

3.6 NON-CAPACITY-RELATED ROADWAY NEEDS (2008 TO 2030)

Non-capacity roadway needs were identified through small area transportation studies, corridor definition studies, meetings with stakeholders, and input from community workshops. Non-capacity roadway needs that were identified in the statewide survey of critical needs, which served as input into the Statewide Transportation Investment Strategy, are also documented. The following sections provide a general overview of non-capacity roadway needs. Table 3.3 contains a detailed list of non-capacity roadway needs.

Critical Needs Definition

The critical needs definition process, which ADOT completed in early 2008, identified several non-capacity-related roadway needs. These were primarily in the areas of:

- Bridge replacement projects
- Bank protection
- Safety projects
- Bringing gravel roads in the Globe area up to air quality standards

Applicable projects in the Central Framework region are listed in Table 3.3.

SATS and Corridor Definition Studies

The *Gila County Small Area Transportation Study* (October 2006) recommended the following projects relating to non-capacity roadway needs:

- SR 288, Junction SR 188 to Young – Complete paving

Input from Stakeholders and Community Workshops

This study solicited input on roadway needs through an extensive program of stakeholder meetings and workshops. These included community workshops, focus groups, stakeholder meetings, a Regional Technical Advisory Committee, and common interest group meetings. Needs identified from these public outreach efforts are summarized in the following sections.

Community Workshops – March and November 2008

Community workshops were held in Florence and Globe on March 26 and 27, 2008. Sixty persons attended the two workshops. A second round of workshops was held in Globe and Coolidge on November 12 and 13, 2008. Fifty-three persons attended the November workshops. Comments regarding non-capacity roadway needs included:

- Improved pedestrian crossings and sidewalks are needed in a number of areas, including Casa Grande (safe pedestrian crossings of I-10 and I-8), US 60 in Superior, and Queen Creek, which is interested in improving trail connectivity. Pedestrian and bicycle activities are of interest to the city of Globe, but terrain and topography make it difficult and expensive to construct pedestrian facilities.
- A need was expressed to review evacuation routes for emergencies.

Focus Group and Stakeholder Meetings

Six focus group meetings were held in Florence and Globe on March 26 and 27, 2008. A total of 27 persons attended the six focus group meetings. In addition, stakeholder interviews were conducted during February, 2008 with representatives of the following agencies:

- City of Apache Junction
- City of Casa Grande
- City of Eloy
- Central Arizona Association of Governments (CAAG)
- Pima Association of Governments (PAG)
- Gila County
- Pima County
- Pinal County
- Town of Globe
- Town of Hayden
- Town of Kearny
- Town of Marana
- Town of Miami
- Town of Oro Valley
- Town of Queen Creek
- Town of Superior
- Gila River Indian Community
- Tohono O'odham Nation

Comments relating to non-capacity roadway needs were:

- Trucks - Crossings of railroads and rivers need to be improved to accommodate commercial trucks. More truck stops and parking are needed. Truck traffic has increased with the growth in mining operations. Truck traffic is an important concern on US 60 and SR 77. In the summer months, many recreational vehicles use SR 77 to access the reservoirs. Truck traffic is a concern in Miami.
- At-grade railroad crossings - At-grade railroad crossings need to be replaced with grade separations. One comment expressed the need for an intermodal facility (for example, near Picacho Peak) to take advantage of the existing railroad infrastructure.
- Safety improvements – Stakeholders mentioned that safety improvements are needed on SR 177 between Kearny and Hayden. They stated that SR 177 is the only state highway with a 10 percent grade. Specific needs are left turn lanes and passing lanes. Another safety need exists at the intersection of SR 177 and SR 77, with improved signage a possible solution. All-terrain-vehicle crossings of SR 177 are also an issue. Other safety issues include rock falls on SR 77. West of Miami, the US 60/ Pinto Valley Mine Road intersection may potentially warrant a traffic signal or interchange at this location. Speeding is a concern in Miami.
- Environmental concerns – A need was expressed for wildlife crossings to enhance wildlife connectivity and movement, aesthetics, and coordination with the Arizona Game and Fish Department and its Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy.
- Air quality – Pinal County is in violation of PM10 standards more than 200 days per year. Problem areas should be identified and improvements planned to address them. Hayden and Winkelman have also been challenged by air quality issues. Air quality (notably PM10) issues are significant in Casa Grande. Several

stakeholders mentioned that paving of the Florence-Kelvin Highway would help to improve air quality, and would also provide a reliever route to US 60 and SR 177. This would connect population and employment centers in Florence to centers in Hayden and Winkelman.

- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities – A common need identified throughout all Central region communities was improved pedestrian facilities along and across state highways. Specific needs include:
 - Bicycle and pedestrian facilities on state highways. Sidewalks and lighting on SR 177 between Hayden and Winkelman would improve pedestrian safety. Hayden town staff mentioned that significant pedestrian activity is associated with the San Carlos Apache Nation. They also mentioned that school children walk along state highways that have no sidewalks. Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) staff stated that they have observed an increasing number of cyclists on state highways in their community. City of Globe staff mentioned a need for bicycle and pedestrian facilities along US 60. However, they recognize that the local topography, with many hills and ravines, make it difficult to construct facilities.
 - Trails and open space for use by pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians, particularly in the Queen Creek area.
 - Pedestrian crossings over US 60 are needed in Superior.
 - Safe pedestrian crossings of I-10 and I-8, particularly in the Casa Grande area.
- Emergency management – A need to identify alternative routes to US 60 between Globe and Miami was raised as an emergency management concern, since there are no alternatives between these cities. SR 77 between Globe and Winkelman is a significant truck corridor. A large percentage of traffic on SR 77 is trucks originating from Miami and serving the mines. Many trucks carry hazardous materials.
- Accessibility to human services – Improved roads and connectivity in eastern Pinal County will improve access to medical care and human services. Many residents must travel to Mesa and the East Valley (in Maricopa County) to receive medical care.
- Other non-capacity roadway needs - Other needs include storm water management, and the need to combine road and utility corridors in order to minimize potential environmental impacts.

Regional Technical Advisory Committee

A Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAT) provided guidance throughout the duration of the project. The RTAT consists of representatives from study area jurisdictions, Indian communities, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), CAAG, PAG, ADOT, and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Four RTAT meetings were held on March 6, 2008, June 12, 2008, October 22, 2008, and April 6, 2009.

Non-capacity roadway needs mentioned at the RTAT meetings included:

- Additional all-weather crossings of the Gila River.
- Infrastructure and policy to support freight traffic. I-10 and SR 87 are major freight corridors.
- Projects to facilitate emergency evacuation of urban areas.

Common Interest Group Workshops

Common interest group meetings were held to obtain input on the three alternative transportation scenarios in March, 2009. Meetings were held with representatives from across the state of the following groups:

- Tribal communities
- Natural resource agencies
- The development community
- Planning professionals
- Economic development
- Resource agencies
- Major freight users
- ADOT Communication and Community Partnerships (CCP)

Although the focus of the meetings was on discussing the three scenarios at a statewide level, there were numerous comments on non-capacity roadway needs in the Central region:

- Trucks and freight – Consider dedicated truck lanes and truck-only facilities.
- Wildlife linkages - Show connectivity to wildlife areas. Show wildlife corridor linkages and assess wildlife concerns. Habitat fragmentation is a key issue.
- Pedestrian crossings.
- Effect of roadway system improvements on air quality.
- Consider hazardous materials.
- Consider all-weather roads for medical transport.
- Access management – There is a need for a strong access management policy/plan.

Summary

Non-capacity-related roadway needs in the Central region include bridge replacement and design projects on US 60, SR 88, and SR 188. These are listed in Table 3.3. More general needs include projects to accommodate freight and trucks, additional truck stops and parking, construction of grade-separated railroad crossings, safety improvements, reducing particulate air pollution, wildlife crossings, and development of emergency management and hazardous material routes.

Table 3.3 provides a detailed list of non-capacity-related roadway needs, other than general concerns. Immediate needs are those considered to be needed in the next five years (before 2015).

Table 3.3 Non-Capacity-Related Roadway Needs

<i>State Highway System</i>						
Route	Location	From	To	Summary of Need	When Needed	Source
US 60	MP 222.8	MP 222.8	MP 223.8	Bridge replacement	2015-2030	Critical needs
US 60	MP 224.6	MP 224.6	MP 225.7	Bridge replacement	2015-2030	Critical needs
US 60	MP 227.7	MP 227.7	MP 228.7	Queen Creek bridge replacement	2030-2050	Critical needs
US 60	MP 229.5	MP 229.5	MP 230.5	Waterfall Canyon bridge replacement	2015-2030	Critical needs
US 60	MP 232.5	MP 232.5	MP 233.5	Devil's Canyon bridge replacement	2015-2030	Critical needs
US 60	MP 238.3	MP 238.3	MP 239.3	Pinto Creek bridge replacement	2030-2050	Critical needs
US 60	MP 242.7	MP 242.7	MP 243.7	Bloody Tanks wash bridge Replacement	2015-2030	Critical needs
US 60	MP 243.7	MP 243.7	MP 244.7	Bloody Tanks bridge replacement	Before 2015	Critical needs
US 60	MP 249.6	MP 249.6	MP 250.6	Pinal Creek bridge replacement	2030-2050	Critical needs
US 60	MP 249.8	MP 249.8	MP 250.8	Pinal Creek bridge replacement	Before 2015	Critical needs
US 60	MP 256.7	MP 256.7	MP 257.7	Quartzite Canyon bridge replacement	Before 2030	Critical needs
US 60	MP 251.8	MP 251.8	MP 252.8	McMillen Wash bridge replacement	2015-2030	Critical needs
US 60	N/A	N/A	N/A	Address safety and speeding issues	Before 2015	Critical needs
US 60/Pinto Valley Mine Road	Intersection	N/A	N/A	Intersection improvements, possible signalization	Before 2015	Community and stakeholders
US 70	N/A	N/A	N/A	Increase shoulder width, add turn lanes and passing zone improvement/stripping, bus stops, truck traffic, and US70 bridge widening improvements.	Before 2015	Critical needs
SR 77	Not specified	N/A	N/A	Safety improvements to address rock falls	Before 2015	Community and stakeholders

Table 3.3 Non-Capacity-Related Roadway Needs (continued)

<i>State Highway System</i>						
Route	Location	From	To	Summary of Need	When Needed	Source
SR 77/SR 177	Intersection	N/A	N/A	Safety improvements at intersection	Before 2015	Community and stakeholders
SR 87	BIA 101/Green Valley Pkwy	N/A	N/A	Address safety issues at BIA 101/Green Valley Pkwy including traffic light crossing patterns, striping, signage, driver sight visibility, and acceleration/deceleration lanes.	Before 2015	Critical needs
SR 88	MP 213-242	213	242	Update to current standards	2030-2050	Critical needs
SR 88	223.5	223.5	224	Fish Creek bridge replacement	Before 2015	Critical needs
SR 88	224.6	224.6	225.1	Lewis Pranty Creek bridge replacement	Before 2015	Critical needs
SR 88	225.5	225.5	226	Dry Wash bridge replacement	Before 2015	Critical needs
SR 88	231.7	231.7	232.2	Davis Wash bridge replacement	2015-2030	Critical needs
SR 88	233.5	233.5	234	Pine Creek bridge replacement	Before 2015	Critical needs
SR 188	242	242	243	Stewart Wash bank protection	Before 2015	Critical needs
SR 288	260.4	260.4	261.4	Eads Wash bridge replacement	2015-2030	Critical needs
SR 288	262.4	262.4	263.4	Salt River bridge replacement	2015-2030	Critical needs
Unknown	Not specified	N/A	N/A	Address crash issues between SR 387/587	Before 2015	Critical needs
SR 347	Not specified	N/A	N/A	Address traffic congestion and zoning enforcement	Before 2015	Critical needs
SR 288	Junction SR 188 - Young	N/A	N/A	Complete paving	Before 2015	Gila County SATS

Table 3.3 Non-Capacity-Related Roadway Needs (continued)

<i>State Highway System</i>						
Route	Location	From	To	Summary of Need	When Needed	Source
1 10 and I 8	Casa Grande	N/A	N/A	Address pedestrian crossing needs	2030-2050	Community and Stakeholders
SR 177	Not specified	N/A	N/A	Shoulder widening and guard rail, and sidewalk	Before 2015	Community and Stakeholders
US 60	Superior	N/A	N/A	Pedestrian crossing	2030-2050	Community and Stakeholders
<i>Other Principal Roadways</i>						
Route	Location	From	To	Summary of Need	Timing	Source
Price Rd/Hunt Hwy	Price Rd/Hunt Hwy	N/A	N/A	Dust complaints from unpaved roads	Before 2015	Critical Needs
Elliot Rd	Not specified	N/A	N/A	Address traffic congestion	Before 2015	Critical Needs
Florence-Kelvin Highway	Not specified	N/A	N/A	Pave road	Before 2015	Community and Stakeholders
Not specified	Gila County, Pinal County, Apache Junction, Casa Grande, Coolidge, Eloy, Florence, Globe, Hayden, Kearny, Mammoth, Marana, Miami, Queen Creek, Superior, Winkelman, Gila River Indian Community, Tohono O'odham Nation	N/A	N/A	Local mobility projects and programs	Before 2015	Statewide Transportation Investment Strategy

Table 3.3 Non-Capacity-Related Roadway Needs (continued)

<i>State Highway System</i>						
Route	Location	From	To	Summary of Need	When Needed	Source
Not specified	Gila County, Pinal County, Apache Junction, Casa Grande, Coolidge, Eloy, Florence, Globe, Hayden, Kearny, Mammoth, Marana, Miami, Queen Creek, Superior, Winkelman, Gila River Indian Community, Tohono O'odham Nation	N/A	N/A	Transportation enhancement and walkable/bikeable communities	Before 2015	Statewide Transportation Investment Strategy

Sources: Statewide Transportation Investment Strategy, June 19, 2008
 Critical Needs Definition
 Gila County Small Area Transportation Study
 Pinal County Small Area Transportation Study
 Stakeholder and public involvement comments