



Lehi Elders' Breakfast

Date: September 2, 2009

Location: Lehi Community Center

Handouts: Project Fact Sheet

Participants: Community to Provide Sign-In Sheet

Project Team: Jennifer Jack, SRPMIC-ECS Project Manager

Esther Moyah, SRPMIC

Misty Dayzie, ADOT Project Manager

Julian Avila, ADOT CCP

Michael Gorton, HDR

Michael LaBianco, HDR

Peggy Fiandaca, Partners for Strategic Action, Inc.

The Project Team was invited to make a presentation at the regular monthly Elders' breakfast in Lehi. The purpose of the presentation was to provide attendees an overview of the SRPMIC Transportation Planning Study, solicit input regarding issues or concerns that should be addressed and to inform participants about upcoming Community Workshops.

Project Overview

Esther Moyah, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC) thanked everyone for giving the Team an opportunity to provide an overview of the Long Range Transportation Planning Study. She introduced the Team members and introduced Misty Dayzie.

Misty Dayzie introduced herself as the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Project Manager. She explained that ADOT is working together with the SRPMIC to study various transportation needs within the Community. Over the next 18 months, there will be many opportunities to get involved, provide ideas and voice concerns.

Misty introduced Michael Gorton with HDR (Transportation Consultant Project Manger) who used PowerPoint slides to discuss the type of issues that the Study will address. Michael explained that the Study will address roadway safety issues, walking and bicycle routes, cut-through traffic concerns and public transportation for Community Members to get to the doctor, work or shopping. All of these issues impact the Community's quality of life. Michael explained the Study's outcome is a long-range plan for transportation improvements within SRPMIC. He encouraged their involvement at one



SRPMIC Transportation Planning Study

of two upcoming Community Workshops. The workshops will have the same format and presentation on two different evenings at two different locations.

October 19, 2009; 5:30 – 7:30 PM
SRPMIC Community Building

October 22, 2009; 5:30 – 7:30 PM
Lehi Community Center

Michael explained that the meetings would include a brief presentation about the Study followed by questions and discussions. Tribal staff, ADOT representatives and planning consultants will be present to answer questions about the Study.

Discussions

Michael introduced Peggy Fiandaca, Public Involvement Coordinator who facilitated a discussion of issues and ideas that participants suggested should be considered during the Study. Following is a highlight of the ideas expressed:

Roadways

- Mesa Drive is very dangerous at night.
- The right turn only on McDowell Road is dangerous for Community Members. It was expressed that this approach should not be repeated. Community Members need to be able to make left runs on McDowell Road without having to make a U-turn.
- Keep roads cleaner. Need to have trash picked up more often.
- Roads need to be better maintained.
- Need to provide a left turn at McKellips Road going east from Pima Road.
- Oak Street (in Lehi) needs to be widened and reconstructed. There are no sidewalks and traffic is speeding along Oak Street.

Cut Through Traffic

- Non-Community Member traffic is coming into SRPMIC at Alma School Road, Indian School Road, Chaparral Road because of the Scottsdale Community College, and the area around Thomas Road and Loop 101.
- When Gilbert Road is closed, there is considerable cut-through traffic.
- A Community Member mentioned that she gets stuck in her driveway due to the amount of traffic at Thomas Road and Loop 101.

Safety

- A concern was mentioned that debris is not adequately picked up after accidents. The glass left behind damages cars and could cause additional accidents.



SRPMIC Transportation Planning Study

- People do not stop at stop signs. There needs to be better enforcement.
- Trucks are not following posted signage.
- People are speeding throughout the Community.
- Traffic calming techniques such as speed bumps should be explored. Speed bumps were removed from Palm Lane because they were improperly installed.
- Speeding is a problem at McDowell and Dobson Roads.
- Speeding is a problem at Indian School Road and Chaparral Road.
- Speeding and ignoring signs are a problem along Gilbert Road and along Indian School Road.
- Need speed control on unpaved roads.

Transit

- Public transit is important to Community members. Potential destinations include the casino, library, shopping mall and health center.
- There needs to be a smooth transfer between bus systems so people can get to medical appointments, shopping, work and other activities.
- Transit is also important for young people who may not have a car.
- The senior van is not always available and a reliable transit system could be a substitute.
- Transit should be provided so Community members can be connected to regional activity centers and be able to get to health facilities.

Pedestrian Facilities

- There is an overall lack of sidewalks throughout the Community.
- There are safety issues on Oak Street sidewalk. It is not compliant with ADA.
- School bus shelters are needed throughout the Community so children do not have to stand out in the rain or heat when waiting for a bus.
- There is a need for a crosswalk at Alma School and Thomas Roads. Students are crossing in this area.

Trails

- There is a need for equestrian trails throughout the Community. Currently, Community members use back roads or fields on horseback.
- A question was asked that if equestrian trails were developed, would non-Community members be allowed to use it. The project team advised that this would be a SRPMIC decision.

Bike Lanes

- Bike lanes are a good idea to connect to schools and the college.



SRPMIC Transportation Planning Study

Air Quality

- Air Quality is a concern of Community members. It is important for the Study to explore alternative fuels that will improve air quality and air quality impacts on the Community's quality of life.

Trespassing

- Trespassing was mentioned often as an issue. There are no trespassing signs posted but non-Community members do not obey them.
- There are outsiders trespassing in the riverbed picking rocks and they do not get in trouble.

Pima Road Development

- There has been an increase in traffic along Pima Road and it will continue to grow as development occurs. It will be important to keep that traffic out of Community residential neighborhoods. Limiting traffic control or managing the movement of the traffic will reduce traffic coming onto the Community. An improved Pima Road could keep traffic off the Community.
- It will be important to have good signage regarding trespassing and staying out of residential areas.

Other Issues

- It was mentioned that there should be nicer landscaping along roads such as Gilbert Road. When Gilbert Road was widened and improved, nicer landscaping was installed on the City of Mesa side of the road and it is better maintained than on the SRPMIC side. The responsibility for maintaining landscaping along Gilbert Road should be investigated.
- McKellips Road area near Hayden and the 101 freeway gets washed out from flooding. Drainage comes from the Community, enters Scottsdale and is redirected back to the Community. This is a joint issue to be addressed with the City of Scottsdale.

Closing Remarks

Peggy thanked them for their ideas and encouraged their participation at the upcoming Community Workshops. If they had additional ideas or comments, they could write them on the Comment Cards on each of the tables and give them to Misty Dayzie or Jennifer Jack.



Comment Cards

Following are comments received at the Elders' Breakfast written on Comment Cards.

The main concern I have is the speeding on Chaparral, mostly a.m. traffic heading west, as I live along Chaparral. There are police parked down the road sometimes, so that helps control speeding. Suggestion: City transit to go through Salt River, possibly on McDowell Road only – make pick up/drop off at designated stops.

You need to ask the bus from Town to come farther into the Community.

You have not worked on McDowell Road in Lehi area and you are thinking about covering the ditch along McDowell Road, I think that is a bad idea. I will be losing my arrow weeds' and we need them as part of our culture. I know there was two elder's the Ownes Family and they wanted the cover ditches, it is not fair that they get what they want. Ask the people in Lehi area. We don't want a covered ditch.

The McDowell Road in Salt River area, there are no left turn and you have to make a u-turn at the intersection, and if you are pulling a horse trailer it gets a little dangerous, and why did ADOT not put cattle guards along Gilbert Road and Hwy. 87 if someone dies from hitting a cow. I hope they sue the hell out of ADOT. ADOT needs to be fair, if they are going to work on the east of Gilbert Road they need to work on the west side. You know you are not fair with the way you deal with us.

SRPMIC Long Range Transportation Study Community Outreach -
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Earth Day

WHERE: Lehi Community Center
DATE: April 24, 2010
TIME: 10:00am-2:00pm
ATTENDEES: Jennifer Jack, SRPMIC ECS
Misty Dayzie, ADOT

SUMMARY:

The following comments were received at the SRPMIC Safety Day Event in regard to the SRPMIC Long Range Transportation Study.

- The following questions were asked:
 - ⇒ Will the light rail extend into the Community?
 - ⇒ What is the plan for the wash out part of Gilbert Road?
- Oppose development on Dobson Road because it is horse preserve land. Development would cause excessive traffic and dumping in the area.
- Build a mass transit loop route that has electric or hybrid energy source (non-gas).
- A city bus stop is need on the Reservation to get on Phoenix and Mesa transit.
- Provide a local trolley or small transit that runs between the casinos, ball field, shopping, and hotels and to the area north of the Arizona Canal.



**Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Indian Community
2010 Long Range Transportation
Planning Study**

Stakeholder Interview Summary Report

Prepared for:
**Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and the
Arizona Department of Transportation**

Prepared by:
HDR Engineering, Inc. and PSA, Inc.
November 20, 2009

Executive Summary

Background

The Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 2010 Long Range Transportation Planning Study is being funded by the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Multimodal Planning Division's Planning Assistance for Rural Areas (PARA) program. The PARA program is funded through the Federal Highway Administration's State Planning and Research program to non-metropolitan communities for the purpose of conducting transportation planning studies. PARA funds may be applied to address a broad range of planning issues related to road and non-motorized transportation modes.

From July to November, 2009, the HDR team initiated an issue identification and data collection effort regarding Long Range Transportation Planning Study. As part of this effort, interviews were conducted with stakeholders and a series of outreach efforts held. The purpose of this report is to summarize the findings from the stakeholder interviews conducted.

In all, 18 individuals were interviewed. Two individuals were contacted but the team was unable to establish an interview – Roger Smith, Jr., President Salt River Materials Group, and Jim Alevras, Public Works Manager, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation. Mr. Smith attended the Community Meeting on October 22, 2009 and spoke with the project team.

Stakeholder Interviews Conducted

Stakeholder	Organization
Greg Bacome, Public Works	SRPMIC Public Works-Roads Maintenance
Dave Bunce, Fire Chief	SRPMIC Fire Department
Stephanie Hinson	Salt River Landfill
John Aker	Saddlebrook Communications
Tim Pickering, CEO	Salt River DEVCO
Larry Schurz, Facilities & Transportation	SRPMIC Schools
Ramon Martinez, Public Information Officer and Bruce Tunncliff, Director Safety & Security	Casino Arizona
Dr. Gerrick Monroe, Superintendent and Ron Latko, Transportation	Mesa Unified School District
Carl Couch, VP of Administrative Services	Scottsdale Community College
Ed Stillings, Engineering Development Coordinator	Federal Highway Administration
Ken Hall, Transit and Planning	City of Mesa
Stuart Boggs, Executive Director	Regional Public Transportation Authority/Valley Metro
Sharon Wallace, Acting Ranger	Tonto National Forest
Shelly Seyler, Traffic Engineering	City of Tempe
Gregg Czajkowski, SRP Designer	Salt River Project
Tom Ward and Randy Harrell, Public Works	Town of Fountain Hills
Shane Anton, Program Manager	SRPMIC Cultural Preservation Program
Stan Kephart, SRPMIC Chief of Police	Salt River Police Department

Issues

Overall, it was clear that individuals were very pleased to be asked to participate in the stakeholder interview process and thought it was an important planning effort that the Community was embarking upon.

The following summarizes the key issues identified in terms of parking, truck traffic, bicycle/pedestrian movements, roadway network, and public transportation.

Road Improvements It was mentioned that better road maintenance was needed, especially on the half and quarter mile roadway section lines. Many stakeholders felt that fixing existing capacity problems and addressing safety issues were highest priority improvements that should be made. However, maximizing economic development opportunities should be considered when prioritizing roadway improvements.

Cut Through Traffic The responses varied depending on if the stakeholder was a Community member or worked for the Community versus a stakeholder from outside of SRPMIC. Many stakeholders from outside of the Community did not understand that cutting through SRPMIC to get from Mesa to Scottsdale is trespassing. Scottsdale Community College mentioned that 10-15% of students and employees come from north Mesa through SRPMIC to the college. The street system is not designed to handle that high traffic volume. Extreme traffic calming measures could affect students' school choice.

It was mentioned that one of the reasons for the cut through traffic is the inadequacy of the regional road system. It was suggested that instead of reducing options, consider designated routes for drivers to use (e.g., limited access boulevard to guide drivers).

Cut through traffic is a major concern for most Community members due to the speed in which people travel causing safety issues or individuals not obeying signs. The excessive speeds endanger pedestrians who have to walk on roads with no sidewalks. A particular concern mentioned was that the children walking along Alma School Road have no refuge from traffic.

Safety The priorities for safety improvements vary depending on the roadway segment as well as the type of problem. Safety concerns for school children were raised more often. Some said that if you fix the capacity of the roadway it may allow you to fix the safety issues and help with economic development. Concern was raised about the feral horses and the safety issues they cause which should be considered in planning any new roadway.

Roadway lighting needs to be improved at intersections for safety reasons. Dusk-to-dawn lighting should be added at major intersections. The lack of signage is also a safety concern. It was suggested that the Community follow the same standards for signs as the rest of the region (MUTCD-Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices).

River Crossings The Forest Service raised concerns about new river crossings near the forest service boundaries and the impact a new crossing might have along the Salt River recreational areas. The lower Salt River Corridor (roughly Bush Highway to Saguaro Lake) is heavily visited with 4 million people annually. Any new connection on Bush Highway would have a major impact.

It was stressed that it was important to build the bridge on Gilbert Road where the bridge was washed out. Also, there was a need to provide another connection across the Salt River to link the Community near the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal crossing.

Public Transit Increasing Community members' access to public transit was viewed positively. The need to better advertise schedules, routes and times of operation were mentioned as important to address. Valley Metro plans to begin regular bus service in 2015 along Shea

Boulevard to the east end of Fountain Hills. The Mesa Public Schools District felt that it would be beneficial for SRPMIC members to be able to get to the light rail system. The study could consider public transit connections to downtown Mesa where Community Members can catch the light rail to get all over the Valley. There is a park-and-ride lot being developed along Gilbert Road in Mesa. Another consideration might be to connect ASU-Tempe and North Scottsdale via SRPMIC as well as providing better connections to the airport. This would allow public transportation for the many employees in the 101 Corridor. Consider transit improvements that would connect activity centers within the Community and to regional activity centers. These connections would benefit Community members as well as others working in the area, making such routes more viable.

Other potential transit routes include:

- ✓ North-south route on Alma School Road
- ✓ East-west route on Chaparral
- ✓ Extend beyond the Scottsdale Community College, continuing into the Community along Chaparral to Longmore and to the government complex
- ✓ Valley Metro McDowell Route should provide a through-route, making stops and connections within the Community to Salt River Transit
- ✓ East-west connections on Thomas
- ✓ Mesa connections on Dobson Road, Country Club and Mesa Drive
- ✓ Improve transit service to serve the casinos
- ✓ Increase transit service from 30 minute to 15 minute intervals

Trails, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities The Forest Service mentioned that they would want to be involved in considering non-motorized trails. There are no trails connecting from the SRPMIC into the Forest Service lands. Such a trail system along the northeast boundary would seasonally impact the bald eagle nesting areas in the winter when the area is closed. Providing trail access would cause an enforcement problem; canoes on the river do not seem to bother the eagles but pedestrians and vehicles are a major concern.

Consider designating the Arizona Canal as part of the regional trail system. Pedestrian paths are important for safety reasons. Additional trails, especially in the Peoples' Village, would be nice. Insufficient rights-of-way are a challenge for establishing more trails. It was suggested that McKellips would be a prime candidate for a trail and McDowell Road for a bike lane.

It was mentioned that the City of Mesa has a Multi-Use Path Master Plan and the Community might want to consider making those pathway connections. The City of Mesa and Forest Service would like the opportunity to coordinate with SRPMIC on trail connectivity.

Regional Cooperation All stakeholders felt it was beneficial for regional cooperation to occur and that SRPMIC continue to be engaged in regional discussions particularly as it relates to transportation. It appeared that current regional cooperation and relationships were working well. The Forest Service mentioned that the formal consultation process is the one that Forest Service is required to use with Tribal entities. Typically, the District Ranger and Forest Service Project Manager coordinate with the Tribal Cultural or Preservation Officer through their Tribal Liaison. Typically, the LRTP would not require formal consultation.

Suggested Road Improvements

1. SR 87 (Beeline Highway) – maintain the highway’s capacity; there is a concern that the capacity of the roadway be maintained if SRPMIC allows development along SR 87
2. Provide an alternative route when accidents or an emergency occurs that shuts down Shea Boulevard or SR 87 (Beeline Highway)
3. Pima Road improvements – five lanes to handle the spring training traffic and future development
4. Gilbert Road river crossing
5. Sidewalks in residential areas including along bus routes
6. Pave Mesa Drive
7. Pave Montebello
8. Traffic signals on Alma School Road at Indian Bend Road
9. Consider public utility easement corridors on new road right-of-ways
10. Pave and extend Earll Drive between Extension and Longmore
11. Pave dirt roads and add sidewalks
12. New road to serve homes along Indian School Road east of 126th Street, which is east of SR 87
13. Shoulder widening – irrigation ditches are a problem
14. Gateway treatment along Longmore Street and Osborn Road (e.g. medians, landscaping, etc.)
15. McDowell Road in Lehi
16. McKellips Road through Salt River into Mesa Drive
17. Traffic lights at Thomas Road and Loop 101
18. Direct connection between McDowell Road and SR 87
19. Provide access between the Community and the Casino Arizona so that Community members do not have to access from the highway
20. McDowell Road to Oak Street, low flow crossing
21. Dobson, from Indian Bend Road to Chaparral Road (canal crossing)
22. Widen Chaparral Road and seal coat
23. Pave Mesa Drive north of Camelback Road
24. Improve Alma School Road north of the canal
25. Greater connectivity between Chaparral Road and Osborn Road
26. Connection from East Mesa to Shea Boulevard

Other Opportunities

Consider the development of a SRPMIC Rio Salado project (Note: there is a SRPMIC Papago Project, see <http://www.srpmic-nsn.gov/community/papago.asp>)

Interview Summaries

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael Gorton

Stakeholder Interview Notes

Interviewee:

Tim Pickering
SRPMIC - DEVCO
Phone: (480) 850-5705 (direct)

Date: October 20, 2009

Conducted: Monday, September 28

Stakeholder Questions

Summarized Response

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each. | As drivers typically do not recognize political boundaries, SRPMIC might consider taking a regional view of traffic. |
| 2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic? | Instead of reducing options, SRPMIC might consider designated routes for drivers. One example could be a boulevard to guide drivers. Mesa Drive is a natural boulevard to guide drivers toward the middle of Scottsdale. |
| 3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation? | A different way to think of this other than traffic as a negative is that the Community could try to harness it. SRPMIC has traffic other communities and businesses would love to have. |
| 4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation? | I have found open houses to be an effective forum for communities to garner input. SRPMIC could also participate in MAG. Other forums might be joint council meetings with neighbors with traffic as a potential topic |
| 5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?
a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)
b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)
c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)
d. Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Medium b. High c. High |
| 6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Pima Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Scottsdale could donate the right-of-way to SRPMIC to make public safety responses consistent b. SRPMIC could accept the right-of-way to control their own destiny. |

- c. ADOT could step back.
- d. Resolves emergency response issues.

- 2) Gilbert Road
 - a. Build a bridge where road is washed out
 - b. Provide additional access to Lehi across the Salt River
- 3) Another connection across the Salt River could be considered to link the Community near the CAP canal crossing.

7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)

- 1) Valley Metro service connecting ASU-Tempe and North Scottsdale via SRPMIC. This would allow public transportation of employees to the corridor.
- 2) Ensuring Pima Road is five lanes throughout to handle spring training facility and future development
- 3) Airport access, either to Sky Harbor, Scottsdale, or potentially a small SRPMIC airport

8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?

- 1) Designate Arizona Canal as part of the regional trail system and connect it.
- 2) Paths need to be designated to improve safety for pedestrians.
- 3) Pedestrian trails could improve property values.

4) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?

A new boulevard may be needed to route travelers through the Community. Way finding is difficult – there, may be a need to designate a route to channel cut-through traffic.

5) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?

Additional Comments:

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

Stakeholder Interview Notes

Interviewee:

Greg Bacome,
Public Works – Roads Maintenance
Salt River Pima-
Maricopa Indian Community
Phone: (480) 362-5608 (direct)

Date: October 1, 2009

Conducted: Wednesday, September 23

Introduction (to be read at the start of each)

Stakeholder Questions

Summarized Response

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.

The focus of the Community should be on overall growth, the community has a wide variety of land uses; agricultural, residential and commercial – each with its own need and affected differently by regional development.

2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?

- The greatest concern regarding cut-through traffic is in regards to safety – people view the Community as a different environment, traffic laws are largely disregarded (by those outside the community) and people behave as if they should be held to a different standard when on community land.
- Signage is a concern; it would be beneficial if the community followed the same standards as the region for signs (MUTCD-Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices).
 - One challenge (faced by community) is the difficulty posting signs because of location of irrigation ditches; in many instances shoulders are only two feet wide.

3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to “go their own way” with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?

The Community should be an active participant in regional planning. The actions of those outside the Community will affect it regardless, so it is in the Community’s interest to actively engage in the process.

4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?

Establish meetings and meet with people face-to-face; direct, persistent communication is most effective.

(Gregg) Was with Scottsdale for 13 years, establishing relationships with people there that makes communication with the City that much easier. The contact with the City of Mesa and Maricopa County has been less frequent and therefore communication with these communities and the office is not as well established.

A ongoing challenge that faces the Community in working with jurisdictions is the fact that SRPMIC is a sovereign nation.

- 5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?
- a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)
 - b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)
 - c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)
 - d. Other
- a. Fixing existing capacity problems (**Very High**)
 - b. Improving safety problems (**Medium**)
- overall accidents are on the low side
 - c. Promoting economic development in the Community (**Low**)
 - d. Other Issues:
 1. Bring roadways up to par, currently many are in need of maintenance
 2. Signage
 3. Shoulder widening - irrigation ditches (over time their have been a handful of deaths from drowning, need to be covered)

- 6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?
- 1) Longmore, from McDowell to the Community
Make roadway improvements that create more of a 'gateway statement' (medians, landscaping, etc.)
 - 2) Osborn
Make roadway improvements that create more of a 'gateway statement' (medians, landscaping, etc.)
 - 3) McDowell Road in Lehi
Bring up to par and then maintain; challenge is that the roadway is maintained by the County and the Community

- 7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)
- 1) Currently, there is limited public transit access to the community. It would be useful to have buses that extend beyond the Scottsdale Community College, continuing along Chaparral to Longmore and the government complex.
 - 2) The Valley Metro McDowell Route should be a through-route, making stops and connections within the Community to Salt River Transit.

- 8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?
- Additional trails, especially in the Peoples' Village would be nice for the Community.
 - One challenge in establishing pedestrian and non-motorized trails is that there is insufficient ROW.

- 9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?
- Don't believe there is a need for additional road corridors. The Community would like to keep it as a rural community.
 - Divided streets are aesthetically pleasing and provide an opportunity to create more of an entry statement; however, don't believe Community members are interested in them.

10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss? (See Additional Comments below)

Additional Comments:

- There are issues with existing ROW, especially pertaining to unimproved dirt roads.

- Don't have sufficient ROW in some cases to make improvements.
- The fact that the community has different rules than those which govern municipalities in Arizona can sometimes be a hindrance to businesses establishing services in the Community.
- Generally, grading is done for serviceability only (school bus safety and access)
 - Dirt roads generate a lot of dust.

Thank you for your time!



To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	
Compiled by: CC: Peggy Fiandaca Participant – Misty Dayzie, ADOT Project Manager	Stakeholder Interview Notes Interviewee: Sharon Wallace, Acting Ranger Mesa District Tonto National Forest
Date: October 1, 2009	Conducted: Monday, September 28

Introduction (to be read at the start of each)

Stakeholder Questions

Summarized Response

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.

Mesa District is not currently interacting with SRPMIC on transportation issues. At this point we are no coordinating on any planning projects. Forest Service is required to do formal consultation and we do that with the Community when appropriate. The District is working on a Travel Management Plan which is focused on dispersed recreation areas on the forest.

Don't really have a position on this issue specifically. From our perspective, regional growth impacts all of us and should be addressed collaboratively. Where the Forest Service and the community interface, we will have concerns or issues. If there are plans to implement changes along the river we would want to be notified and involved. Or any changes along the Salt River we would want to be a part of the dialogue.

2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?

Where the boundary turns north (SR 87, along the river and up to Bush Highway area) is a concern for cut-through traffic. It is a joint issue for both the Forest Service and SRPMIC. There are roads in this area that people have found that they can get to the back side of the river. There is a lot of trespassing of ATV and 4-wheel drive vehicles that take these back roads to get to the river. There is no motorized traffic crossing the river.

3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?

It is extremely important for cooperation to occur. Traffic flows better if there is a continual direction for the traffic to move. If SRPMIC proposes a new road across the Salt River, the Forest Service would be very concerned and want to be involved in the dialogue. It would be better for this cooperation to occur at the local level than pushing it to

the federal level.

The Forest Service has heard about the rumors about the new crossing of the river and would want to be involved in the conversation. There are some pluses/minuses for the Forest Service. The lower Salt River Corridor (roughly Bush Highway to Saguaro Lake) is heavily visited with 4 million people annually. Any new connection on Bush Highway would have a major impact. It could work well if it was well coordinated or it could be a nightmare for everyone.

This area is grid locked on holiday weekends and is often closed. This might cause increased cut-through traffic through SRPMIC. Every Memorial Day (3 day weekend) the area closes due to meeting its limit and July 4th sometimes the area closes.

<p>4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?</p>	<p>The formal consultation process is the one that Forest Service is required to use with Tribal entities. Typically the Forest Service Project Manager works with the Tribal Cultural or Preservation Officer. The Forest Service has a Tribal Liaison. The District Ranger would be involved. This type of project would not require formal consultation.</p> <p>On transportation projects with impact to the Forest Service face to face meetings should be held first and after that email updates are appropriate.</p>
<p>5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?</p> <p>a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>d. Other</p>	<p>a. Medium</p> <p>b. High</p> <p>c. High (if promoting economic development, revenues would be generated for the budget so that the other issues can be addressed. Need to balance capacity with economic development.)</p>
<p>6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?</p>	<p>1) Closing down the remote unpaved roads along the border between SRPMIC and the Forest Service would be a priority for us because of the problems they cause the Forest Service.</p>
<p>7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (Examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)</p>	<p>If there was direct road access from SRPMIC onto the forest lands, our answer might be different. But now there is no direct link so public transit is not a concern.</p> <p>If a bridge or new road was developed than public transit should be explored along Bush Highway.</p>

8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?

We would want to be involved in considering non-motorized trails. There is nothing that crosses from the SRPMIC into the Forest Service lands. Such a trail system along the N/E boundary would impact seasonally the bald eagle nesting areas in the winter. The area is closed. Providing trail access would cause an enforcement problem. Eagles are not concerned with the canoes on the river but pedestrians or vehicles are a major concern.

There is not bridge across the river so no way for foot traffic to cross.

South and west of the Granite Reef area there is a mountain bike area in the Utery Mountain area. There is an unofficial parking lot right at the SRP pumping station where the CAP Canal goes under the road. SRPMIC could get access to the mountain bike area if there was a way to cross the canal.

If there would be a connection to the Phon-D-Sutton and Coon Bluff area the Forest Service would have concerns and want to be involved. There are dead end roads now and any connections to make the area a through road would be a concern. Foot bridge would be okay but motorized vehicles would be a concern.

There are trails along the river; basically just fisherman trying to get access.

9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why?
How would it benefit your customers and the Community?

Pluses and minuses. If the Forest Service could get the "through traffic" off Bush Highway the traffic focus can be on recreation only.

If there was some connection to the Beeline with no off ramps to the SRPMIC, maybe it could work to the benefit of both agencies. Now Power and Gilbert Road are the only two crossings. The new road could potentially impact the eagles and impact the overall recreational use would be a large public concern.

10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?

(See Additional Comments below)

Additional Comments:

- Our major issue is that if there is any proposal to connect Mesa area to the Beeline Highway the Forest Service would want to be involved.
- Feral horses need to be considered in planning any new roadways.

Thank you for your time!



To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	
Compiled by: by:: CC:	Stakeholder Interview Notes Interviewee: Tom Ward, Director Randy Harrell Public Works Town of Fountain Hills
Date: October 1, 2009	Conducted: Monday, September 28

Introduction (to be read at the start of each)

Stakeholder Questions	Summarized Response
1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	Difficult to choose. Both are important and should be addressed. Regional growth all around the Community will impact the Community. Some of what Fountain Hills will be doing may impact SRPMIC. There is going to be increased traffic on 87 and Shea Boulevard that the Town will be trying to attract into the downtown area for economic development purposes. Working on a 6-lane divided roadway for Shea Boulevard as the ultimate design. It will be done incrementally.
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	The regional road system is inadequate causing the cut-through traffic issue. There are highways and local streets but no regional roads. There is no good link (regional road) between the Mesa/Chandler/Gilbert area and Scottsdale or North Phoenix. Candidate Access Report for Usery Pass Road, Stantec for MCDOT – looked at extending Power Road across the Salt River to SR 87. Fort McDowell Tribe was very interested in the study and the possible extension. Having another route would take the pressure off Gilbert Road and provide another important connection. It also provides another evacuation route for the Community.
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to “go their own way” with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	Because Fountain Hills do not have any roads that go directly into SRPMIC, we don’t have a regular coordination approach with the Community. The Town would like to improve this communication effort. SRPMIC should be an active player in regional planning issues like transportation. Regionally there are some missing links and some can impact the Community.
4) If future cooperation from the	When ADOT widened the Beeline, a partnering meeting was held with



<p>community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?</p>	<p>the Town, SRPMIC, and other stakeholders. It was a good coordination approach.</p> <p>The Town of Fountain Hills should have more periodic meeting with SRPMIC. It should occur at the Council to Council and at Senior Management to Senior Management levels. However, we don't know how to institutionalize this approach.</p>
<p>5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?</p> <p>a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>d. Other</p>	<p>a. High</p> <p>b. High</p> <p>c. High</p> <p>They are so inter-related. When you fix one thing you need to examine if you create a larger problem other places.</p> <p>The priorities also vary depending on the roadway segment as well as the issue. If you fix the capacity of the roadway it may allow you to fix the safety issues and helps with economic development. SRPMIC has done a good job of attracting economic development.</p>
<p>6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?</p>	<p>1) East Mesa to Shea Boulevard connection</p> <p>2) Beeline Highway – maintain the highway's capacity; concerned that if SRPMIC allows development along SR 87 the capacity of the roadway be maintained</p> <p>3) Alternative route when accidents or emergency occurs that shuts down Shea Boulevard or the Beeline Highway.</p>
<p>7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (Examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)</p>	<p>Valley Metro plans to begin regular bus service (2015) on Shea Boulevard out to the east end of Fountain Hills.</p>
<p>8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?</p>	<p>There is nothing leading out of Fountain Hills to the south. Fountain Hills trail focus is to the north to McDowell Mountain Park.</p> <p>No comments</p>
<p>9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?</p>	<p>East/west connections through the Community; but we recognize that it might be in the best interest of SRPMIC. However, it could be designed to limit the access so it would remove cut-through traffic and provide that important regional link.</p>
<p>10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?</p>	<p>(See Additional Comments below)</p>



Additional Comments:

- Any new development along SR 87 should be sensitive to ensure that the highway continues to operate effectively.
- Appreciate the opportunity to participate in the Study and to provide input.

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

Stakeholder Interview Notes

Interviewee:
Stephanie Hinson
Salt River Landfill

Date: October 1, 2009

Conducted: Monday, September 21

Introduction (to be read at the start of each)

Stakeholder Questions

Summarized Response

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	Both; in particular the focus should be on the type of growth along the Pima Corridor where much of the development is occurring.
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	Not an issue with regard to the Salt River Landfill; due to location, trucks are accessing the landfill via major routes such as McDowell, McKellips, Gilbert Road and the Beeline Highway.
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	Makes sense to coordinate regionally. Key issue is the main roads and their continued operation and maintenance.
4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?	No comment.
5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements? a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low) b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low) d. Other	a. Fixing existing capacity problems (Low) b. Improving safety problems (Medium) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High) d. Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driving within the community is much improved (through Ms. Hinson's 4 yr tenure) • Insufficient lighting is a concern, more is currently found in Salt River than the Lehi area • Lack of adequate street signs
6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	Gilbert Road (river crossing) is a priority; has been over 1 ½ years waiting for bridge improvements.
7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital	n/a

improvements, etc.)

8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?

Community would certainly benefit from additional trails, equestrian facilities, and general recreation trails.

There are currently little to no sidewalks, people walk in the street.

There has been discussion regarding turning the landfill into a park at future date, would be nice to see connections to larger (regional) trail system.

9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why?
How would it benefit your customers and the Community?

Would like to see a (direct) connection between McDowell and Bee Line Highway.

Provide access between community and the Casino Arizona so that Community members do not have to access the highway in order to travel there.

10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?

(See Additional Comments below)

Additional Comments:

- Salt River Landfill employs approximately 33 people; an additional 20-40 contractors are located at the Material Transfer facility; and about five are employed at the green waste facility.

Thank you for your time!



To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	
Compiled by:: CC:	Stakeholder Interview Notes Interviewee: Dr. Gerrick Monroe Assistant Superintendent Ron Latko Director of Transportation Mesa Unified School District
Date: October 1, 2009	Conducted: Monday, September 28

Introduction (to be read at the start of each)

Stakeholder Questions	Summarized Response
1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	<p>Difficult to answer. Our interaction is transporting many SRPMIC children to Mesa Public Schools. Besides transporting about 100 students, there is a partnership between SRPMIC and the Mesa District to provide additional support to students (e.g. counseling, tutoring, etc.).</p> <p>Mesa School District is not seeing an increase in students from SRPMIC attending Mesa schools since the Community is building their own schools. We anticipate always have some Community Members continuing to send their children to Mesa schools because of the commitment they have to those schools (i.e. several generation of family members attended the school).</p>
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	No comment – the average person does not understand that when they cut through the Community they are trespassing
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to “go their own way” with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	The relationship with the Mesa School District has been excellent. The School District has a Tribal Liaison responsible for addressing any concerns and ensuring good communication occurs. Annually all Superintendents meet to strengthen the ties and it has been key to the long term success of the relationship. The Community shares with the District their changing needs.
4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?	The current system works very well for us and no changes are needed.
5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing	a. High



<p>new transportation improvements?</p> <p>a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>d. Other</p>	<p>b. Medium</p> <p>c. High</p> <p>Capacity and safety issues go hand in hand. However, key to every Community is economic development.</p>
<p>6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?</p>	<p>1) McKellips Road flooding has been an issue in the past</p> <p>Basically, since all of the roads that the buses travel are all paved now they no longer have a problem. In the past, this was a big issue for the buses.</p>
<p>7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (Examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)</p>	<p>The ability for SRPMIC members to be able to get to the light rail system. Maybe a public transit connection to downtown Mesa where Community Members can catch the light rail to get all over the Valley.,</p>
<p>8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?</p>	<p>May want to make the regional connection that needs to be developed (i.e. Scottsdale to the Beeline) and then shut off access to all other roads.</p>
<p>10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?</p>	<p>(See Additional Comments below)</p>

Additional Comments:

- We have a narrow focus – primarily busing kids to school. Biggest issue in the past has been the dirt roads. The District added different buses because of the dirt roads. However, that has changed. For the most part, all the roads being used are paved and this situation gets better every year.
- They run about 13 buses (84 and 72 passenger buses) and Special Education Buses (24 passengers). Ron Latko will send a routing map. Special education students are picked up at their homes.

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

Stakeholder Interview Notes

Interviewee:
Kenneth Hall
Transit and Planning
City of Mesa

Date: October 12, 2009

Conducted: Monday, October 1

Introduction (to be read at the start of each)

Stakeholder Questions

Summarized Response

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	Not in position to answer, this is really the call of the Community.
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	No comment. Key corridors like McKellips Road obviously need to be maintained. Obviously, another important through route is the Bee Line Highway (SR 87) - Country Club Road.
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	The Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community's active role on the Maricopa Association of Governments is evidence of the Community's interest in being engaged with regional issues and problem solving.
4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?	Communication between the Community and City of Mesa is well coordinated through the Intergovernmental representative for Mesa.
5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements? a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low) b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low) d. Other	a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High) – focusing on linkages between major arterials b. Improving safety problems (High) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (n/a) – This should be coordinated through the Community's Comprehensive Development Plan d. Other Key factors in the Community's LRTP should be connectivity, linkages, expanding capacity and keeping key corridors up to par.
6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	1) Bridges across the Salt River should be a priority, MCDOT currently studying Gilbert Road, McKellips Road, and Dobson Road crossings (in that order); Gilbert Road is already identified in the Maricopa Association of Governments Transportation Improvement Plan.
7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why?	1) Park and Ride along Gilbert Road (in City of Mesa). This project is currently in the design phase, some money has been allocated for it next year.

(examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)

-
- | | |
|--|--|
| 8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community? | Refer to the Multi-Use Path Master Plan (City of Mesa) – connectivity with the Mesa system, Tonto National Forest, would benefit the region as a whole. Specifically the Lehi Trail (Mesa) and paths along the canals, which are important elements of Mesa’s non-motorized plans. There is discussion of a potential trail head at Red Mountain Mining at Granite Reef Dam (part of the restoration of the Va Shly’Ay Akimel Salt River Ecosystem, between the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and Mesa, Ariz.) |
| 9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why?
How would it benefit your customers and the Community? | No comment. Can’t speak to their need for additional network. Their system, like much of the Valley, based on a mile grid serves the area well. |
| 10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss? | Refer to Additional Comments below. |
-

Additional Comments:

- An additional concern is the traffic resulting from the Loop 101 spillover traffic when this route is congested.
- Mesa would appreciate the opportunity to collaborate with the SRPMIC on trail connectivity. Refer to #8 above.

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	
Compiled by: Michael Gorton Stakeholder Interview Notes Interviewee: Stuart Boggs RPTA Valley Metro Phone: (602) 262-7433 (direct)	
Date: October 20, 2009	Conducted: Thursday, September 24

Stakeholder Questions	Summarized Response
1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	SRPMIC should be proactive about the impacts of overall regional growth and its impact on the Community or ignore it at its peril.
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	<p>There are poor north-south public transit connections through the Community. RPTA has plans to extend service both from the south and the north with connections to Mesa, Scottsdale, and Fountain Hills.</p> <p>Provides more transit options for residents and provides access for outside workers.</p> <p>Coordination is needed on PARA transit side. The casino are asking for route extensions. RPTA is coordinating with the casinos and the Community.</p>
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to “go their own way” with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	Proponent of regional dialogue, SRPMIC should be at the table because no one exists in a vacuum.
4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?	SRPMIC is a member of MAG. Encourage SRPMIC to get a seat on the RTPA board either as a voting or non-voting member so their voice is heard.
5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?	<p>a.</p> <p>b.</p> <p>c. High</p> <p>Other Issues:</p> <p>1. Increased travel options increases Community members’ access to economic growth opportunities.</p>
a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low) b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low) d. Other	
6) Where are your three highest transit improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	<p>1) North-South Connections</p> <p>a. SRPMIC - Mesa</p>

b. SRPMIC - Scottsdale

2) Mesa Connections

a. Dobson Road

b. Country Club

c. Mesa Drive

3) East-West Connection on Thomas

7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)

1) Improve transit service to serve casinos

2) Extend routes into SRPMIC to provide Community better access to jobs, education, and medical services

3) Increase transit service to 30 minute to 15 minute intervals

8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?

1) Better trail systems would increase accessibility. It would contribute trips to transit stops and distribute trips from transit stops

2) Health benefit from increased exercise

9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why?
How would it benefit your customers and the Community?

10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?

How activity centers are located in relationship to the transportation infrastructure is important. There should be a solid linkage between land use and transportation. As planning continues on SRPMIC there should be a solid conversation between land use and transportation.

Additional Comments:

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

Stakeholder Interview Notes

Interviewee:
John Aker
Engineering Manager
Saddleback Communications

Date: October 1, 2009

Conducted: Wednesday, September 23

Introduction (to be read at the start of each)

Stakeholder Questions

Summarized Response

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	The focus should be on commercial growth in the corridor to enrich/sustain the earned income for allottees and Community members.
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	No Comment.
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	It is very important for the Community to coordinate actions with the region, and likewise, as all surrounding areas affect the Community. The Community may as well participate since they will be affected by regional growth, whether they choose to participate or not.
4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?	Coordination of communication should be through the Tribal Council; they are the elected body and able to speak for the Community with one voice.
5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements? a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low) b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low) d. Other	a. Fixing existing capacity problems (Medium) b. Improving safety problems (Medium) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High) d. Other (LEHI) only one entry/exit (Gilbert). Should consider making McDowell to Oak a low-flow crossing, at one time (before flooding in the 80's) McDowell used to go through. There is still a communication ROW along this route (Mountain States Telegraph), although the infrastructure has long since been relocated. The ROW is now owned by Saddleback Communications – an enterprise of the SRPMIC.
6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	1) McDowell to Oak, low flow crossing 2) Dobson, from Indian Bend to Chaparral (Canal crossing) 3) Additional ideas, not in priority order a. Chaparral – widen lanes a bit and seal coat b. Mesa Drive, above Camelback (may want to pave) c. Alma School – unpaved (dirt) north of the Canal, may want to improve

- 7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)
- 1) A priority of public transportation could be bringing employees to work. As an example
 - a. Saddleback Communications has approximately 35 employees. Engineering and Construction Services (ECS) is also located at this location (another 30-40 employees) as well as an ECS warehouse.
 - b. Community trailer parks (2) these contain over 800 spaces with retirees that are in need of transit services.
Other high density locations that would create good transfer locations,
 - c. Lehi Community Center
 - d. Government Complex (Two Waters)
 - 2) Light Rail along freeway corridor
Given the amount of current employment in the Pima Corridor, and the anticipated employment and special event facilities (e.g., the convention center and spring training venue), light rail and connections to it would benefit the area.

- 8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?
- Create an off-street bike trail. An example of a successful system can be seen in Denver, CO. Such a trail would comprise eight foot paved/asphalt trails.
 - McKellips would be a prime candidate for a trail (currently only 3' shoulders)
An annual Ironman competition is held in SRPMIC; improvements to this route would have additional benefit to the community
 - McDowell another candidate for bike trail, or possibly bike lane in roadway
 - SR87, currently bicycle traffic is taking this route from/to Fountain Hills

- 9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why?
How would it benefit your customers and the Community?
- McDowell to Oak (as noted previously) to service the Lehi area
 - Dobson canal crossing (as noted previously)
 - Greater connectivity between Chaparral and Osborne (Two Waters) connectivity

- 10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss? (See Additional Comments below)

Additional Comments:

- Would like to see (the) Salt River developed as a *Rio Salado* like project.
- Roads such as Indian School, McDowell, Chaparral can handle traffic, the focus should be on maintaining them and making them safe.
- Loop 101 and 202 should carry bulk of traffic today and in the future.

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled Michael Gorton
by::

Stakeholder Interview Notes

Interviewee:

Carl Couch
VP of Administrative Services
Scottsdale Community College
Phone: (480) 423-6161 (direct)

Date: October 19, 2009

Conducted: Thursday, September 24

Stakeholder Questions

Summarized Response

<p>1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.</p>	<p>Close-in housing opportunities are appealing to the Community College. East of campus is a planned apartment development that would bring the possibility of student housing.</p>
<p>2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?</p>	<p>Cut-through is a concern for the college. Between 10 and 15 percent of students and employees come from north Mesa through SRPMIC. The street system isn't designed for high traffic volumes.</p> <p>The cut-through traffic is not only from students, but also traffic seeking access to the congested Loop 101.</p> <p>Extreme traffic calming measures could affect students' school choice. Most likely increase the perception of inconvenience.</p>
<p>3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?</p>	<p>Geography makes the community a key player. There should be a thoughtful discussion about transportation and commercial development and its impact on the regional transportation system. The Community would benefit from discussions as broad as possible. MAG is the best forum for most of these discussions.</p>
<p>4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?</p>	<p>MAG is logical point of coordination. Cooperation should involve key stakeholders and be considered as on-going.</p>
<p>5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?</p> <p>a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>d. Other</p>	<p>a. Medium</p> <p>b. Clearly most important.</p> <p>c. High</p>
<p>6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?</p>	<p>1) Activity on Loop 101 is paramount. Chaparral Road is the only point of access for the Community College. There is a</p>

provision in the lease agreement with the Community for the construction of 92nd Street north to the McDonald Interchange. Internal circulation plans are in place for the eventual extension of 92nd Street.

7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)	There is some pedestrian and bicycle traffic from Scottsdale. Most students drive to school. Better transit service is needed in Scottsdale provide better access to the Community College.
8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?	Pedestrian and non-motorized trails would be beneficial. However feral dogs are an issue for bicyclists riding to campus. Otherwise it would be wonderful if the Community had bike paths.
9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?	Dedicated arterials within the Community to facilitate north-south access would be a benefit of the college because it would make it more accessible to students in Mesa.
10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?	I applaud the Community for engaging in a forward, progressive thinking study like this. The Community College is looking for opportunities to engage with the Community like this.

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

Stakeholder Interview Notes

Interviewee:

Larry Schurz
Facilities & Transportation Coordinator
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian
Community Schools

Date: October 1, 2009

Conducted: Monday, September 21

Introduction (to be read at the start of each)

Stakeholder Questions

Summarized Response

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.</p> | <p>Both, however, the emphasis should be on the Community's needs.</p> |
| <p>2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?</p> | <p>This is a major concern. There are students waiting at bus stops and cut-through traffic presents a safety concern. Regarding cut-through traffic, there is an observed lack of courtesy with regard to school buses; drivers ignore safety signals (such as school stop warnings), and pass busses when stopped and in motion.</p> |
| <p>3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?</p> | <p>Cooperation is critical. Increasing congestion throughout the region is a concern as it affects the time students must spend travelling to and from schools, especially in the case of SRPMIC students travelling to Mesa Schools.</p> <p>There is an agreement with Mesa City schools that the students in the unorganized territories (those areas outside of the SRPMIC school district boundary areas) are covered by and may attend Mesa schools.</p> |
| <p>4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?</p> | <p>The Education Board does a good job of communicating with the Community.</p> <p>It is important that departments within the Community communicate with each other; for example, a decision made by the Housing Department (with regard to new subdivision for instance) may have a direct impact on school transportation needs and access. When such decisions are considered in an open forum the implications are fully understood and input can be received that will best serve the Community.</p> |
| <p>5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?</p> <p>a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>b. Improving safety problems (High,</p> | <p>a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High)</p> <p>b. Improving safety problems (High)
Safety of children should be a top priority</p> <p>c. Promoting economic development in the Community (Low)</p> |

Medium, Low)	d. Other
c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)	
d. Other	
6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gilbert Road Important for community (including bus transportation) – provides one of only several access routes to Lehi 2. Cut-through traffic – Student safety is paramount
7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Safe bus stops for children – no designated areas providing shelter from rain/sun -due to travel time, Mesa schools are sometimes picking up children in the dark 2. Too few crossing zones – few streets (besides directly adjacent to schools) are marked for pedestrians 3. Street lighting is insufficient
8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?	Secure Right-Of-Way to allow trails in the future (trails that are developed should be maintained and developed to look natural)
9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?	Don't believe there should be new road corridors designated through the Community. Greater through roads will result in greater cut-through traffic.
10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?	(See additional comments below)

Additional Comments:

- Students from the Community are travelling to Mesa schools, and increased traffic (in general) will result in the students having to spend more time travelling each day. Overall, SRPMIC students attend a total of eight elementary schools, four junior high schools, and two high schools.
- As school enrollment increases there is additional parent drop-off at the schools. Want to ensure student safety as growth occurs. Also, as development occurs the travel time for students and busses will increase.
- An increasing number of parents are choosing to drop their children at school resulting in greater traffic around the schools during those busy pick-up and drop-off times.
- Locating new schools will be a challenge because allotted land being built up by families.
- There are currently plans for the expansion of the elementary school (close proximity to the High School)
- Cars are travelling on canal banks (primarily contractors), results in dust and unsafe conditions along these potential non-motorized routes.
- Schools have bike racks, but they aren't used. Few children ride their bikes to schools. This might be due in part to the fact there are no dedicated bike routes.
- Safe Routes to Schools should be further evaluated.

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael Gorton

Stakeholder Interview Notes

Interviewee:

Gregg J. Czajkowski,
Engineering & Construction Services
Salt River Project
Phone: (602) 818-7725 (direct)

Date: October 19, 2009

Conducted: Thursday, September 24

Stakeholder Questions

Summarized Response

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	Better road maintenance is needed, especially on the ½ mile and ¼ mile road section lines.
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	Excessive speeds of cut-through drivers endanger pedestrians who have to walk on roads with no sidewalks. There is no place for pedestrians to go. Children walk along Alma School Road with no refuge from traffic.
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to “go their own way” with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	Community needs to be included all regional planning and development. There should be knowledge sharing at the local planning level.
4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?	The best forum is a well-publicized public hearing held in the early stages of a project. These are good tools for gauging the public climate. The newspapers should also be used for disseminating planning information.
5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements? a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low) b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low) d. Other	<p>a. High priority b. High priority; especially sidewalks and lighting c. Medium</p> <p>Other Issues:</p> <p>1. Roadway lighting needs to be improved with lights at intersections. Dusk-to-dawn lighting should be added at major intersections.</p>
6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	<p>1) Sidewalks in residential areas; school bus stops; bike paths. 2) Pave internal roads. Mesa Drive, Montebello. 3) Traffic signals on Alma School Road at Indian Bend. 4) Consider Public Utility Easements corridors on new road right-</p>

of-way.

-
- | | |
|---|--|
| 7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why?
(examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.) | 1) Valley Metro route through Community. North-South route on Alma School. East-west Route on Chaparral. |
|---|--|
-
- | | |
|---|---|
| 8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community? | 1) Add sidewalks to roadsides.
2) Pave and extend Earll Drive between Extension and Longmore.
3) Pave dirt roads and add sidewalks. |
|---|---|
-
- | | |
|--|--|
| 4) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why?
How would it benefit your customers and the Community? | New road needed to serve homes along Indian School Road east of 126 th street, which is east of SR 87. There are homes being built here, but there is no established road grid. Utilities are following 'bunny trails.' |
|--|--|
-
- | | |
|---|--|
| 5) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss? | |
|---|--|

Additional Comments:

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

Stakeholder Interview Notes

Interviewee:

Dave Bunce
Fire Chief
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Date: October 12, 2009

Conducted: Monday, October 5

Introduction (to be read at the start of each)

Stakeholder Questions

Summarized Response

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each. | The focus of the plan should be on the overall growth. The SRPMIC General Plan identified the areas where growth will be focused; with commercial growth along the Pima Corridor, and to a lesser degree McKellips, and the residential growth focused on the People’s Village. Infrastructure improvements, both completed and planned, are driving an interest in Community members returning to the Community to build homesites on their allotments - especially north of the Arizona Canal between Mesa Drive and Alma School Road. |
| 2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic? | Cut-through traffic has always been a concern (for the ten years the Chief has been around Community). The circulation within the Community is rural, with lots of stop signs that clog traffic and are often ignored. Much of the community is 35 mph speeds and when school buses stop on major streets traffic is blocked. |
| 3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to “go their own way” with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation? | No comment. |
| 4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation? | For our department, communication should be through the Administration and then to Council for their buy-in and support. The Community’s intranet site is a great venue for disseminating information. |
| 5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?
a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)
b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)
c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)
d. Other | a. Fixing existing capacity problems (Medium) – look at major arteries heading east-west and ensure they continue to serve capacity.
b. Improving safety problems (High) – on issue are the blind corners, a result of narrow right-of-way and overgrown vegetation.
c. Promoting economic development in the Community (No ranking) – should look at commercial corridors, ensure that as development is planned that these issues are considered. This will be real important as sites for the Stadium are explored. |

- | | |
|--|--|
| 6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Widths of roadways, especially on some major arteries are too narrow. 2) Maintain surfaces, continue paving additional roads; emergency response vehicles are not designed to travel unpaved roads, this adds wear and tear to these vehicles. 3) Additional canal crossings; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dobson across the canal, and then pave the road from Indian Bend to Jackrabbit • Mesa Drive bridge (canal) helped • Alma School Road (canal) crossing needs to be improved. This is an old bridge, not sure of tonnage capacity, however needs to be widened and brought up to current standards. 4) Access to Lehi
Currently access Lehi by way of Gilbert Road; it is a bit of an island and response times would improve with additional access. 5) Continuing Indian Bend Road through to Mesa Drive
This would also assist in improving response times. |
| 7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.) | <p>Public transit should be prioritized based on the following needs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Transit for elders; either don't drive or can't drive 2) Disabled 3) Community members without a vehicle. |
| 8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community? | <p>New development should put in sidewalks. While it would be nice to have pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian facilities, oftentimes there is insufficient Right-of-Way to accommodate these needs.</p> |
| 9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community? | <p>It would be beneficial to develop Dobson with paving and a bridge across the Arizona Canal.</p> |
| 10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss? | <p>(See Additional Comments below)</p> |

Additional Comments:

An additional concern is the traffic resulting from the Loop 101 spillover traffic when this route is congested.

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

Stakeholder Interview Notes

Interviewee:

Ed Stillings
Engineering Development Coordinator
Mobility Planning Engineer
Federal Highway Administration

Date: October 9, 2009

Conducted: Tuesday, October 6

Introduction (to be read at the start of each)

Stakeholder Questions

Summarized Response

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	It would be difficult to separate the two (overall growth/type of growth), focus must be on both.
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	No comment. Can understand cut-through traffic being a concern to the Community; however the FHWA is primarily concerned with the larger arterial roadway system.
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	It is important for the Community to be a participant in planning so that we can address issues at a regional level.
4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?	The Community's involvement in the Maricopa Association of Governments is a good venue for participation in regional issues. Of course, as this study demonstrates, SRPMIC should continue to coordinate with the Arizona Department of Transportation, neighboring communities and Maricopa County.
5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements? a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low) b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low) d. Other	a. Fixing existing capacity problems (Medium) b. Improving safety problems (High) – this is one of the FHWA's major priorities. c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High) – it is important for the Community to have an opportunity for growth.
6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	No comment, FHWA is generally interested in higher order of roadways.
7) Where are your three highest public	No specific comments. Ideally the focus would be on serving those

transit priorities that impact the Community and why?
(examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)

corridors that have the greatest density of population or employment.

8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?	It would be beneficial for the Community to develop some kind of a (non-motorized) plan – focusing on addressing those areas where greatest foot traffic is anticipated.
9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?	No comment.
10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?	No additional comments.

Additional Comments:

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

Stakeholder Interview Notes

Interviewee:

Bruce Tunnickliff, Safety & Security Director and
Ramon Martinez, Public Information Officer
Casino Arizona

Date: October 9, 2009

Conducted: Wednesday, October 7

Introduction (to be read at the start of each)

Stakeholder Questions

Summarized Response

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.

Believe that you must look at the overall growth. Specific issues relating to the Casino Arizona include ingress/egress (access) and the quality of roadways accessing the casino. It is important that the Community continue to require a high standard of development to support and enhance the investment made by the community enterprises such as the casinos, Talking Stick Golf Course and the convention center.

2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?

This has been a long-standing concern of the Community. In general, Community members do not want outsiders trespassing in the Community. There is a desire among Community members to preserve the rural, safe feel of the Community.

Ideally, would like to see through traffic channeled to specific routes; McDowell, McKellips, Indian School Road and Thomas.

3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to “go their own way” with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?

It is very important for the Community to stay involved for several reasons; 1) need to be engaged to stay informed and be able to influence growth, and 2) it is a “good neighbor” policy to be engaged.

4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?

The Council is the appropriate body to communicate both with the Community and the greater region. In addition the Community’s involvement with the Maricopa Association of Governments provides an appropriate forum to communicate with neighboring and regional jurisdictions.

5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?

- a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)
- b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)

- a. Fixing existing capacity problems **(High)**
- b. Improving safety problems **(High)** – specifically cut through traffic and the overall volume of traffic.
- c. Promoting economic development in the Community **(High)**

- c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)
- d. Other

6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	Continued access to the Community's enterprise operations is critical; Salt River Sand And Gravel, the casinos, and new commercial development along the Pima Corridor.
7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)	<p>The top transit priorities should be to develop connections for Salt River Transit users to the Valley Metro system. In addition to the casinos, logical connection points include the Scottsdale Community College, the Pavillions, and Pima Corridor shopping centers.</p> <p>Regarding the casino employees, there have been requests in the past to provide convenient, scheduled service to the casinos. If this were a priority of the Community, Casino Arizona would certainly be interested in working with Transit to facilitate service to the casinos.</p>
8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?	<p>A real challenge with regard to the establishment of trails is the way land is divided up; allotted land does not provide sufficient Right-of-Way for trails.</p> <p>This has always been a challenge. At one time (Mr. Martinez) family was involved in boarding horses on the Community and it was difficult for owners to ride on reservation because they were not able to access areas for that purpose.</p>
9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?	Do not see that there is a need or desire for any additional roadway corridors in the Community.
10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?	No other comments.

Additional Comments:

Thank you for your time!



**Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Indian Community
2010 Long Range Transportation
Planning Study**

**Second Round Community Outreach
Summary Report**

Prepared for:
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Prepared by:
HDR Engineering, Inc. and PSA, Inc.

June 2010

Executive Summary

Background

The Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 2010 Long Range Transportation Planning Study is being funded by the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Multimodal Planning Division's Planning Assistance for Rural Areas (PARA) program. The PARA program is funded through the Federal Highway Administration's State Planning and Research program to non-metropolitan communities for the purpose of conducting transportation planning studies. PARA funds may be applied to address a broad range of planning issues related to road and non-motorized transportation modes.

Community Outreach

The first round of Community Outreach occurred from July to November, 2009 and focused on issue identification and data collection. As part of this initial effort, interviews were conducted with 18 stakeholders, presentation at elders' breakfasts occurred, and two Community Workshops held.

The second round of Community outreach was intended to provide Community members with an overview of the SRPMIC Transportation Planning Study, update them on the progress made to date, solicit input regarding the transportation improvement recommendations, and understand any issues or concerns that should be addressed in the final Study recommendations. Second round Community outreach included:

- Elders' Breakfasts – April 7th and May 5th
- SRPMIC Earth Day Celebration – April 24th
- Community Workshops – May 17th and May 24th
- Tribal Council Presentation – May 12th and June 16th

The meeting summary notes from the above listed outreach meetings are included in the Appendix. The Project Team had a project booth at the SRPMIC Earth Day event to collect public input and distribute flyers.

As was done during the first round of outreach, the Community Workshops were extensively promoted within the Community in the following ways:

- Water Bill Mailer – 1,600 copies distributed; Community members received their water bills 7 to 10 days prior to the workshops
- Two Advertisements in the Community Newspaper – newspaper delivery dates April 15th and May 6th
- Announcement on SRPMIC digital signage and marquee – May 3rd
- Flyers posted to the 16 Community bulletin boards – May 3rd
- 160 flyers distributed with the home delivered meals to seniors – May 3rd

- Announcements of the Community Workshops posted to the SRPMIC intranet
- Announcement at the two Elders' Breakfasts – April 7 and May 5
- Announcement of the Community Workshops at the Tribal Council meeting – May 12th

Comments on Recommendations

Overall, it was clear that individuals were very pleased to be asked to participate in the Long Range Transportation Planning Study and thought it was an important planning effort that the Community was embarking upon.

The following summarizes the comments related to the transportation recommendations.

Road Improvements There was general support for the roadway improvements suggested in the draft plan. There was some concern expressed about the widening of 92nd Street being too large of a road east of Loop 101. Others roadway improvements questioned were the widening of SR 87 and Gilbert Road.

Bridges Some Community members commented that they felt a bridge over the Arizona Canal or a bridge on Dobson across the Salt River was not needed.

Safety The priorities for safety improvements were very important to Community members. Safety improvements related to pedestrian facilities for school children and reducing speeds throughout the Community were supported. Center and Country Club on Osborn Road as well as Sycamore to Palm Lane were areas that were recommended for speed limit enforcement.

Public Transit Increasing Community members' access to public transit was viewed positively. The need to better advertise schedules, routes and times of operation were mentioned as important to address. It was mentioned that transit service should be provided every day of the week to serve Community members needing to get to medical services such as dialysis.

APPENDIX

Salt River and Lehi Elders' Breakfasts

Date: April 7, 2010 (Salt River Elders); May 5, 2010 (Lehi Elders)

Locations: Lehi Community Building, 1231 E. Oak Street
Salt River Community Building, 1880 N. Longmore Road

Handouts: Study Recommendations Handout

Project Team: Jennifer Jack, SRPMIC-ECS Project Manager (4/7 & 5/5)
Misty Dayzie, ADOT Project Manager (4/7 & 5/5)
Esther Moyah, SRPMIC (4/7 & 5/5)
Julian Avila, ADOT CCP (5/5)
Michael Gorton, HDR (5/5)
Michael LaBianca, HDR (5/5)
Peggy Fiandaca, Partners for Strategic Action, Inc. (5/5)

The Project Team was invited to distribute information at the Salt River Elders' Breakfast on April 7th and make a brief announcement regarding upcoming public workshops associated with the SRPMIC Transportation Planning Study. Additionally, at the regular monthly Elders' breakfast in Lehi on May 5th, the Project Team made a presentation and facilitated a discussion with Elders attending the breakfast. This was the second round of presentations made at the Elders' breakfasts during the Study.

The purpose of the full study presentation at the Lehi Breakfast was to provide attendees an overview of the SRPMIC Transportation Planning Study, update them on the progress made to date, solicit input regarding the transportation recommendations, and understand any issues or concerns that should be addressed during the upcoming Community Workshops and final Study recommendations.

Lehi Elders' Breakfast Presentation

Jennifer Jack, SRPMIC thanked everyone for giving the Team an opportunity to provide an overview of the Long Range Transportation Planning Study and the recommendations. She also introduced the Study Team members.

Michael Gorton with HDR (Transportation Consultant Project Manger) used PowerPoint slides to discuss the Study and transportation recommendations. Michael explained that the Study addresses roadway safety issues, walking and bicycle routes, cut-through traffic concerns and public transportation for Community members to get to the doctor, work or shopping. All of these issues impact the Community's quality of life. Michael explained the Study's outcome is a long-range plan for transportation improvements within SRPMIC. He encouraged their involvement at one of two upcoming Community

Workshops (May 17 – Lehi and May 24 – Salt River). The workshops will have the same format and presentation on two different evenings at two different locations.

May 17, 2010; 5:30 – 7:30 PM
Lehi Community Center

May 24, 2010; 5:30 – 7:30 PM
SRPMIC Community Building

Michael explained that the meetings would include a brief presentation about the Study followed by questions and discussions. Tribal staff, ADOT representatives and planning consultants will be present to answer questions about the Study.

The Project Team then facilitated a discussion of questions, issues, and ideas that participants expressed:

- Comment – Enforce the speed limit on Center and Country Club on Osborn Road
- Question - No improvements in Lehi shown? Response - McDowell Road construction will begin this summer and Oak Street is currently in the predesign stage and will include roadway reconstruction and new sidewalks.
- Speeding is an issue on Sycamore to Palm Lane; need to put the speed bumps back to calm the traffic in the area; it is a graded road but a popular road to get from Mesa
- Traffic is heavy in the AM and PM on Center and Thomas; need to have speed bumps with a warning that speed bumps are ahead; dangerous one-way; curves; and dead end all cause this area to be dangerous

Peggy thanked them for their ideas and encouraged their participation at the upcoming Community Workshops. If they had additional ideas or comments, they could write them on the Comment Cards on each of the tables and give them to Misty Dayzie or Jennifer Jack.

Comment Cards

Following are comments received at the Elders' Breakfast written on Comment Cards.

- Why don't we have toll roads?
- Don't widen 87 or Gilbert Road
- Don't need Dobson Bridge over the Salt River
- Don't want 92nd/Dobson Road improved
- Don't need bridge over Arizona Canal. Community members can get to the casino on the 101
- Do not want more land going to ADOT/MCDOT for roads
- Improvements need to be internal to benefit and preserve the Community
- Need to follow up on the waterline in McDowell – Mesa or SRPMIC water
- Palm Lane – signage to slow cars because children are at play
- Need traffic calming at Center & Thomas
- Explore the possibility of speed bumps in residential areas; too much fast traveling by Community and non-Community members
- Would the SRPMIC-DOT consider putting traffic lights either on Center and Beeline or North Mesa Drive and Beeline? Sometimes to make a turn a left turn at Beeline from either North Mesa Drive or Center, the wait is long and vehicles are traveling fast. This would be a safety issue for school buses also. Also, bushes in the median at these locations block your view.

Tribal Council Presentation

Date: May 12, 2010

Location: May 12th – Salt River Tribal Council Chambers

Handout: Study Recommendations Handout

Participants: Tribal Council

Project Team: Jennifer Jack, SRPMIC-ECS Project Manager
Misty Dayzie, ADOT Project Manager
Julian Avila, ADOT CCP
Michael LaBianca, HDR

The Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC) Transportation Planning Study was initiated in mid-2009 to develop transportation improvement recommendations to meet the Community's long range needs. The recommendations address roadway safety issues, walking and bicycle routes, cut-through traffic concerns and public transportation for Community members. These transportation recommendations are intended to improve the Community's quality of life.

The second round of Community outreach was intended to provide Community members with an overview of the SRPMIC Transportation Planning Study, update them on the progress made to date, solicit input regarding the transportation recommendations, and understand any issues or concerns that should be addressed in the final Study recommendations. The second round of outreach efforts included:

- Elders' Breakfasts – April 7th and May 5th
- SRPMIC Earth Day Celebration – April 24th
- Community Workshops – May 17th and May 24th
- Tribal Council Presentation – May 12th and June 16th

On May 12th, the Project Team provided Tribal Council an overview of the Study, progress to date, and preliminary recommendations. The purpose of the meeting was to provide Tribal Council a preview of the recommendations before the Community Workshops.

Comments Following a PowerPoint presentation, the Tribal Council made the following comments:

- In the Community member comments, Broderick Antone requested that the Lehi connector road be placed as priority 1.
- President commented that the Community population seems low. Michael responded that we got that comment from others and checked with various staff departments to verify and get the most accurate data that we could. One councilmember asked if the plan included truck routes. NOTE: In speaking with Jennifer and Phil after the presentation it was suggested that we include a reference in the Plan to an earlier study done for SRPMIC addressing this topic.
- Councilmember Richardo Leonard asked if we planned on presenting at any District Meetings. Jennifer Jack responded that we went to two District Meetings at the early stages and we would be happy to come to anyone's District that would like. Councilmember Leonard requested that we come to his District Meeting on June 15.
- Councilmember Claire Miller requested a copy of the 2001 Transportation Plan. NOTE: Jennifer Jack burned it to a CD on May 14th and took to her office.
- One councilmember indicated that the lanes are very narrow on Gilbert Road and many bicyclists try to use that road. She is afraid that a bicyclist will get hit or that there will be an accident if a car swerves to miss a bike. She requested an alternate route for bicyclists to use until the road is complete. Michael LaBianca responded that a multiuse trail is being recommended for Gilbert Road. The Council expressed concern on the maintenance of such a trail. They have seen a lack of maintenance on Gilbert Road and want to make sure there is a plan for additional facilities to be properly maintained.
- One councilmember expressed his concern for school bus safety and asked if the plan takes into consideration slowing down traffic during school pick up and drop off times. Michael LaBianca answered that the study by Red Mountain Engineering looked into this concern and that HDR incorporated some of the recommendations into our model which lead to a decrease in speeds by a third.
- One councilmember asked if there was a standard spacing for speed limit signs and indicated that McDowell Road maintained by MCDOT needs to have a closer spacing on speed limit signs. Michael LaBianca responded that we would pass this comment on to the Maricopa County TAC representative.
- President emphasized that the proposed Dobson Bridge over the Salt River (priority 9) was still under review and that no decisions have been made yet.
- Council requested that we return to the June 16th quarterly meeting. Jennifer Jack has asked to be placed on the agenda for this meeting.
- Councilmember Deanna Scabby asked about what advertising we have done for the upcoming workshops. She had not seen anything. Jennifer Jack told her that we placed announcements in water bill mailers, on the internet and intranet

under Community Announcements, on the marquees, and on the signs throughout the Community. NOTE: Jennifer confirmed with Esther on May 14th and she said that it did go to all those places as well as the newspaper, senior center, and senior home delivery.

Jennifer Jack thanked the Tribal Council for their ideas and the Project Team looks forward to coming back before on June 16th.

Tribal Council Quarterly Meeting Presentation

Date: June 16, 2010

Location: Salt River Tribal Council Chambers

Handout: Study Recommendations Handout

Participants: Tribal Council and Public

Project Team: Jennifer Jack, SRPMIC-ECS Project Manager
Misty Dayzie, ADOT Project Manager
Michael Gorton, HDR
Michael LaBianca, HDR

On June 16th, the Project Team returned to the Tribal Council at the Quarterly Meeting for an overview of the Study, progress to date, and preliminary recommendations. The purpose of the meeting was to provide Tribal Council a preview of the specific Plan recommendations.

Comments Following a PowerPoint presentation, the public made the following comments:

- Did the study collect traffic counts that identify the non-resident cut-through traffic using Community roads? Michael Gorton responded that the Red Mountain Engineering cut-through traffic study collected data on cut-through traffic. Jennifer Jack provided here contact information to the individual making to question for later follow up.
- How many people attended the public workshops? Jennifer Jack responded that one person attended the May Lehi workshop and three attended the May Salt River workshop. Jennifer also indicated that all of the outreach and summaries was posted on the ADOT project website.
- SRPMIC staff collected comments at the front counter from Community member Brodrick Antone:
 - He feels like the 92nd Street/Dobson improvements will lead to more people cutting through into the Community but he can see that it is warranted. He is a landowner in the Windstone area and would like to discuss further with the other 23 landowner representatives before he gives their position on the 92nd Street/Dobson improvements.
 - He likes that the Lehi connection is included in the plan. He feels that a bridge should be constructed in the near term to connect Lehi and Salt River.
 - He wants to see a new road constructed on Gilbert Road north of the Beeline to Indian Bend and Indian Bend from Gilbert to Mesa Dr.
 - He also wants to see light rail along Pima Road.
 - He requested that ECS present the study at the next landowner meeting in July.

Community Workshop

Date: May 17, 2010 and May 24, 2010

Location: May 17th - Lehi Community Building; 1231 E. Oak Street
May 24th – Salt River Community Building

Handouts: Study Recommendations Handout

Participants: Lehi Community Workshop

Carolyn French

Salt River Community Workshop

Collette Corthwy

Bonnie Makil

Debby Makil

Project Team: Jennifer Jack, SRPMIC-ECS Project Manager

Misty Dayzie, ADOT Project Manager

Julian Avila, ADOT CCP

Michael Gorton, HDR

Michael LaBianca, HDR

Peggy Fiandaca, Partners for Strategic Action, Inc.

The Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC) Transportation Planning Study was initiated in mid-2009 to develop transportation improvement recommendations to meet the Community's long range needs. The recommendations address roadway safety issues, walking and bicycle routes, cut-through traffic concerns and public transportation for Community members. These transportation recommendations are intended to improve the Community's quality of life.

The second round of Community outreach was intended to provide Community members with an overview of the SRPMIC Transportation Planning Study, update them on the progress made to date, solicit input regarding the transportation recommendations, and understand any issues or concerns that should be addressed in the final Study recommendations.

Promotions The Community Workshops were extensively promoted within the Community in the following ways:

- Water Bill Mailer – 1,600 copies distributed; Community members received their water bills 7 to 10 days prior to the workshops
- Two Paid Advertisements in the Community Newspaper – newspaper delivery dates April 15th and May 6th
- Announcement on SRPMIC digital signage and marquee – May 3rd
- Flyers posted to the 16 Community bulletin boards – May 3rd
- 160 flyers distributed with the home delivered meals to seniors – May 3rd
- Announcements of the Community Workshops posted to the SRPMIC intranet
- Announcement at the two Elders’ Breakfasts – April 7 and May 5

Meeting Format The Community Workshop was an open house format where participants could discuss one-on-one with the consultants and SRPMIC staff the recommendations while reviewing project displays. Michael Gorton with HDR (Transportation Consultant Project Manager) used PowerPoint slides to discuss the Study and transportation recommendations. Michael explained that the Study addresses roadway safety issues, walking and bicycle routes, cut-through traffic concerns and public transportation for Community Members to get to the doctor, work or shopping. Michael explained the Study’s outcome is a long-range plan for transportation improvements within SRPMIC.

Comments The Project Team then facilitated a discussion of questions, issues, and ideas that participants expressed:

- Transit should be a 7-day per week service to provide service for dialysis patients
- Don’t like 92nd Street widening because it is too big of a road east of the freeway (101)
- Don’t like to have economic development coming east of the freeway
- Transit circulator is needed and would like to have regular service
- Like the sidewalks being shown; they are needed for safety purposes; now people have to walk on the roads
- Need to pass a leash law within the Community

The Project Team thanked the participants for their ideas and encouraged their ongoing participation. If they had additional ideas or comments, they could let Misty Dayzie (ADOT) or Jennifer Jack (SRPMIC) know about them.

SRPMIC Long Range Transportation Study Community Outreach -
Councilman Tom Largo Meeting

WHERE: SRPMIC Education Board Room
DATE: September 28, 2009
TIME: 6:00-8:00pm
ATTENDEES: Tom Largo, SRPMIC
See attached Sign-in Sheet for remainder

SUMMARY:

The following comments were received at Councilman Tom Largo's District Meeting in regard to the SRPMIC Long Range Transportation Study. The comments received were divided into 5 major categories.

1: Safety – What are the issues and where?

- ⇒ Suggestion was made to lower the speed limit to 35mph.
- ⇒ Drivers are ignoring the stop signs throughout the Community.
- ⇒ It has been observed that drivers from outside of the Community will stop in the middle of the road when they are lost causing a safety hazard.
- ⇒ Parents are concerned about the safety of their children. It has been noticed that non-Community drivers slow down to ask directions from children or just to look at the children.
- ⇒ A suggestion was offered to block off a roadway such as Mesa Drive in order to control pass through traffic. At the same time, it was noted that this road closure would be an obstacle for Community members if they want to get to facilities such as shopping, healthcare and employment that exist off the reservation.
- ⇒ People are racing through the dirt canal roads and getting stuck. Evergreen Canal Road was identified in particular from Center to Mesa Drive. It was suggested that canals be blocked off to avoid racing through these dirt roads and contributing to the dust identified below.
- ⇒ Dust is everywhere causing air pollution.
- ⇒ It was suggested that SRP put up gates to block off canal roads to prevent drivers on the canal roads.
- ⇒ A couple of safety issues were identified for State Route 87 (Beeline Highway). A Community member commented that the current speed limit of 65mph is too high and as a result, it is often difficult to decelerate and make right and left in turns while the rest of the traffic continues on. There have been many instances of frustrated drivers flashing their lights and/or tailgating. It was suggested that the speed limit be reduced from McDowell Road to Mesa Drive where the intersections increase. The other safety concern was in regard to vegetation growth on the median islands that obstruct visibility.
- ⇒ Install speed bumps on McDowell Road in Lehi.
- ⇒ Community members expressed the need for more enforcement to prevent speeding and running stop signs throughout the Community.
- ⇒ Street lighting was requested at 117th and Highland Road.

⇒ Community members expressed concern about the heavy traffic on Chaparral Road near Scottsdale Community College. Students are often speeding on this road. The speeding and congestion is unsafe for the children playing outside their homes nearby. Speed bumps were suggested to slow down the traffic in addition to speed limit enforcement.

2: Cut through traffic: Any concerns and where?

⇒ Cut through traffic is high on Mesa Drive.

⇒ A suggestion was made to toll all major access roads, particularly Alma School Road.

⇒ A lot of traffic was identified from Dobson Road to Chaparral Road to the Loop 101.

3: Roadway improvements: What do the roads need? Do new roads need to be developed?

⇒ The roads in Bunnyville near the Stapley area are washboard and there is no right of way.

⇒ Gilbert Road needs to be rebuilt with a bridge.

⇒ Question was raised about the three (3) access roads to the Lehi area and whether or not they will be reopened. Community members commented that they should remain as dirt roads.

⇒ Indian School Road from Mesa Drive to the end needs to be resurfaced.

4: Walking paths, trails, sidewalks or horse trails?

⇒ Community members present at the meeting felt that the current sidewalk situation on the reservation is adequate but any additional sidewalks should be developed around the schools.

5: Buses and transit: From where to where?

⇒ It was commented that the SRPMIC transit is unreliable in that Community members felt that they took a chance of availability when they dialed in for pick-up. The phones are either busy or no one answers. Members felt it was a hassle to utilize the system.

⇒ Suggestion was made to extend transit operating hours to 9pm, even 10-11pm to allow for late work shifts off the Community.

⇒ Transit policy does not allow for children/students to ride without an adult. This is inconvenient especially when students participate in after school activities and need a ride home.

⇒ Members would like the SRPMIC transit to connect to Valley Metro from within the Community. The police and fire substations were suggested as connection points on Indian School Road and Center Street.

⇒ There was a request for an increase in service by increasing the number of drivers.

⇒ SRPMIC transit only provides service within the Community. Community members requested expanded connection (in addition to current connections) at the boundaries if not within the Community.

⇒ Community members would prefer having a bus schedule and wait, rather than dialing for a pick-up.

6: Other comments

⇒ There was an opposition from a Community member to widen Pima Road entirely on the Community side. She felt Scottsdale should have some of the widening on their side too. Clarification was provided that the widening of Pima Road is occurring within existing right of way. The developable area of land on SRPMIC is not being affected.

⇒ A new sign was posted for no right turns from Longmore Road onto McDowell without adequate notification to the Community. In addition to the sign being too small, the sudden change in traffic control is unnoticed and drivers are being ticketed.

⇒ Drivers are not stopping when merging onto Thomas Road after exiting off of Loop 101. Safety is a concern because the Community monument blocks visibility.

⇒ The Community members have repeatedly noticed that some signals do not change from the red (or take an extremely long time to do so) at the following locations:

- Gilbert Road and Beeline
- Pima Road and Chaparral Road
- Loop 101 and Chaparral Road
- McDowell Road and Pima Road
- Indian School Road at the Loop 101



Event: Elders Briefing – SRPMI Transportation Planning Study
Sign-in Sheet



Date:

Name	Organization	Phone Number	E-Mail
Sissin Owens	Community member	402-748-0588	✉
Guske Owens	Community member	✉	✉
Misty Dargatzis	ADOT Multimodal Planning	602-712-7029	mldargatzis@arizona.gov
Janean Auzá	ADOT Community Planning	602-712-7033	jane.az@arizona.gov
Carolyn French		480-946-7472	
Victoria Gonzales	Community member	480-830-1310	victoria.gonzales@arizona.gov
Kim Manuel	USMMA member	—	—
Michelle Schwetz	Comm. Member	N/A	N/A

Completion of this sign-in sheet is completely voluntary, and helps the project team keep an accurate record of meeting attendees. Under state law, any identifying information provided will become part of the public record, and as such, must be released to any individual upon request.

SRPMIC Long Range Transportation Study Community Outreach
Councilwoman Claire Miller's District Meeting

WHERE: SRPMIC Council Chambers
DATE: September 22, 2009
TIME: 6:00-7:00pm
ATTENDEES: Claire Miller, SRPMIC
Jennifer Jack, SRPMIC ECS
Misty Dayzie, ADOT

SUMMARY:

The following comments were received from Councilwoman Claire Miller in regard to the SRPMIC Long Range Transportation Study.

Transit:

- ⇒ There is a need to increase connectivity between the Community's transit system and the surrounding transit systems such as Valley Metro primarily for commuting to work and the healthcare facilities.
- ⇒ Councilwoman Miller expressed an interest for the Light Rail to be extended into the Community at some point in the future, particularly along the Commercial Corridor and to the casinos.
- ⇒ Councilwoman Miller asked if the surrounding cities such as Tempe and Phoenix help in funding the light rail system or if the system was exclusively funded by ADOT. *Answer:* "The light rail transit is funded by a number of mechanisms. The local or regional funds are estimated to fund about half the cost of a corridor with the combination of federal funds" meeting the other half (METRO). "This depends on each corridor competing nationally for those federal funds at the time of development. This is a highly competitive process and the Federal Transit Administration awards the funds based upon those that meet their criteria with the highest ratings (METRO)." For example, "the 20 mile central Phoenix East Valley line, which opened in December, was funded by a combination of funds. 50 percent from taxes from the cities of Phoenix, Tempe and Mesa and another 47 percent from federal funds and a mixture of FTA 5309 and CMAQ funds (METRO)." ADOT does not contribute funding but provides safety, security and oversight of the light rail system.
- ⇒ School bus and transit shelters are needed throughout the Community to shield riders from the sun or rain while waiting.

Traffic:

- ⇒ Councilwoman Miller expressed her concern about the speeding on McDowell Rd. She informed the study team that there were no stops on this road except at 92nd street, Longmore and Alma School roads.
- ⇒ Councilwoman Miller suggested that McDowell road may offer relief from cut through traffic into the Community if it was better able to accommodate the speed.

- ⇒ Councilwoman Miller stated that traffic signals are needed in the Community, particularly at rush hour. She asked whether the signals could be programmed to function only at rush hour (and then flashing red for a stop condition at all other times).
- ⇒ There was concern about the traffic congestion that occurs daily near Wal-Mart.

Others:

- ⇒ There was concern about drainage on Chaparral Rd near Scottsdale Community College, which have caused a lot of potholes in the roadway.

Councilwoman Miller's primary concern was in regard to providing safety for the children.

SRPMIC Long Range Transportation Study Community Outreach -
Salt River Safety Day

WHERE: Salt River Community Center
DATE: October 8, 2009
TIME: 5:00-9:00pm
ATTENDEES: Council Members
Esther Moyah, SRPMIC CDD
Jennifer Jack, SRPMIC ECS
Misty Dayzie, ADOT

SUMMARY:

The following comments were received at the Salt River Safety Day Event in regard to the SRPMIC Long Range Transportation Study.

- Bike paths are needed.
- A representative from the SRPMIC Air Quality Program suggested paving the unpaved roads because of dust concerns.
- We need an additional street sweeper. There is a lot of track out (sand and gravel) on McDowell Road, McKellips Road and off of SR87.
- Speeding on the canal roads.
- Bike Trails are needed.
- Request for multi-use trails towards the mountains with connection to forest service trails.
- There use to be access to open areas for nature walks near the water treatment center but it has been blocked off for the eagles. The Community needs more designated trails to walk and bike.
- One Community member was unclear about accessibility of open areas. The following questions were asked: Is it okay to walk those areas, even just to rest?
- Non community people are speeding, particularly when they want to pass. Suggestion was made for toll booths especially at rush hour.
- Absolutely no extension of Gilbert Road through the preserve to Shea Blvd. This has been suggested before and is strongly opposed.
- School bus stop shelters are needed.
- Designate a specific road for cut-through traffic.
- Bike paths are needed.
- Bike paths and sidewalks would be good to have. People are starting to exercise more and sidewalks will encourage this activity.
- Sidewalks are needed in Lehi. One community member was walking their dog in the street and it got hit by a car.
- Sidewalks are needed on Longmore Road for surrounding areas to access the Two Waters Complex or Friendship Park.
- The Community needs street lighting.

- Need better advance notice/warning signs about the curve on McDowell Road (Lehi) into Mesa Drive. Existing signs are after the houses but it needs to be sooner.
- The pavement is bumpy and not smooth on Center Road.
- Need to repave 126th street in Bunnyville. Keep the rest of the roads in Bunnyville dirt. If they were paved, more people will use them.
- Need to have bus shelters and benches at the transit bus stops, specifically at the Boys and Girls Club on Mesa Drive and Indian School Roads.
- Roads need to have street lighting. Pedestrians should wear better clothes when walking at night. They walk on the road and you cannot see them.
- Roads need to have an edge stripe.



- C I am against anything that will generate traffic through the Community. I am for keeping the traffic on Pima Road or on the outskirts of the Community but not in the Community.
- A We have heard that people want to keep the traffic from cutting through SRPMIC.
- C Concerned that if we build more bridges it will bring more people or traffic into SRPMIC. For example, Dobson bridge, who does it benefit? Community members can get back and forth just fine.
- Q Where will the financing come from for the roadway improvements?
- A Some of the funding will come from the federal government as well as revenues generated by the Community. The funding depends on the type of project and where the project is located. For example, the bridge project is being funded by Maricopa County.
- Q I am concerned that new road improvements will impact the Community's Per-Capita allocation.
- A Some of the funding for transportation comes from casino revenues. There is a percentage set aside from casino revenues that will be used for Community-wide improvement projects. This fund is different then the fund for Per-Capita allocations.
- C We have a small population and enjoy a rural lifestyle. That lifestyle should be protected. We don't want to become a city.
- C Cannot see our transit system ever being a profit-making enterprise. It is an important service for residents.
- Q You mentioned pedestrian fatalities on Alma School Road, but I have not seen pedestrians on that road.
- A Bicycle and pedestrians are lumped together so they could have been bicyclists.
- Q When improvements are recommended by the study, does it take into account future maintenance? Who is responsible for the maintenance of the roads?
- A Maintenance responsibility depends on the ownership of the road. I don't think this study will get into the details of the long term maintenance costs. SRPMIC Public Works is working on a pavement management system that monitors the condition and maintenance of the roads. At some point maintenance is no longer cost effective for the roadway and a complete rebuild is required. Public Works makes that decision. Staff will examine the maintenance costs for any improvements that this study will recommend.
- Q What happened to the connection that was going to be built between Salt River and Lehi? I thought it was a priority of the Tribal Council. Lehi connector would be good for emergency access. Don't have a lot of bridges.
- A In 2001 it was listed on the Tribal Council's high priority list. A design concept study was performed and public meetings were held. No direction has been given to proceed.
- C If there is going to be another crossing of the Salt River it would have to be worked out with the haul road. There might be a need for a parallel road to the quarry road along the riverbed. If it is separated in some way it might be safe. Would like to see an AB crossing.
- C I would like to see Oak Street reopened. It is an important connection from Lehi to Salt River. If it is opened, there needs to be a signalized intersection at Oak Street and SR 87.
- C What is happening with the Gilbert Road bridge?



- A The low flow crossing is being repair currently which will provide two lanes north and two lanes south from Beeline Hwy to Thomas Road. A future six lane bridge is being designed to replace the existing condition.
- C Concerned about outside stakeholders' influence on what we should do here. Don't need to improve transportation for outside purposes. Example was the proposed connection to Higley Road.

Comment Cards

- ✓ I would like to see Gilbert Road fixed with a bridge that would be high enough out of the flood zone. Our reservation is in an area that allows access to other cities to enter which we can't control but I would like them to respect the laws visa versa as us going into Scottsdale, Mesa, Phoenix, etc.
- ✓ Canal Road – considered the back way to the Pavilions. People speed along this road. The area is congested along Alma School and Chaparral. McDowell Road is a speedway.

Other Comment Cards Received

- ✓ Transit needs to go further out; needed transit to pick up but they said they couldn't because it was beyond their boundaries.
- ✓ Pave Lehi in Salt River (Dobson to Longmore)



**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION**



**SALT RIVER PIMA-MARICOPA INDIAN COMMUNITY
PLANNING ASSISTANCE FOR RURAL AREAS PROJECT
STAKEHOLDERS**

Gregg Bacome

Public Works – Roads Maintenance
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
10005 East Osborn Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85256
Phone: (480) 362-7900 (main)
Phone: (480) 362-5608 (direct)
Fax: (480) 362-5900
Email: Gregg.Bacome@SRPMIC-nsn.gov

Stan Kephart

Chief of Police
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
10005 East Osborn Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85256
Phone: (480) 850-8200 (main)
Phone: (480) 850-8201 (direct)
Fax: (480) 850-8238
Email: Stanley.Kephart@SRPMIC-nsn.gov

Stephanie Hinson

Salt River River Landfill
13602 East Beeline Highway
Scottsdale, AZ 85256
Phone: (480) 941-3427 (main)
Fax: (480) 949-4261
Email: shinson@srlandfill.com

Tim Pickering

CEO
Salt River Devco
8800 E. Chaparral, Suite 260
Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Phone: (480) 850-5700 (main)
Phone: (480) 850-5707 (direct)
Fax: (480) 850-5715
Email: tpickering@salriverdevco.com

Pedro (Pete) Chavez

Transit
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
10005 East Osborn Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85256
Phone: (480) 362-7900 (main)
Phone: (480) 850-8276 (direct)
Fax: (480) 362-5900
Email: Pedro.Chavez@SRPMIC-nsn.gov

Dave Bunce

Fire Chief
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
10005 East Osborn Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85256
Phone: (480) 362-7400 (main)
Email: Dave.Bunce@SRPMIC-nsn.gov

John Aker

Engineering Manager
Saddleback Communications
10190 East McKellips Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85256
Phone: (480) 362-7037 (direct)
Fax: (480) 362-7118
Email: jaker@saddlebackcomm.com

Roger Smith, Jr.

President
Salt River Materials Group
8800 E. Chaparral, Suite 155
Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Phone: (480) 850-5757 (main)
Phone: (480) 850-5757 (direct)
Fax: (480) 850-5758
Email: rsmith@srmaterials.com

[Larry Schurz](#)

Facilities & Transportation Coordinator
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Schools
10005 East Osborn Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85256
Phone: (480) 362-2500 (main)
Phone: (480) 362-2524 (direct)
Fax: (480) 362-2501
Email: larry.schurz@srpmic-ed.org

[Dr. Gerrick Monroe](#)

Assistant Superintendent, Business and Support Services
Mesa Unified School District
63 East Main Street #101
Mesa, AZ 85201
Phone: (480) 472-0000 (main)
Phone: (480) 472-7205 (direct)
Fax:
Email:

[Ed Stillings](#)

Engineering Development Coordinator
Mobility Planning Engineer
Federal Highway Administration
4000 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1500
Phoenix, AZ 85012-1906
Phone: (602) 379-3646 (main)
Phone: (602) 382-8966 (direct)
Fax: (602) 382-8998
Email: ed.stillings@dot.gov

[Bruce Tunnicliff](#)

Safety & Security Director
Casino Arizona
PO Box 10099
Scottsdale, AZ 85271
Phone: (480) 850-7777 (main)
Phone: (480) 850-7776 (direct)
Fax: (480) 850-7741
Email: bruce.tunnicliff@casinoaz.com

[Carl Couch](#)

VP of Administrative Services
Scottsdale Community College
9000 East Chaparral Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85256
Phone: (480) 423-6000 (main)
Phone: (480) 423-6161 (direct)
Fax: (480) 362-2501
Email: carl.couch@sccmail.maricopa.edu

[Jim Alevras](#)

Public Works Manager
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
P.O. Box 17779
Fountain Hills, AZ 85269
Phone: (480) 789-7350 (main)
Phone: (480) 789-7350 (direct)
Fax: (480) 816-1664
Email: jalevras@ftmcdowell.org

Mike James

Deputy Transportation Director, Transit and Planning

City of Mesa

300 East 6th Street

Mesa, AZ 85201

Phone: (480) 644-2160 (main)

Phone: (480) 644-5075 direct

Fax: (480) 644-3909

Email: mike.james@mesaaz.gov

Arthur Wirtz

Mesa District Ranger

Tonto National Forest

5140 E. Ingram Street

Mesa, AZ 85205

Phone: (480) 610-3300 (main)

Phone: (480) xxx-xxxx direct

Fax: (480) 610-3345

Email:

Gregg Czajkowski

SRP Designer

Salt River Project

1521 North Project Drive

Tempe, AZ 85281

Phone: (602) 236-6322 (direct)

Phone: (602) 818-7725 (mobile)

Email: gjczaiko@srpnet.com

Civil Rights

Lucy Schrader

(602) 712-7378

lschrader@azdot.gov

Valley Project Management

Steve Beasley

(602) 712-7645

sbeasley@azdot.gov

Carol Ketcherside

Deputy Director - Planning

Regional Public Transportation Authority/Valley Metro

302 North First Avenue, Suite 700

Phoenix, AZ 85003

Phone: (602) 262-7433 (main)

Phone: (602) 534-0733 (direct)

Fax: (602) 495-0411

Email: cketcherside@valleymetro.org

Andy Goh

City Engineer

City of Tempe

31 East 5th Street

Tempe, AZ 85281

Phone: (480) 350-8200 (main)

Phone: (480) xxx-xxxx (direct)

Fax: (480) xxx-xxxx

Email: andy_goh@tempe.gov

Tom Ward

Director of Public Works

Town of Fountain Hills

16705 East Avenue of the Fountains

Fountain Hills, AZ 85268

Phone: (480) 816-5100 (main)

Phone: (480) 816-5129 direct

Fax: (480) 837-1404

Email: tward@fh.az.gov

Eddie Edison

(602) 712-7761

eedison@azdot.gov



**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION**



**SALT RIVER PIMA-MARICOPA INDIAN COMMUNITY
PLANNING ASSISTANCE FOR RURAL AREAS PROJECT
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Jennifer Jack

Engineering & Construction Services
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
10005 East Osborn Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85256
Phone: (480) 362-7900 (main)
Phone: (480) 362-7747 (direct)
Fax: (480) 362-5900
Email: Jennifer.Jack@SRPMIC-nsn.gov

Kirk Beaty

Engineering & Construction Services
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
10005 East Osborn Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85256
Phone: (480) 362-7900 (main)
Phone: (480) 362-7776 (direct)
Fax: (480) 362-5900
Email: Kirk.Beaty@SRPMIC-nsn.gov

Phil Matthews

Engineering & Construction Services
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
10005 East Osborn Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85256
Phone: (480) 362-7900
Phone: (480) 362-7789 (direct)
Fax: (480) 362-5900
Email: Phil.Matthews@SRPMIC-nsn.gov

Bob Maxwell, Regional Roads Planner

BIA Western Regional Office
Division of Transportation
400 N. 5th Street
Two Arizona Center, 12th Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Phone: (602) 379-6782
Fax: (602) 379-3837
Email: Bob.Maxwell@bia.gov

Nicole Charlie

Administration
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
10005 East Osborn Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85256
Phone: (480) 362-7900 (main)
Phone: (480) 362-7646 (direct)
Fax: (480) 362-5900
Email: Nicole.Charlie@SRPMIC-nsn.gov

Suzanne Colver

Community Development
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
10005 East Osborn Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85256
Phone: (480) 362-7900
Phone: (480) 362-7654 (direct)
Fax: (480) 362-5900
Email: Suzanne.Colver@SRPMIC-nsn.gov

Tim Oliver, Systems Planning Manager

Maricopa County
Department of Transportation
2901 W. Durango
Phoenix, Arizona 85009
Phone: (602) 506-3994 (Tim)
Phone: (602) 506-8054 (Mitch)
Fax: (602) 506-4750
Email: timoliver@mail.maricopa.gov

Misty Dayzie, Tribal Planner

Arizona Department of Transportation
Multimodal Planning Division
206 South 17th Avenue, MD 310B
Phoenix, AZ 85007-3213
Phone: (602) 712-7029
Fax: (602) 712-3046
Email: mdayzie@azdot.gov

[Julian Avila](#)

Arizona Department of Transportation
Communications & Community Partnerships
206 South 17th Avenue, Rm. 101, MD 118A
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Phone: (602) 712-7033
Fax: (602) 712-7855
Email: JAvila@azdot.gov

[Robert Samour](#), District Engineer
Arizona Department of Transportation
Phoenix Construction District Office
1309 N. 22nd Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85009
Phone: (602) 712-8965
Fax: (602) 712-3116
Email: rsamour@azdot.gov

[Tish Hunter](#)
Arizona Department of Transportation
Environmental Planning Group
1611 W. Jackson, MD EM02
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Phone: (602) 712-6895
Fax: (602) 712-3066
Email: thunter@dot.state.az.us

[Mitch Wagner](#), Senior Planner
Maricopa County
Department of Transportation
2901 W. Durango
Phoenix, Arizona 85009
Phone: (602) 506-8054
Fax: (602) 506-4882
Email: mitchwagner@mail.maricopa.gov

[Bob Hazlett](#), Senior Engineer
Maricopa Association of Governments
302 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 300
Phoenix, AZ 85003
Phone: (602) 254-6300
Fax: (602) 254-6490
E-mail: bhazlett@mag.maricopa.gov

[Tim Wolfe](#), District Engineer
Arizona Department of Transportation
Phoenix Maintenance District Office
2140 S 22nd Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85009
Phone: (602) 712-6550
Fax: (602) 712-6983
Email: twolfe@azdot.gov

[Teresa Huish](#), Principal Transportation Planner
City of Scottsdale
Transportation Department
7447 E. Indian School Rd
Scottsdale, AZ 85251
Phone: (480) 312-7829
Fax: (480) 312-4000
Email: Thuish@Scottsdaleaz.Gov

**SALT RIVER PIMA-MARICOPA INDIAN COMMUNITY
PLANNING ASSISTANCE FOR RURAL AREAS PROJECT
CONSULTING TEAM**

[Michael E. Gorton](#)

HDR

3200 East Camelback Road, Suite 350
Phoenix, AZ 85018-2311
Phone: (602) 522-7700 (main)
Phone: (602) 474-3916 (direct)
Fax: (602) 522-7707
Email: Michael.gorton@hdrinc.com

[Michael LaBianca](#)

HDR

3200 East Camelback Road, Suite 350
Phoenix, AZ 85018-2311
Phone: (602) 522-7700 (main)
Phone: (602) 778-7334 (direct)
Fax: (602) 522-7707
Email: Michael.labianca@hdrinc.com

[Brent Cain](#)

HDR

3200 East Camelback Road, Suite 350
Phoenix, AZ 85018-2311
Phone: (602) 522-7700 (main)
Phone: (602) 522-7782 (direct)
Phone: (602) 448-5921 (cell)
Fax: (602) 522-7707
Email: brent.cain@hdrinc.com

[Laura Paty](#)

HDR

101 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 1950
Phoenix, AZ 85003-1923
Phone: (602) 385-1610 (main)
Phone: (602) 792-8836 (direct)
Fax: (602) 522-7707
Email: laura.paty@hdrinc.com

[Peggy A. Fiandaca, AICP](#)

Partners for Strategic Action, Inc.

13771 Fountain Hills Blvd., Ste 360
Fountain Hills, AZ 85268
Phone: (480) 816-1811
Fax: (480) 816-1813
Email: psainc@cox.net

SRPMIC Long Range Transportation Study Community Outreach -
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Tribal Council Meeting

WHERE: SRPMIC Council Chambers
DATE: May 12, 2010
TIME: 5:00pm-7:00pm
ATTENDEES: Jennifer Jack, SRPMIC ECS
Misty Dayzie, ADOT
Michael LaBianca, HDR
Phil Matthews, SRPMIC ECS

SUMMARY:

The following comments were received at the SRPMIC Tribal Council Meeting in regard to the SRPMIC Long Range Transportation Study.

- In the Community member comments, Broderick Antone requested that the Lehi connector road be placed as priority 1.
- President commented that the Community population seems low. Michael LaBianca with HDR responded that the team got that comment from others and had checked with various staff departments to verify and get the most accurate data that the project team could.
- One councilmember (CM) asked if the plan included truck routes. Jennifer and Phil suggested that the project team include a reference in the Plan to an earlier study done for SRPMIC addressing this topic.
- CM Richardo Leonard asked if the project team planned on presenting at any District Meetings. Jennifer responded that the team went to 2 District Meetings at the early stages and would be happy to come to anyone's district that would like. CM Leonard requested that we come to his District Meeting on June 15.
- CM Claire Miller requested a copy of the 2001 Transportation Plan. Jennifer burned it to a CD May 13, 2010 and took it to her office.
- One councilmember indicated that the lanes are very narrow on Gilbert Road and that many bicyclists try to use that road. She is afraid that a bicyclist will get hit or that there will be an accident if a car swerves to miss a bike. She requested an alternate route for bicyclists to use until the road is complete. Michael responded that a multiuse trail is being recommended for Gilbert Road. Council expressed concern on the maintenance of such a trail. They have seen a lack of maintenance on Gilbert Road and want to make sure there is a plan for additional facilities to be properly maintained.
- One councilmember expressed his concern for school bus safety and asked if the plan takes into consideration slowing down traffic during school pick up and drop off times. Michael answered that the study by Red Mountain Engineering looked into this concern and that HDR incorporated some of the recommendations into the traffic demand model which lead to a decrease in speeds by a third.
- One councilmember asked if there was a standard spacing for speed limit signs and indicated that McDowell Road maintained by MCDOT needs to have a closer spacing

on speed limit signs. Michael responded that the project team would pass this comment on to the Maricopa County TAC representative. The same concern was expressed for State Route 87.

- President emphasized that the proposed Dobson Bridge over the Salt River (priority 9) was still under review and that no decisions have been made yet.
- Council requested that the project team return to the June 16th quarterly meeting. Jennifer has asked to be placed on the agenda for this meeting.
- CM Deanna Scabby asked about what advertising we have done for the upcoming workshops. She had not seen anything. Jennifer told her that the project team placed advertisements in the water bill mailers, on the internet and intranet under Community Announcements, on the marquees, and on the signs throughout the Community. Jennifer confirmed with Esther Moyah on morning of May 13th and Esther said that the ad did go to all those places as well as the newspaper, senior center, and senior home delivery.
- One councilmember asked if paying for ROW was included in the transportation plan. Jennifer answered that the Transportation plan only recommends improvements and does not recommend whether or not right of way will be purchased. If a project does not have right of way, staff would follow the normal process for acquiring. No right of way purchase would be made without Council approval.
- After the presentation, Mr. Smith of Salt River Materials asked that Jennifer contact him. Jennifer left a message for Mr. Smith the morning of May 13th.

SRPMIC Long Range Transportation Study Community Outreach
Young River People's Council

WHERE: SRPMIC Two Waters Bldg A – Whirlwind Conference Room
DATE: September 23, 2009
TIME: 6:00-7:00pm
ATTENDEES: SRPMIC Youth Council
Esther Moyah, SRPMIC CDD
Jennifer Jack, SRPMIC ECS
Misty Dayzie, ADOT

SUMMARY:

The following comments and concerns were received from SRPMIC Youth Council in regards to the Community's transportation system.

- ⇒ Drivers are not following the speed limit.
- ⇒ Sidewalks are needed next to the smoke shop on McDowell Rd, on Country Club Rd and at the major intersecting roads on the Community. Kids walk in the street because there is no other place to walk.
- ⇒ Flooding occurs on all the major roads.
- ⇒ Drivers are ignoring a newly installed stop sign near Victory Acres 2 (Center and Monterosa).
- ⇒ Drivers do not notice the no right turn on red sign from Longmore Rd onto McDowell Rd. Once a car is stopped at the intersection, it is past the sign.
- ⇒ There is heavy congestion on Chaparral Rd.
- ⇒ Left and right turn lanes are needed at all the major intersections.
- ⇒ Designated bus stops and shelters are needed – children are often waiting on a sharp embankment in the sun or rain.
- ⇒ The Youth Council expressed concern about drivers ignoring the bus stop signs and the students exiting the bus and crossing the roadway. One member mentioned that there was a pedestrian crash due to this behavior. Drivers are ignoring the bus stop signs especially at the intersections (on Alma School in particular).