highways on new highway construction or hlghway reconstruction (widening) In accordance with FHPM 7-7-3 for projects constructed with participating federal funds.

It is the objective of the Department to alaintaln acceptable highway traffic nolse levels within practical and financlal limits on new and reconstructed hlghways.

This directive outlines the basic pollcy and responsibllitles of the Department in dealling with nolse generated by motor vehicles on new and reconstructed hlghways that are $100 \%$ stale funded.

## 11. POLICY FOR $100 Z$ STATE-FUNDED PROJECTS

It is intended that. when possible. the Arizona Department of Transportation's noise policy will be in agreement with federal pollcy and guidelines as stated in FIIPM 7-7-3. For state-funded projects. the following criterla shall be used In lleu of paragraph 4(g) "Traffic Nolse Impacts." of FHPM 7-7-3.

- Len - The equlvalent steady - state sound level which In a stated perlod of time contains the same acoustic energy as tlme-varying sound level durlng the sanie períod.

The Department shall conslder nolse mitigation when the predicted design year traffic nolse levels equal or exceed an hourly Leq level of 67 DBA or 72 dB^ (Category B and Category C. respectively, as defined in Section 1 ) for the following two conditions:

1. Mitlgation will only be consldered for areas that support a developed land use (l.e.. those tracts of land or portlons, thereof, whlch contaln Improvements or actlvities devoted to frequent human hablation or use) at the tlme the project becomes public knowledge.
a) For llmited access facllitles on new locatlon. the date of publle knowledge shall normally be the date of the location public hearing.
b) For llmited access, facllltes which conslst of adding additional trafflc lanes to an existing hlghway, the date of public knouledge shall noraally be one of the following: the date of the flrst public hearing offer or the date of the first public hearing notice. whichever is first. or if nelther of the above apply. then it shall be the date that the environmental document is approved by the Arizona Depariment of Transportation.
2. Mltgation will only be provided after such factors as cost of mitigation. design requirements or constraints. and any adverse Impacts On the surrounding property owners have been evaluated.
3. Hhenever a nolse barrler is proposed, an attempt should be made to achleve a minlmum altenuation of 5 dBA.

## III. DECISION MAKING

Environmental Planning Services shall be responsible for the preparation. or approval, of all trafflc nolse reports.

The Deputy State Englneer. Illghway Development Group, shall be responslble for all declslons regarding the construction of nolse abatement measures.

Effectlve 7/22/86
Revised 1/26/87
Revised 5/20/88

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> HIGHWAYS DIVISION <br> 206 South Seventeenth Avenue <br> Phoenix. Arizona 85007-3212 

FIFE SYMINGTON

May 22, 1991

```
Mr. Peter Atonna, AICP
Deputy Planning Director
Planning Department
City of Phoenix
125 East Washington
Phoenix AZ 85004-2342
```

RE: ADOT Disclaimer to the City of Phoenix
Piestewa Peak Freeway Policy Specific
Plan
Dear Mr. Atonna:
The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has worked
closely with the City of Phoenix (COP) Planning Department
in the development of the COP Piestewa Peak Freeway Policy
Specific plan in an effort to accurately describe and
appropriately incorporate the policies and procedures under
which ADOT has been mandated by the Maricopa Association of
Governments to construct this freeway.

ADOT emphasizes that a reasonable effort has been made to ensure that the contents of the COP Plan are consistent and not in conflict with ADOT policies. We further state that ADOT is not a party to the Plan, and future implementation of the Plan involving $A D O T$ will be only as articulated and further agreed upon in current and future IGAs with the City.

Under separate memo, ADOT submitted official written comments to the COP Plan for the May 22, 1991 COP Public Hearing.

Sincerely,


RMS:CAT:vlb

```
cc: Hank Moore, Baker Engineers
    Dan Powell, District l Engineer
    Bob Bortfeld, Street Transportation
```
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