

## Appendix D. Planning and Environmental Linkages Questionnaire and Checklist

This page is intentionally left blank.

## Questionnaire for Transportation Planners – Part 1

This part of the questionnaire should be completed by transportation planners at the beginning of the transportation planning study. Please note that planners should also review the second part of the questionnaire to understand what additional issues will need to be considered and documented as the study progresses.

Project identification			
<i>What is the name of the study? What cities and region does it cover? What major streets are covered? For corridor studies, what are the intended termini?</i>			
<p><b>Study Name:</b> Interstate 10 (I-10)/Interstate 17 (I-17) Corridor Master Plan (otherwise known as the Spine Study)</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> The corridor begins at the I-10/State Route 202 Loop (SR-202L) Pecos Stack in the south part of Phoenix, extends north/west on I-10 to the I-10/I-17 Split, then north on I-17 to the I-17/SR-101L North Stack. The total length of the corridor is 35 miles and the initial corridor study width is approximately one and one-half miles on each side of the defined freeway corridor, but may expand during the study depending on early study findings. The study area covers Chandler, Guadalupe, Tempe and Phoenix (Figure 1). The Spine Corridor has many existing capacity and operational constraints that hinder performance for traffic that ranges in volume from 90,000 to 262,000 vehicles per day.</p> <p><b>Major Streets:</b> I-10, I-17, SR-202L, SR-101L, State Route 143 (SR-143), 48<sup>th</sup> Street, 56<sup>th</sup> Street/Priest Drive, Kyrene Road, crossing arterials (McDowell Road, Thomas Road, Indian School Road, Camelback Road, Bethany Home Road, Glendale Avenue, Northern Avenue, Dunlap Avenue, Peoria Avenue, Cactus Road, Thunderbird Road, Greenway Road, Bell Road and Union Hills Drive), Baseline Road, US-60, Southern Avenue, Broadway Road, Buckeye Road, 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue.</p> <p><b>Intended Termini:</b> Currently the intended termini are the I-10/SR-202L Pecos Stack at the southern end of the study area and the I-17/SR-101L North Stack at the northern end.</p>			
<i>Who is the study sponsor?</i>			
The study sponsors are the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) in association with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).			
<i>Briefly describe the study and its purpose.</i>			
<p>MAG, ADOT, and FHWA have entered into a partnership for establishing a Corridor Master Plan for planning, determining, and implementing Regional Transportation Plan improvements to I-10 and I-17 and parallel arterial corridors in the Phoenix Metropolitan area. This project's management partners recognize the corridor under study as "the Spine;" as this project is a combination of both interstates serving as the entire regional freeway system's backbone. I-10's and I-17's operation affects all other freeway corridors feeding the Spine corridor as well as the Valley's entire arterial street system.</p> <p>The purpose behind the I-10/I-17 Spine Corridor Master Plan is to provide guidance in establishing a project or group of projects to incorporate into the MAG Regional Transportation Plan that will meet a regional vision for I-10 and I-17 through 2040. Included in this outcome will be a planning-level estimate of costs, environmental clearance needs, determination of engineering and operational acceptance for changes in interstate highway access, central mitigation and implementation strategy, and timing for project construction.</p>			
<i>Who are the primary study team members (include name, title, organization name, and contact information)?</i>			
Team Member	Title and Department	Organization and Department	Contact Information
Bob Hazlett	Senior Engineering Manager	MAG Transportation Planning and Programming	602.452.5026, bhazlett@azmag.gov
Eric Anderson	Transportation Director	MAG Transportation Planning and Programming	602.254.6300, eanderson@azmag.gov
Brent Cain	Deputy State Engineer	ADOT State Engineer's Office Urban Operations,	602.712.8274, BCain@azdot.gov
Steve Beasley	Transportation Manager	ADOT Urban Project Management	602.712.4368, SBeasley@azdot.gov
Michael Kies	Assistant Director	ADOT Multimodal Planning Division (MPD))	602.712.8140, 602.712.4574, Mkies@azdot.gov
Paul O'Brien	Group Manager	ADOT Environmental Planning Group	602.712.8669 PO'Brien@azdot.gov
Daniel Gabiou	Transportation Planning Program Manager	ADOT Systems and Regional Planning	602.712.7025 DGabiou@azdot.gov

Alan Hansen	Team Leader	FHWA Planning, Environment, Air Quality, and Realty (PEAR) Team	602-382-8964, alan.hansen@dot.gov
Team Member	Title and Department	Organization and Department	Contact Information
Rebecca Yedlin	Environmental Coordinator	FHWA PEAR Team	602-382-8979, rebecca.yedlin@dot.gov
<i>Does the team include advisory groups such as a technical advisory committee, steering committee, or other? If so, include roster(s) as attachment(s).</i>			
<p>Charter Partners – The Charter Partners have been established to provide oversight on policy matters related to decisions in developing the project. Elected officials from the cities of Chandler, Tempe, Phoenix and the Town of Guadalupe, as well as representation from MAG, ADOT, FHWA, Department of Public Safety, Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) and Valley Metro Rail (VMR), are part of this group. These partners have signed a formal Project Charter summarizing project goals. Quarterly meetings are envisioned for the Charter Partners for presentation, review and comment.</p> <p>Management Partners – For day-to-day project delivery, ADOT and FHWA representatives support MAG's project manager as Management Partners. These partners' primary responsibilities are ensuring schedule compliance, providing guidance on delivering the scope of the study, providing direction to the consultant team, reviewing documents and work products, and ensuring adequate resource availability from their respective agencies. This project's Management Partners began meeting in April 2013 and have engaged an Operating Principles agreement to oversee project development. These partners plan to continue to meet monthly for the project duration.</p> <p>Planning Partners – These partners provide technical oversight of the project's key deliverables. Planning Partners representatives include management and technical staffing from the cities of Chandler, Tempe, Phoenix, the Town of Guadalupe, MAG, ADOT, FHWA, RPTA and VMR. The cities provide representatives from their city manager, aviation, streets, and transit departments, as appropriate. Monthly meetings are anticipated for the Planning Partners.</p> <p>Agency Partners – As project recommendations could affect the Valley's transportation future, a second technical advisory team is envisioned to meet as needed to provide collaboration, early coordination, and recommendations needed for plan implementation. Representatives of these partners may include, but are not limited to, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Transit Administration, Western Area Power Administration, Flood Control District of Maricopa County, neighboring MAG member agencies (e.g., cities of Glendale and Mesa, Maricopa County, Gila River Indian Community (GRIC)), other City of Phoenix departments (e.g., Community and Economic Development, Planning and Development, and Public Works), and other agencies identified during the study process.</p> <p>In addition to this project's formal Partner groups, the Consultant team will provide coordination with a fifth group: the project's Stakeholders. There are various affected groups, individuals, and interests throughout the 35-mile corridor with mutual and diverse interests in the project's outcome. Groups include, but are not limited to, Phoenix Village Planning committees, trucking and freight providers, private transportation providers, service organizations, homeowner associations, land developers, and the general public. Regular and consistent coordination with these stakeholders is an important project outcome.</p>			
<i>Have previous transportation planning studies been conducted for this region? If so, provide a brief chronology, including the years the studies were completed. Provide contact names and locations of the studies and study websites.</i>			
Yes, previous transportation planning studies have been conducted for this region.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study (CPHX) Completed 2013 Study Area: Loop 101 (West and North), Loop 202 (North and East), GRIC (South) Bob Hazlett, Senior Engineering Manager, MAG Transportation Planning and Programming, 602-452-5026, bhazlett@azmag.gov <a href="http://www.bqaz.org/phxPapers.asp?mS=m14">http://www.bqaz.org/phxPapers.asp?mS=m14</a></li> <li>Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study Completed 2012 Study Area: I-10 Papago Freeway/SR 202L Red Mountain Freeway (North), SR-101L Price Freeway (East), GRIC (South), SR-101L Price Freeway (East) Bob Hazlett, Senior Engineering Manager, MAG Transportation Planning and Programming, 602-452-5026, bhazlett@azmag.gov <a href="https://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=4236">https://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=4236</a></li> <li>Managed Lanes Network Development Strategy Report Completed 2012 (Phase I) Study Area: Phoenix Metropolitan Area Regional Freeway System Bob Hazlett, Senior Engineering Manager, MAG Transportation Planning and Programming, 602-452-5026, bhazlett@azmag.gov <a href="http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1041&amp;CMSID2=4190">http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1041&amp;CMSID2=4190</a></li> <li>Regional Transit Framework Study Completed 2010 Study Area: MAG Region Kevin Wallace, Transit Program Manager, MAG Transportation Planning and Programming, 602-254-6300, kwallace@azmag.gov <a href="http://www.bqaz.org/frameFinalReport.asp?mS=m12">http://www.bqaz.org/frameFinalReport.asp?mS=m12</a></li> </ul>			

- Freight Transportation Framework Study  
Completed in 2012  
Study Area: Sun Corridor – MAG, Central Arizona Governments, Pima Association of Governments  
Tim Strow, Freight Coordinator, MAG Transportation Planning and Programming, 602-254-6300, tstrow@azmag.gov  
<http://www.bqaz.org/freightstudy.asp>
- Sustainable Transportation and Land Use Integration Study  
Completed 2013  
Study Area: MAG Region  
Eileen Yazzie, Transit Coordinator, MAG Transportation Planning and Programming, 602-452-5058, eyazzie@azmag.gov  
<http://www.bqaz.org/freightstudy.asp>
- I-10 Corridor Improvement Study and Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Section 4(f) Evaluation  
Discontinued  
Study Area: I-10, SR-51 Piastewa Freeway/SR-202L Red Mountain Freeway to SR-202L Santan Freeway  
ADOT Urban Project Management  
Website discontinued (available through ADOT Information Data Warehouse or project team)
- I-17/Black Canyon Freeway Corridor Study and Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Section 4(f) Evaluation  
Discontinued  
Study Area: I-17, I-10 Split to SR-101L Agua Fria/Pima Freeway  
ADOT Urban Project Management  
Website discontinued (available through ADOT Information Data Warehouse or project team)

What current or near-future planning (or other) studies in the vicinity are underway or will be undertaken? What is the relationship of this study to those studies? Provide contact names and locations of the studies and study websites.

Study Name: South Mountain Freeway (SR-202L), I-10 (Papago Freeway) to I-10 (Maricopa Freeway) Final Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation

Project Contact: Carmelo Acevedo, ADOT Urban Project Management, 602-712-7559, CAcevedo@azdot.gov  
<http://www.azdot.gov/SouthMountainFreeway>

Project Overview: Over the past 40 years, Phoenix-area population, housing, and employment experienced some of the fastest growth in the nation. MAG projections indicate Maricopa County's population will add an average 1 million people per decade from 2005 to 2035. A major transportation facility (the South Mountain Freeway) has been included in the region's adopted transportation planning documents since 1985 and remains in the current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). At the beginning of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, the need for a major transportation facility in the southwest portion of the Phoenix metropolitan area in Maricopa County (study area) was reexamined to determine whether it was still needed. Using state-of-the-practice methods and tools, the analysis conducted for the EIS revealed that a major transportation facility is needed to address socioeconomic factors, regional transportation demand, and existing and projected transportation system capacity deficiencies.

Relationship to Spine Corridor Master Plan: The proposed South Mountain termini intersect the proposed Spine Corridor southern termini at the I-10/SR-202L Pecos Stack and the I-10 Maricopa Freeway west of the Spine Corridor study area. The loop formed by the South Mountain freeway will complete the SR 202L system and support the regional vision for I-10 under the Master Plan.

---

Study Name: Arizona Passenger Rail Study: Tucson to Phoenix

Project Contact: Thor Anderson, ADOT Multimodal Planning Division (MPD) Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL), 602-712-4574, TAnderson@azdot.gov  
<https://www.azdot.gov/planning/CurrentStudies/PassengerRail/overview>

Project Overview: ADOT has been working closely with the Federal Transit Administration, the Federal Railroad Administration, and local governments and planning organizations in Maricopa, Pinal and Pima counties to determine which routes would move forward for further study. ADOT continues to study the feasibility of a passenger rail line between Phoenix and Tucson and has narrowed the list of alternatives. ADOT is studying several alternatives, including the Orange Alternative, which would serve the East Valley and share part of its alignment with the planned North-South Freeway Corridor; the Yellow Alternative, also serving the East Valley but sharing right of way with Union Pacific Railroad, and the no-action alternative. Current action alternatives would run along I-10 south of Eloy to Tucson.

Relationship to Spine Corridor Master Plan: The proposed Arizona Passenger Rail Study parallels I-10 through Downtown Phoenix and the 'heart' of the Spine Master Plan study area. This segment of the passenger line would provide opportunities to explore multimodal transportation in the development of alternatives.

---

Study Name: Arizona Key Commerce Corridor Study

Project Contact: Thor Anderson, ADOT Multimodal Planning Division (MPD) Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL), 602-712-4574, TAnderson@azdot.gov  
<https://www.azdot.gov/planning/CurrentStudies/key-commerce-corridors>

Project Overview: ADOT MPD has identified corridors throughout the state where improvements to the transportation infrastructure support the greatest potential commercial and economic benefits. These "Key Commerce Corridors" represent a strategic statewide approach to leverage infrastructure improvements to enhance Arizona's competitive economic position. These corridors can support the creation of high-value, export focused jobs, increasing the state's high value overall economic growth and resulting in increased revenues for both state and local governments.

Relationship to Spine Corridor Master Plan: Among the corridors identified are the I-17 Phoenix to Flagstaff and I-10 California to Phoenix. Development of transportation alternatives for the I-17 and I-10 segments of the Spine Corridor will dovetail with the goals of the Arizona Key Commerce Corridor Study.

---

Study Name: South Central Corridor Study

Project Contact: Sonya Pastor La Sota, Valley Metro, Community Outreach Coordinator, 602-744-5584  
[http://www.valleymetro.org/projects\\_and\\_planning/project\\_detail/south\\_central#sthash.bOyE9Lpo.dpuf](http://www.valleymetro.org/projects_and_planning/project_detail/south_central#sthash.bOyE9Lpo.dpuf)

Project Overview: Valley Metro has initiated a 24-month Alternatives Analysis (AA) study of the South Central Phoenix Corridor. An AA evaluates several high-capacity transit options, including light rail, bus rapid transit and modern streetcar, to determine which transit mode and route serves this community best. It is the start of the federal process to eventually apply for funding.

Relationship to Spine Corridor Master Plan: The South Central Corridor study area is bound by 7th Avenue on the west, 7th Street on the east, Baseline Road on the south, and Washington Street on the north. The northern portion of the study area crosses I-17 within the Spine Master Plan study area. This study ties into the Spine Master Plan as well as the Arizona Passenger Rail Study.

---

Study Name: Northeast Transit Corridor and West Phoenix/Central Glendale Transit Corridor Studies

Project Contact: info@valleymetro.org, 602 262-7433  
[http://www.valleymetro.org/images/uploads/agency\\_transitresearch/Future\\_Transit\\_Corridors\\_Brochure\\_\\_August\\_2014.pdf](http://www.valleymetro.org/images/uploads/agency_transitresearch/Future_Transit_Corridors_Brochure__August_2014.pdf)

Project Overview: The Northeast Transit Corridor Study encompasses a 12-mile study area running northeast towards Paradise Valley Mall; this transit corridor is scheduled to open in 2034. The West Phoenix/Central Glendale Transit Corridor Study encompasses a 5-mile study area running northwest into downtown Glendale; this transit corridor is scheduled to open in 2026. The transit mode and route for each study is to be determined.

Relationship to Spine Corridor Master Plan: These study corridors, as proposed, would branch off the existing VMR line in the central Phoenix urban core and provide a linkage to the Spine Master Plan Corridor.

---

**Study objectives**

What are your desired outcomes for this study? (Mark all that apply.)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder identification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scheduling of infrastructure improvements over short-, mid-, and long-range time frames
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder roles/responsibilities definition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental impacts
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Travel study area definition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mitigation identification
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance measures development	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development of purpose and need goals and other objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alternative evaluation and screening	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alternative travel modes definition	

---

Have system improvements and additions that address your transportation need been identified in a fiscally constrained regional transportation plan?

In general, yes; however, the project proposes to address transportation needs in a systemic manner through establishing corridor operating principles that align with livable communities initiatives. Although the study purpose includes identifying projects for incorporation into the RTP, some of the projects that are developed through this process may not be specifically listed within the RTP.

---

Will a purpose and need statement<sup>1</sup> be prepared as part of this effort? If so, what steps will need to be taken during the NEPA process to make this a project-level purpose and need statement?

Yes, the purpose and need (P/N) will provide an overview of the context of the corridor's contribution to addressing transportation needs within the Master Plan area. Additional P/N to define the transportation problem at the project level will be by project with reference to the Master Plan P/N.

<sup>1</sup> For an explanation of purpose and need in environmental documents, please see the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA's) "NEPA and Transportation Decisionmaking: The Importance of Purpose and Need in Environmental Documents," <Purpose and Need>. This website provides links to five additional resources and guidance from FHWA that should be helpful in understanding the relationship between goals and objectives in transportation planning studies and purpose and need statements of NEPA documents.

<b>Establishment of organizational relationships</b>
Is a partnering agreement in place? If so, who are signatories (for example, affected agencies, stakeholders, organizations)? Attach the partnering agreement(s).
A partnering agreement signed by the Charter Partners is in place (attached). In addition, the Management Partners have entered into an operating agreement.
What are the key coordination points in the decision-making process?
The study team will coordinate with appropriate stakeholders and potentially affected parties at the following milestones and/or project phases. Some of these coordination points will occur concurrently. Task 1) Project Initiation to ensure that Project Management Plan, Public Involvement Plan, and Decision Process Memo are accounted for. Task 2) Establish Baseline and Future Conditions, complete Environmental Overview (Attachment 1) and report on those to establish Goals and Objectives. Task 3) Draft Purpose and Need and Establish Comprehensive Set of Alternatives and Screening Approach. Task 4) Identify Reasonable Alternatives. Task 5) Screen/Evaluate Alternatives. Task 6) Submit Draft Master Plan. Task 7) Submit Final Master Plan.
<b>Planning assumptions and analytical methods</b>
Is the time horizon of the study sufficiently long to consider long-term (20 years or more from completion of the study) effects of potential scenarios?
Yes. The study time horizon is Year 2040
What method will be used for forecasting traffic volumes (for example, traffic modeling or growth projections)? What are the sources of data being used? Has USDOT validated their use?
Data from the suspended I-17 and I-10 EIS projects serves in establishing an overview. Corridor Future Conditions will be based upon 2040 socio-economic data adopted by the MAG Regional Council in June 2013. MAG will provide travel demand, microsimulation model, and Regional Transportation Plan data in order for the team to examine demand and microsimulation forecasts and identify potential safety issues resulting from greater travel demand throughout the study area. Yes, USDOT has validated the use of this information.
Will the study use FHWA's Guide on the Consistent Application of Traffic Analysis Tools and Methods <sup>2</sup> ? If not, why not? How will traffic volumes from the travel demand model be incorporated, if necessary, into finer-scale applications such as a corridor study?
The study will account for FHWA guidance and utilize socioeconomic data from MAG member general plans, average vehicle trip data and projections for the MAG region, the distribution of travel modes used by travelers in the MAG region, estimates of existing transportation infrastructure capacity for regional travel, projected capacity of RTP-planned infrastructure improvements, and projected capacity of County, city and private developer street improvements. The study will also consider alternative means to measure network performance – more associated with network reliability, safety, and dependability – as well as metrics accounting for the movement of people and goods and not necessarily in terms of vehicles.
Do the travel demand models base their projections on differentiations between vehicles?
Yes
<b>Data, information, and tools</b>
Is there a centralized database or website that all State resource agencies may use to share resource data during the study?
At this time there is no such database or website.

<sup>2</sup> FHWA November 2011 publication: <[Traffic Analysis Tools and Methods](#)>

Questionnaire for Transportation Planners – Part 2

This part of the questionnaire should be completed by transportation planners at the end of the transportation planning study. This completed document should become an appendix to the study's final report to document how the study meets the requirements of 23 Code of Federal Regulations § 450.212 or § 450.318.

<b>Purpose and need for this study</b>
How did the study process define and clarify corridor-level or subarea-level goals (if applicable) that influenced modal infrastructure improvements and/or the range of reasonable alternatives?
What were the key steps and coordination points in the decision-making process? Who were the decision-makers and who else participated in those key steps?
How should this study information be presented in future NEPA document(s), if applicable? Are relevant findings documented in a format and at a level of detail that will facilitate reference to and/or inclusion in subsequent NEPA document(s)? <sup>3</sup>
Were the study's findings and recommendations documented in such a way as to facilitate an FHWA or Federal Transit Administration decision regarding acceptability for application in the NEPA process? Does the study have logical points where decisions were made and where concurrence from resource or regulatory agencies, stakeholders, and the public was sought? If so, provide a list of those points.

Establishment of organizational relationships – tribes and agencies <sup>4</sup>			
Tribe or agency	Date(s) contacted	Describe level of participation	Describe the agency's primary concerns and the steps needed to coordinate with the agency during NEPA scoping. <sup>5</sup>
<b>Tribal</b>			
GRIC		Stakeholder	
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC)		Stakeholder	
<b>Federal</b>			
Bureau of Indian Affairs		Agency Partner	
Bureau of Land Management		Agency Partner	
Bureau of Reclamation		Agency Partner	
Federal Highway Administration		Managing & Charter Partner	
National Park Service		Agency Partner	
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers		Agency Partner	

<sup>3</sup> For an explanation of the types of documents needed under the NEPA process and the nature of the content of those documents, please see "NEPA Documentation: Improving the Quality of Environmental Documents," <[Documentation](#)>.

<sup>4</sup> Users may add rows to this table to accommodate additional tribes and agencies. Unused rows may be deleted.

<sup>5</sup> If the transportation planning study final report does not adequately document interactions (for example, meeting minutes, resolutions, letters) with the relevant agencies, append such information to the end of this questionnaire and checklist.

Establishment of organizational relationships – tribes and agencies <sup>4</sup>			
Tribe or agency	Date(s) contacted	Describe level of participation	Describe the agency's primary concerns and the steps needed to coordinate with the agency during NEPA scoping. <sup>5</sup>
U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service		Agency Partner	
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency		Agency Partner	
U.S. Department of Defense		Agency Partner	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		Agency Partner	
Federal Aviation Administration		Agency Partner	
Federal Transit Administration		Agency Partner	
Western Area Power Administration		Agency Partner	
Federal Rail Administration		Agency Partner	
Surface Transportation Board		Agency Partner	
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)		Agency Partner	
State			
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality		Agency Partner	
Arizona Department of Public Safety		Agency Partner	
Arizona Game and Fish Department		Agency Partner	
Arizona State Land Department		Agency Partner	
County			
Maricopa County - manager, aviation, streets, transit, parks departments, as appropriate		Agency Partner	
(name of county and department)			
Local			
Chandler, Tempe, Phoenix, the Town of Guadalupe - city manager, aviation, streets, transit, parks departments, as appropriate		Planning Partner	

Establishment of organizational relationships – tribes and agencies <sup>4</sup>			
Tribe or agency	Date(s) contacted	Describe level of participation	Describe the agency's primary concerns and the steps needed to coordinate with the agency during NEPA scoping. <sup>5</sup>
neighboring MAG member agencies (e.g., cities of Glendale, Mesa and Tolleson - city manager, aviation, streets, transit, parks departments, as appropriate)		Agency Partner	
other City of Phoenix departments - Community and Economic Development, Planning and Development, and Public Works		Agency Partner	
Transportation agencies			
RPTA		Planning Partner	
VMA		Planning Partner	

Establishment of organizational relationships – stakeholders and members of the public <sup>6</sup>			
Public and stakeholders	Date(s) contacted	Describe level of participation	Describe the primary concerns expressed by members of the public and stakeholders.
<b>Public</b>			
Members of the public		3 meetings	
<b>Stakeholders</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Audubon Society</li> <li>•Center for Biological Diversity</li> <li>•citizens groups</li> <li>•HOAs</li> <li>•Sierra Club</li> <li>•Utility providers</li> <li>•School Districts</li> <li>•Emergency Response Providers</li> <li>•Bicycle and equestrian groups</li> <li>•Village Planning Groups</li> <li>•Chambers of Commerce</li> <li>•Flood Control District</li> </ul>			

Planning assumptions and analytical methods
Did the study provide regional development and growth assumptions and analyses? If so, what were the sources of the demographic and employment trends and forecasts?
What were the future-year policy and/or data assumptions used in the transportation planning process related to land use, economic development, transportation costs, and network expansion?
Were the planning assumptions and the corridor vision/purpose and need statement consistent with each other and with the long-range transportation plan? Are the assumptions still valid?
<b>Data, information, and tools</b>
Are the relevant data used in the study available in a compatible format that is readily usable? Are they available through a centralized web portal?

<sup>6</sup> Users may add rows to this table to accommodate additional stakeholders.

Are the completeness and quality of the data consistent with the quality (not scale or detail) of inputs needed for a NEPA project-level analysis <sup>7</sup> ?
Are the data used in the study regularly updated and augmented? If regularly updated, provide schedule and accessibility information.
Have the environmental data been mapped at scales that facilitate comparison of effects across different resources and at sufficient resolution to guide initial NEPA issue definition? If not, what data collection and/or manipulation would likely be needed for application to the NEPA scoping process?

<sup>7</sup> For an explanation of the types of information needed to evaluate impacts in environmental documents, please see FHWA’s “NEPA and Transportation Decisionmaking: Impacts,” <[Analysis of Impacts](#)>. This website provides links to six additional resources and guidance that should be helpful in understanding the types of impacts that need to be assessed, their context, and their intensity.

Examine the Checklist for Environmental Planners, at the back of this document, for more detail about potential impacts that could be mapped. Below is an abbreviated list of resources that could occur in the study area and may be knowable at this time and at the study's various analytical scales:

Resource or issue	Is the resource or issue present in the area?	Would any future transportation policies or projects involve the issue? Would there be impacts on the resource?	Resource or issue	Is the resource or issue present in the area?	Would any future transportation policies or projects involve the issue? Would there be impacts on the resource?
Sensitive biological resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Section 4(f) <sup>8</sup> wildlife and/or waterfowl refuge, historic site, recreational site, park	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Wildlife corridors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Section 6(f) <sup>9</sup> resource	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Wetland areas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Existing development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Riparian areas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Planned development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
100-year floodplain	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Title VI/ Environmental justice populations <sup>10</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide or local importance	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Utilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Visual resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Hazardous materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Designated scenic road/byway	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Sensitive noise receivers <sup>11</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Archaeological resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Air quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Historical resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Other (list) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable

<sup>8</sup> Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (49 U.S. Code § 303, as amended); see <Section 4(f)>.

<sup>9</sup> Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act

<sup>10</sup> refers to Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and 1994 Executive Order 12898 on environmental justice

<sup>11</sup> under FHWA's Noise Abatement Criterion B: picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sports areas, parks, residences, motels, hotels, schools, churches, libraries, and hospitals

Did the study incorporate models of, for example, species/habitat locations (predictive range maps), future land use, population dynamics, stormwater runoff, or travel demand? What models were used? Did the study adequately document what models were used, who was responsible for their use, and how they were used (with respect to, for example, calibration, replicability, contingencies, and exogenous factors)?
In scoping, conducting, and documenting the planning study, participants have come across documents and leads from agency staff and other sources that the environmental planners may be able to use in conducting their studies. List any applicable memoranda of understanding, cost-share arrangements, programmatic agreements, or technical studies that are underway but whose findings are not yet published, etc.
<b>Development of alternatives</b>
Were resource agencies, stakeholders, and members of the public engaged in the process of identifying, evaluating, and screening out modes, corridors, a range of alternatives, <sup>12</sup> or a preferred alternative (if one was identified—the latter two refer to corridor plans)? If so, how? Did these groups review the recommendation of a preferred mode(s), corridor(s), range of alternatives (including the no-build alternative), or an alternative? Were the participation and inputs of these groups at a level acceptable for use in purpose and need statements or alternatives development sections in NEPA documents? If not, why not?
Describe the process of outreach to resource agencies, the public, and other stakeholders. Describe the documentation of this process and of the responses to their comments. Is this documentation adequate in breadth and detail for use in NEPA documents?
If the study was a corridor study, describe the range of alternatives considered (if any), screening process, and screening criteria. Include what types of alternatives were considered (including the no-build alternative) and how the screening criteria were selected. Was a preferred alternative selected as best addressing the identified transportation issue? Are alternatives' locations and design features specified?
Also regarding whether the study was a corridor study, for alternatives that were screened out, summarize the reasons for their rejection. Are defensible, credible rationale articulated for their being screened out? Did the study team take into account legal standards <sup>13</sup> needed in the NEPA process for such decisions? Did the study team have adequate information for screening out the alternatives?
What issues, if any, remain unresolved with the public, stakeholders, and/or resource agencies?

<sup>12</sup> For an explanation of the development of alternatives in environmental documents, please see FHWA's "NEPA and Transportation Decisionmaking: Development and Evaluation of Alternatives," <Alternatives>.

<sup>13</sup> 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 771.123(c), 23 CFR § 771.111(d), 40 CFR § 1502.14(a), 40 CFR § 1502.14(b) and (d), 23 CFR § 771.125(a)(1); see FHWA Technical Advisory T 6640.8A, October 30, 1987, <FHWA Technical Advisory T 6640.8A>.

Formally joining PEL with the NEPA process
Lead federal agencies proposing a project that will undergo the NEPA process will want to most effectively leverage the transportation planning study's efforts and results. How could a Notice of Intent (for an environmental impact statement <sup>14</sup> ) refer to the study's findings with respect to preliminary purpose and need and/or the range of alternatives to be studied?
40 §1502.21 Incorporation by reference. "Agencies shall incorporate material into an environmental impact statement by reference when the effect will be to cut down on bulk without impeding agency and public review of the action. The incorporated material shall be cited in the statement and its content briefly described. No material may be incorporated by reference unless it is reasonably available for inspection by potentially interested persons within the time allowed for comment. Material based on proprietary data, which is itself not available for review and comment, shall not be incorporated by reference"
The P/N for the masterplan could be incorporated by reference to support the specific P/N for a given project and/or used as screening criteria as a consistency with established criteria for corridor purpose and need.
Could a Notice of Intent in the NEPA process clearly state that the lead federal agency or agencies will use analyses from prior, specific planning studies that are referenced in the transportation planning study final report? Does the report provide the name and source of the planning studies and explain where the studies are publicly available? If not, how could such relevant information come to the environmental planners' attention and be made available to them in a timely way?
Yes, and the report would provide the source of the planning studies and how to gain access to them.
List how the study's proposed transportation system would support adopted land use plans and growth objectives.
The basic MAG model is based upon the adopted plans and growth objectives of each.
What modifications are needed in the goals and objectives as defined in the transportation study process to increase their efficient and timely application in the NEPA process?
Recognition that purpose and need for specific projects will require elaboration but will be supported by the Goals & Objectives.
Jurisdictional delineations of waters of the United States frequently change. Housing and commercial developments can alter landscapes dramatically and can be constructed quickly. Noise and air quality regulations can change relatively rapidly. Resource agencies frequently alter habitat delineations to protect sensitive species. Will the study data's currency, relevance, and quality still be acceptable to agencies, stakeholders, and members of the public for use in the NEPA process? If not, what will be done to rectify this problem? Who will be responsible for any needed updating?
Acceptance of past data is not at the discretion of agencies randomly. What constitutes updates is based upon obligatory re-evaluation of past documents – have conditions changed on the ground and on the network, have demographics and growth rates altered, has the project changed, are there new regulatory requirements or state of the practice analyses/methods/models, have regulatory conditions changed – EJ, Cumulative?
Other issues
Are there any other issues a future NEPA study team should be aware of (mark all that apply)? In the space below the check boxes, explain the nature and location of any issue(s) checked.
<input type="checkbox"/> Public and/or stakeholders have expressed specific concerns <input type="checkbox"/> Utility problems <input type="checkbox"/> Access or right-of-way issues <input type="checkbox"/> Encroachments into right-of-way <input type="checkbox"/> Need to engage—and be perceived as engaging—specific landowners, citizens, citizen groups, or other stakeholders <input type="checkbox"/> Contact information for stakeholders <input type="checkbox"/> Special or unique resources in the area <input type="checkbox"/> Federal regulations that are undergoing initial promulgation or revision <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____

<sup>14</sup> While Notices of Intent are required by some federal agencies for environmental assessments, they are optional for FHWA. Please see "3.3.2 Using the Notice of Intent to Link Planning and NEPA," in *Guidance on Using Corridor and Subarea Planning to Inform NEPA* (Federal Highway Administration, April 5, 2011), <[Notice of Intent](#)>.

Concurrence
By signature, we concur that the transportation planning document meets or exceeds the following criteria in terms of acceptability for application in NEPA projects:
<input type="checkbox"/> Public involvement (outreach and level of participation) <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder involvement (outreach and level of participation) <input type="checkbox"/> Resource agencies' involvement and participation <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation of the above efforts <input type="checkbox"/> Applicability of the general findings and conclusions for use, by reference, in NEPA documents
Approved by: _____ Date: _____
DALLAS HAMMIT State Engineer Arizona Department of Transportation
Approved by: _____ Date: _____
SCOTT OMER Director Multimodal Planning Division, Arizona Department of Transportation
Approved by: _____ Date: _____
KARLA PETTY Division Administrator Federal Highway Administration

### Checklist for Environmental Planners – Part 3

By completing this checklist, environmental planners will be able to systematically evaluate the transportation planning study with regard to environmental resources and issues. It provides a framework for future NEPA studies by identifying those resources and issues that have already been evaluated, and those that have not. The role of environmental planners during the study’s various stages is laid out in the flowchart on page 3. This role includes timely advocacy for resources and issues that will later be integral to NEPA processes.

#### Checklist for environmental planners

Resource or issue	Is the resource or issue present in the area?	Are impacts to the resource or issue involvement possible?	Are the impacts mitigable?	Discuss the level of review and method of review for this resource or issue and provide the name and location of any study or other information cited in the planning document where it is described in detail. Describe how the planning data may need to be supplemented during NEPA.
<b>Natural environment</b>				
Sensitive biological resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Wildlife corridors	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Invasive species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Wetland areas	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Riparian areas	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
100-year floodplain	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Clean Water Act Sections 404/401 waters of the United States	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Prime or unique farmland	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Farmland of statewide or local importance	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	

#### Checklist for environmental planners

Resource or issue	Is the resource or issue present in the area?	Are impacts to the resource or issue involvement possible?	Are the impacts mitigable?	Discuss the level of review and method of review for this resource or issue and provide the name and location of any study or other information cited in the planning document where it is described in detail. Describe how the planning data may need to be supplemented during NEPA.
Sole-source aquifers	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Wild and scenic rivers	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Visual resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Designated scenic road/byway	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
<b>Cultural resources</b>				
Archaeological resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Historical resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
<b>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) resources</b>				
Section 4(f) wildlife and/or waterfowl refuge	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Section 4(f) historic site	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Section 4(f) recreational site	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Section 4(f) park	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Section 6(f) resource	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	

Checklist for environmental planners

Resource or issue	Is the resource or issue present in the area?	Are impacts to the resource or issue involvement possible?	Are the impacts mitigable?	Discuss the level of review and method of review for this resource or issue and provide the name and location of any study or other information cited in the planning document where it is described in detail. Describe how the planning data may need to be supplemented during NEPA.
<b>Human environment</b>				
Existing development	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Planned development	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Displacements	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Access restriction	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Neighborhood continuity	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Community cohesion	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Title VI/Environmental justice populations	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
<b>Physical environment</b>				
Utilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Hazardous materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Sensitive noise receivers	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Air quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Other (list)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	

<b>Identification of potential environmental mitigation activities</b>
Could the transportation planning process be integrated with other planning activities, such as land use or resource management plans? If so, could this integrated planning effort be used to develop a more strategic approach to environmental mitigation measures?
With respect to potential environmental mitigation opportunities at the PEL level, who should ADOT consult with among federal, State, and local agencies and tribes and how formally and frequently should such consultation be undertaken?
Off-site and compensatory mitigation areas are often creatively negotiated to advance multiagency objectives or multiple objectives within one agency. Who determined what specific geographic areas or types of areas were appropriate for environmental mitigation activities? How were these determinations made?
To address potential impacts on the human environment, what mitigation measures or activities were considered and how were they developed and documented?

Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Environmental Planning Group, Arizona Department of Transportation

Attachment 1  
I-10/I-17 (Spine) Corridor Master Plan  
Environmental Overview

This page is intentionally left blank.