

Appendix L. Comments Summary

This page is intentionally left blank.

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
1	EX-3	Executive Summary	ADOT	Dan Gabiou	Left column, bottom bullet: recommend defining "DHOV" here instead of on the right column under Agency & Public Feedback.	A	will comply	A
2	EX-4	Executive Summary	ADOT	Dan Gabiou	Left column, bottom bullet: recommend replacing "vehicle-to-capacity" with "volume-to-capacity".	A	will comply	A
3	27	Table 2-1: Cumulative impacts / Secondary impacts	ADOT	Dan Gabiou	Since we're are no longer looking at the same alternatives as identified in the I-10 & I-17 EIS's and we'll be likely identifying multiple projects to include in MAG's RTP, I would strongly suggest that MAG considers cumulative and secondary impacts as part of the alternatives evaluation process.	D	Will not consider in the NAR but will investigate evaluating traffic cumulative and secondary impacts as part of the alternatives evaluation	D

**I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary**

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
1	7-1	7.1	ADOT	Weeks	General comment: not reviewed for spelling and grammatical errors	HDR	D	Will comply	D
					"The 2014 Arizona State Highway Strategic Plan <i>Arizona 2014 Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> provides a comprehensive framework for reducing fatalities and serious injuries on public roadways. This plan identifies actions and strategies to be taken over next 5 years to reduce auto and pedestrian involved crashes <i>the total number of fatalities and serious injuries in Arizona by 3 to 7 percent.</i> "	HDR	A		A
2	7-1	7.2	ADOT	Weeks	"Given the low number of crashes in those categories, the "very low" rating is used to indicate only locations that have less than one <i>no</i> crash es in the 5-year analysis period. , indicating that there are zero crashes in those locations since there can only be a whole number of crashes. " Traffic Engineering Group. Using "very low" rating for locations that have no crashes is misleading.	HDR	A/D	Will make text revision as suggested, but using "very low" is the most appropriate description as the data only represents a five year sampling of data. Stating that there are no accidents could also be misleading as it would imply accidents never occur at that location.	A/D
3						HDR	D		D
4	7-7	7.5	ADOT	Weeks	"All of the crashes listed in the ADOT Traffic Safety Division crash data had one of six severity ratings: no injury, possible injury, non-incapacitating injury, <i>incapacitating injury, fatal and unknown.</i> "	HDR	A	Will add	A
5	7-8 ff		ADOT	Weeks	Titles of Figures 7-1 to 7-17 do not indicate that <u>rating ranges</u> are shown, and not frequency, rate, totals, number of crashes, etc. as indicated by the titles.	HDR	D	These figures were developed, reviewed, and approved by the Spine Engineering and Safety working group (ADOT was represented in this working group). It was specifically decided in the working group not to associate numbers with the levels. See the Appendix I for the detailed information.	D
6	EX-3	Executive Summary	ADOT	Orrahood	Under Agency and Public Feedback, suggest changing "dangerous merging" to "considerable merging"; same for other segments.	HDR	D	dangerous merges was the actual phasing that the public used in their feedback.	D
7	EX-12	Executive Summary	ADOT	Orrahood	Under Infrastructure Age/Condition Issues, might want to mention why Camelback, Glendale Ave, Northern Ave, and Greenway Rd are not listed.	HDR	D	The Executive Summary is only mean to give a high level overview only and discuss only the significant issues.	D
8	5-1	Commuter Express	ADOT	Orrahood	Suggest noting that several RAPID and Express routes have ramp meter bypass access to freeways	HDR	A		A
9	5-10	Traffic Signal Priority	ADOT	Orrahood	TPS could be looked at for metered entrance ramps where buses do not yet have HOV bypass	HDR	D	There is an alternative proposed for the next phase of Spine to evaluate bus HOV bypass on metered ramps.	D
10	General		ADOT	Orrahood	Is there general discussion anywhere on the percentage of traffic which will divert from freeways to arterials for regular commuting? Will this percentage increase by 2040?	Wilson	D	This analysis was not specifically conducted. However, there is somewhat of a correlation between the volumes in the 2040 base condition and the 2040 scenario that was developed to determine the number of travel lanes that would be required without congestion. One may assume that the difference in freeway volumes are those that have elected to divert routes and/or destinations in response to congestion.	D

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
1		Executive Summary	ADOT	Mark Poppe	More information from Sections 6 and 7 should be brought into the Executive Summary. Clearly some of the information in the first paragraph of section 6.3.2 needs to be brought forward.	D	The intent of the Executive Summary was not to highlight not every issue included in the NAR (that is what the subsequent chapters are for), but to focus only on those factors that seemed to be extraordinary for each segment of the corridor so that targeted solutions could be identified.	D
2		Executive Summary	ADOT	Mark Poppe	Need some discussion of the safety and mobility performance of I-10, 35th Ave to the Split. This is a vital corridor in the study area, but yet seems to be generally overlooked. The performance of the Spine is closely tied to the performance of the Inner Loop. Any future TSM&O plans for the Spine cannot ignore the Inner Loop.	D	I-10/I-17 Corridor Master Plan is not looking at I-10 between the Stack and the Split because the tunnel cannot be widened anymore. A separate study is being planned for that segment.	D
3	EX-6	Executive Summary	ADOT	Mark Poppe	Under Agency and Public Feedback - "Entrance /exit ramp issues" listed twice.	A	Will fix text	A
4		2	ADOT	Mark Poppe	Please incorporate road safety considerations into the NEPA analysis. See FHWA document "Integrating Road Safety into NEPA Analysis: A Primer for Safety and Environmental Professionals" regarding how this may be done. http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/tsp/fhwasa1136/fhwasa1136.pdf . Also, see comments regarding importance of road safety on mobility measures and ped/bike considerations.	D	The purpose and need has been developed and finalized by ADOT, MAG, and FHWA, and during the discussion, safety was carefully considered and addressed in the P&N as the agencies felt was appropriate. As a result, we are not inclined to reopen that discussion again. From the FHWA guidance on this issue, many transportation projects produce safety benefits, in the sense that completing the project will tend to reduce accident rates and/or the overall number of accidents. Yet, the potential for a safety benefit does not necessarily mean that safety is one of the purposes of the project. In general, safety should be included as a primary project purpose only where there is an identified safety need. Typically, a safety need exists where there is data demonstrating the existence of a safety problem—for example, an accident rate that exceeds the statewide average for similar roadways. There is plenty of guidance of how to use safety in the NEPA process and we feel the environmental working group incorporated that guidance properly in the P&N for this Corridor Master Plan.	D
5		3	ADOT	Mark Poppe	With the emerging importance of TSM&O, I believe there should be some discussion here of other mobility performance measures; specifically, those related to travel time reliability. It would seem travel time reliability should be a factor in assessing future alternatives. An agreed upon measure and method of analysis is needed.	D	Methods for addressing this criteria in the context of the available output from the travel demand model is being researched. Once an appropriate measure is identified, it will be incorporated into the alternative evaluation.	D

**I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary**

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
6		3	ADOT	Mark Poppe	Closely related to comment above. Suggest there be some discussion of the importance of non-recurring delay. The analysis, at present, only addresses capacity from a recurring delay perspective. A major factor in mobility in the urban roadway environment is non-recurring delay due to incidents. This is closely tied to the frequency and severity of crashes, as crashes are the number one cause of non-recurring delay. See attached proposed steps for assessing the I-17 ATM near-term improvement. This type of framework may be applicable to other proposed improvements.	D	While we agree that non-recurring congestion due to incidents is a significant factor in the operations of the system, the randomness of location, time, and severity means that there are an infinite number of operational models that could be run to simulate their effects. This is outside the scope of the Spine Study; however, because we recognize the importance of this issue, the Spine study recommendation will include an integrated corridor management (ICM) strategy to help route traffic around incidents. Because of the detail required to plan and implement ICM is very complex, those details will be addressed in future studies/projects.	D
7	4-1	4.3	ADOT	Mark Poppe	Please add some discussion of access control. There is no access control along much of the I-17 frontage roads. Driveways immediately down stream of the exit ramps are problematic from a traffic safety and mobility perspective. Long-term improvements should include options for acquisition of access control limits conforming to the ADOT RDG.	A	Will add some discussion of access control, and the current variances along the I-17 frontage roads.	A
8	4-16	4.8.1	ADOT	Mark Poppe	While the bridge condition for I-17 at Camelback and I-17 at Bethany may be "good" based on bridge condition rating, the triangular cantilevers that support the SPUI left turn lane configurations on the ramps are settling. Much AC cold mix has been used to address the differential between the main bridge and the cantilevers. It is a continuing maintenance problem.	D	Because the NAR is a high level needs assessment report, we did not focus on small maintenance items. Individual projects that arise out of this study will focus on spot improvements such as maintenance items as those projects develop.	D
9	4-16	4.8.1	ADOT	Mark Poppe	There is significant settlement on the approach slabs for the SR 51/I-10 HOV lane ramps. The problem is significant enough to warrant installation of "BUMP" warning signs.	D	I-10/I-17 Corridor Master Plan is not looking at I-10 between the Stack and the Split because the tunnel cannot be widened anymore. A separate study is being planned for that segment.	D
10	4-16	4.9.1	ADOT	Mark Poppe	It should be noted there is an on-going detailed needs assessment for all ADOT maintained pump houses. This study is being performed by HDR.	A	It will be noted in the report that a detailed needs assessment report is currently being completed by ADOT.	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan

DRAFT Needs Assessment Report

Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
11		7	ADOT	Mark Poppe	Somewhere here you need to say something about I-10, 35th Ave to the I-17 Split. It is in the study area but completely omitted from discussion. Certainly the crash rates in the influence area of the tunnel and the crash rate at I-10/7th Ave are worthy of discussion. It represents a significant need in the study area. The I-10 , 35th Ave - Sky Harbor Safety Study should be mentioned. Copy of the study is attached.	D	I-10/I-17 Corridor Master Plan is not looking at I-10 between the Stack and the Split because the tunnel cannot be widened anymore. A separate study is being planned for that segment.	D
12	8-9	8.6.1	ADOT	Mark Poppe	ADOT is also operating TransSuite. The ADOT CCTV were generally located to maximize view of the freeway mainline. Additional CCTV located for and dedicated to interchange traffic signal operations would be beneficial.	A	Agree. Recommend updating the 3rd bullet under 8.6.1, Infrastructure – please include a sentence at the end of that bullet: “It would also be beneficial to have CCTV located for and dedicated to interchange traffic signal operations.”	A
13	8-9	8.6.1	ADOT	Mark Poppe	The most likely roadways useful for diversion of traffic from I-17 mainline is the frontage road system. Yet the frontage roads are in very sorry condition in many areas, particularly south of Dunlap. Much of the frontage road system is one lane, some without curb and gutter. It would seem widening and improving the frontage road system in this area may be necessary to support ATM.	D	Will be analyzed as a diversion solution to congestion/crashes on the freeway.	D
14	11-19	11.3	ADOT	Mark Poppe	I believe we should explicitly identify improving safety as a purpose. I feel the information in sections 6 and 7 support the position this is a need. The public outreach seems to confirm safety as a top priority. Improving transportation safety is a core Regional goal. See the recently completed MAG Strategic Transportation Safety Plan. Reduced number of crashes supports mobility. Not necessarily the other way around, as bullet point 5 implies. See attached document in support of safety.	D	<p>The purpose and need has been developed and finalized by ADOT, MAG, and FHWA, and during the discussion, safety was carefully considered and addressed in the P&N as the agencies felt was appropriate. As a result, we are not inclined to reopen that discussion again.</p> <p>From the FHWA guidance on this issue, many transportation projects produce safety benefits, in the sense that completing the project will tend to reduce accident rates and/or the overall number of accidents. Yet, the potential for a safety benefit does not necessarily mean that safety is one of the purposes of the project. In general, safety should be included as a primary project purpose only where there is an identified safety need. Typically, a safety need exists where there is data demonstrating the existence of a safety problem—for example, an accident rate that exceeds the statewide average for similar roadways. There is plenty of guidance of how to use safety in the NEPA process and we feel the environmental working group incorporated that guidance properly in the P&N for this Corridor Master Plan.</p>	D

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
1	11	Executive Summary, Segment Profiles	City of Chandler	City of Chandler	The plan identifies NB DMS sign at Warner, and SB DMS sign at Guadalupe. Actually, the existing NB DMS sign is at Ray, and there are two DMS signs SB – one at Guadalupe, and one at Warner. Further, there is an ADOT project under construction today to add more DMS, cameras, and detection on I-10 from Ray to Queen Creek. Some of this new equipment may already be operational.	KHA	A	We will update the infrastructure map and provide to HDR. Comment is correct – by now, some of the new equipment is probably operational. It is not showing up on ADOT's az511.gov map as an active sign. Was under construction when first prepared. Please also make this update: EX-3, Segment 1 profile, technology infrastructure, first bullet. The following dynamic message signs (DMS) are located on this segment of I-10: one westbound (inbound) at Ray Road and two eastbound (outbound) at Warner Road and Ray Road. ADOT is in the process of implementing additional DMS south of SR-202L to advise travelers heading west toward the Spine study area.	A
2	16	Executive Summary, Technology Infrastructure Issues	City of Chandler	City of Chandler	1st bullet. It says that Phx, Tempe and Chandler manage arterial signals but none of the signals/cameras are interconnected. Actually, ALL of the intersections under Chandler control are interconnected with fiber, and each signal has cameras viewable from our Traffic Management Center (TMC). Note that the two interchange signals at Ray and at Chandler are not under City control.	KHA	A	This is a good clarification. They are connected within their cities, but not across city boundaries. This is also addressed on one of Tempe's comments in a different segment. EX9, Segment A1, first bullet under Technology Infrastructure Issues. Please change entire bullet as follows: Three different agencies (Cities of Phoenix, Tempe and Chandler) manage their arterial signals and infrastructure, which are connected to their respective TMCs. Through regional systems, agencies are able to view other agencies' CCTV.	A
3	16	Executive Summary, Technology Infrastructure Issues	City of Chandler	City of Chandler	4st bullet. Chandler's staffing of the TMC is 6 am to 6 pm, Monday to Fridays.	KHA	A	EX-9, Technology Infrastructure Issues. 4th bullet. Revise as follows: Staffing levels at local Traffic Management Centers in this segment do not provide full-time coverage at all centers for changes to signal operations during business hours. Typical hours for local TMCs are 6 AM to 6 PM, Monday through Friday. Local agencies do not staff their respective TMCs after business hours or on weekends.	A
4			City of Chandler	City of Chandler	There are many references to moderate and high levels of ped, bike, and vehicular crashes along this corridor. I believe Table 7-8 says that 1 ped or bike crash per year is considered high. Are there references to show that this number is indeed well above a national average? Or are these ranges arbitrary and intended to show only relative safety?	HDR	D	The ranges are relative to the Spine data set. The approach is outlined in Section 7.2 of the NAR. It was decided by the Spine Engineering working group that national averages would not be used because of differing reporting thresholds depending on the agency and because it would not be comparing the Spine data to urban areas of similar characteristics.	D

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
5		Figure 1-2	City of Chandler	City of Chandler	Figure 1-2. The Near Term GP lanes added on to I-10 only extends to Ray Rd and not beyond Pecos as shown on the drawing. I thought we were proposing a C-D road in the Near Term, and not "braided ramps" at the Broadway Curve as identified in this figure? The South Mountain Freeway should be shown as a near term (lower case) project.	HDR	A/A/D	Will fix GP lanes to terminate at Ray Road. Will change I-10 Braided Ramps to I-10 C-D Roads. SMF is shown on the map as a near term improvement, labeled as a New Freeway.	A/A/D

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
1		General	City of Tempe	Catherine Hollow	Not sure why University to SR 143 (and SR 143) were not included in the list of arterials. It's a little confusing because they are in the study area and show up on several maps such as EX-2 and 1-2 and 1-3 and are mentioned in other places and shown as data points on several maps such as crashes.	HDR	D	Decision was made early on that these corridors would not be considered corridors of interest in the Spine Study as they could not meaningfully be used as alternate routes to I-10 and I-17.	D
2		General	City of Tempe	Catherine Hollow	When the Near-term I-10 improvements are listed can you in parenthesis indicate "including ped bridges"	HDR	A	Will comply	A
3		General	City of Tempe	Catherine Hollow	Should the Pascua Yaqui Tribe be mentioned somewhere?	Jacobs	D	No additional text to be added to the Final NAR. The Pascua Yaqui does not need to be reference at this time; however, if a build alternative is defined and selected, FHWA will need to conduct ongoing Section 106 consultation with land management agencies, municipalities, tribal communities and the public. The Pascua Yaqui would be a consulting party to the Section 106 process. Any agreement documents related to the Section 106 process will be used to guide future consideration and treatment of cultural resources."	D
4	EX-9	Executive Summary	City of Tempe	Catherine Hollow	On Ex-9: to be more clear: signals are connected to the TMCs within the jurisdictions. Also, jurisdictions can see cameras in other cities.	KHA	A	Change. On Page EX-9, Segment A2, Technology Infrastructure issues, first bullet. Replace with the following: Three different agencies (Cities of Phoenix, Tempe and Chandler) manage their arterial signals and infrastructure, which are connected to their respective TMCs. Through regional systems, agencies are able to view other agencies' CCTV.	A
5			City of Tempe	Catherine Hollow	Tempe is starting design on the Highline Canal Multi-Use Path from Baseline to Knox Rd alignment.	HDR	A	See Figure 6-1. Trail is included in bike/ped inventory.	A
6		Executive Summary	City of Tempe	Catherine Hollow	In Ex Summ, it says that it is challenging to coordinate detours. To be more clear: detours take coordination among agencies (For example, if ADOT wants help they call a City and signal timing is changed by the City – it works but this is not as envisioned by some)	KHA	A	Page EX-9. Under Technology Infrastructure Issues, third bullet should start: Challenging to coordinate detours/re-routes among agencies.....	A
7	4-10	Chapt. 4	City of Tempe	Catherine Hollow	When PCCP pavement is mentioned, the portion on the arterials at the interchanges seems to have been missed. Also, Southern has PCCP under the I-10 bridge. All maintained by ADOT.	HDR	A	Will address in intro to PCCP section.	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
1	Overall		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	For all of the SPINE maps, please include the identified L202-South Mountain freeway, and the Light Rail segments that are open and under construction.	HDR	D	Will show SMF on all maps. Incorporate into the base map template. Will evaluate if LTR will clutter the maps too much.	A
2	Overall		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	There is no mention of TDM or carpooling in the report. This report should include current program, analysis, and planned future program.	HDR	D	As a corridor master plan, TDM and TSM strategies will very likely be mentioned as elements of the recommended alternative, but the goal of the Spine Study is to identify the major elements of the plan that need to be programmed and scheduled for long range planning. TDM and TSM strategies will be part of solution, but TDM and TSM do not require substantial funding or infrastructure investments. As a result, they will be mentioned, but not studied in great deal at this level of development. Under chapter 3 put in a section on TDM/TSM. Text can be used from the current RTP.	A
3	Overall		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Suggest changing Transit Infrastructure to Transit, Carpool and Vanpool Infrastructure; TDM; or another inclusive title. The majority of HOV users are carpoolers, not transit riders. The analysis and conclusions in the report and ExSum should include carpool information, statistics, vanpool information, etc.	HDR	D/A	Chapter 5 (Transit) includes vanpool information as it is considered one of the "public transit" modes offered in the region. While there is a public carpool matching service, carpools are generally treated as a private transportation mode and typically not included with transit reporting data. Incorporating additional vanpool data and carpool data into the Executive Summary is possible, but changing the title of Chapter 5 to include Vanpool and Carpool in the title name may not be necessary as the opening paragraph in Chapter 5 states that vanpool is inclusive of the multiple modes of transit reviewed in the chapter.	D/A
4	Overall		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Section 3.9, in the ExSum per each segment, and in the Summary of Identified Issues (P3-22) is analysis and description of the Capacity Needs for Unconstrained Demand (#of Lanes needed). While this is an interesting analysis, the goal of the study to aim for no congestion/free flow traffic has yet to be identified. Please consider stating the goal related to congestion. The way it is referenced in the ExSum under each Segment, and in 3.9 Summary of Identified Issues, it is proposing a goal (free flow traffic) and a solution (# of lanes). Is this appropriate in the ExSum of a needs assessment?	Wilson	C	The intent was to provide context for the number of lanes that would be required for no congestion, but does not suggest that this is the goal of the study Further discussion required -perhaps we remove these references from the exec summary and just leave in the separate section of the report. Will Remove from the Executive Summary	A
5	Overall (relates to comment #4)	E-4Executive Summary	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	At 44th Street in the PM peak, 22 lanes would be needed to accommodate future demand without congestion. We know this isn't going to happen and congestion will always be present. So, can we improve commuter service with a dedicated freeway bus lane, another HOV lane, or make the necessary improvements on parallel streets such as Southern, Broadway and Baseline Road to connect into existing transit service (East Baseline PnR (24th Street) and SM RAPID service and provide stronger commuter options?	Wilson	C	The intent was to provide context for the number of lanes that would be required for no congestion, but does not suggest that this is the goal of the study Further discussion required -perhaps we remove these references from the exec summary and just leave in the separate section of the report. Will Remove from the Executive Summary	A

**I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary**

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
6	Overall		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Transit Operations is lacking in ExSum and report. Please consider including contextual information about operations, per year, the Short Range Transit Program and the TLCP. All of these programs has identified transit operations information, included any expanded routes.	HDR	D	While information from the SRTP and TLCP could be incorporated into the report (Executive Summary and Chapter 5), neither programs include significant increases in transit operations or capital investments and are subject to change annually based on available funding. The recent passage of Proposition 104 (City of Phoenix) will likely have a more significant infusion of transit investment within the study area, but at this time, it is unknown how much or when the funding will be available.	D
7	Overall		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	The Bike and Pedestrian Infrastructure Issues in the ExSum seems to be lacking information that would give a reader a sense of ADA conditions, walkability, bike ability, access, connectivity, at major mile intersections.	HDR	C	Need clarification. EX Summary only meant to give a high level gap analysis. Add that more detail can be found in Chapter 6	A
8	Overall		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	The City of Phoenix submits its Bicycle Master Plan for projects to be analyzed, included as alternatives, and possibly included as solutions are developed. Please include the identified projects in the report as appropriate. (City of Tempe Transportation Plan is referenced in the ExSum)	HDR	C	The Phoenix Bicycle Master Plan can also be referenced, but if Phoenix believes there are elements in that plan that should be included in the Spine Study that could contribute to the Spine purpose and need, please be specific as to which improvements you are referring to. Will add a reference to City of Phoenix Bike and City of Chandler bike master plans. No changes to the map.	A
9	Overall		COP	Public Transit Department	The timing of the final Spine Study Report will be such that the <u>City of Phoenix Transportation Plan 2050</u> will be decided by Phoenix voters in an August 25, 2015 general election. The outcome of that vote on the Transportation Plan will have a significant impact on Phoenix streets, bus and light rail. Those future transportation plans should be incorporated in the production of the final report otherwise the final report will be significantly outdated when published.	HDR	A/D	It is recognized that the recent passage of the 2050 Transportation Plan could have some impacts to the content of the Needs Assessment Report(NAR), however, at this time, MAG's position is that Prop 104 is just a funding stream, not a prioritized, programmed, and adopted transportation plan. We recognize that Phoenix is working on developing this prioritized program, but it is our understanding that this will not be available for 3-6 more months in an adopted form. As such, a forward will be added to the NAR stating: "It understood that the passage of the 2050 Transportation Plan will or could contain projects that contribute to the goals and objectives of the Spine Study. Since the 2050 program has yet to be developed and adopted by the Phoenix City Council, we are not able to incorporate it into the Final NAR. However, as information becomes available, it will be considered as the Spine alternatives screening process advances over the next year." Will add a section in Chapter 1 that acknowledges that Prop 104 has passed and that it will affect the Spine corridor and will be a major PHX initiative moving forward. Add the maps prepared for the proposition. Will use Prop 104 information in subsequent phases of the Spine study.	A

**I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary**

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
10	Overall		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	The public input that was received needs to be concluded, and key findings need to be identified. These key findings should feed into the 'Purpose and Action' section. It is requested that this section responds to the public input, and appropriate revisions be included.	HDR	D	Purpose and Need has been developed and public input was incorporated. In addition, the guiding principles developed to guide the alternative screening process were developed using the public feedback.	D
11	Overall		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	"If deficiencies are found in the network, analysts can suggest the types of improvements to the region's transportation network necessary to address the deficiencies, in addition to testing the suggested improvements to assess their effectiveness." The recommended type of traffic analysis tools, limit the analysis and solutions. The Overview in the ExSum indicates that multimodal solutions will be explored, and a full range of regional transportation modes and concepts will be evaluated. Are there other tools out there to aid in developing and assessing multi modal solutions? MMLOS, Bike/Ped accessibility, any ideas about TDM analysis for a system, other transit ridership models to aid in prediction, etc.? Any need to include land use changes - shorter trips, more dense places?	HDR	D	Study is and will be multi-modal but alt modes make up a small percentage of the corridor trips, consequently, the typical traffic analysis tools will still be the primary analysis tools that will be needed for the majority of the trips. The Spine alternative screening will evaluate "non-transportation" solutions, which will include land use changes, but since land use decisions are made by the municipalities, the Spine study will at most only be able to make suggestions to those agencies if worthy land use solutions are identified. Address with a section in chapter 1 outlining why/how the study came together and outline how the study will proceed after the NAR.	A
12	Overall		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Please incorporate the public input, and relate how the key public input points relate to the 8 preferred solutions/actions.	HDR	D	Public input was used to develop these 8 solutions/actions. (See Comment 161)	D
13	Overall		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Under the preferred solutions would include actions to, please consider modifying to incorporate the following: address safety as it's own topic, include technology into this section (it can provide improvements for operations, and communicating travel choice (TDM) to commuters), including travel choices as an action "provide a transportation system that gives people a choice to drive alone, carpool, use transit, walk, bicycle, and or telecommute", Involve the public and community residents if recommendations include purchasing new right of way, Utilize existing ROW.	HDR	D	This is the topic of the alternatives development and screening report that will be developed over the next year.	D
14	Ex-1	Executive Summary	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Should the purpose of the study be to add corridor capacity and efficiency through the development of a set of improvements that also provide greater access to other modes of transportation ?	HDR	D	The purpose and need is intended to be general in nature as this is a corridor master plan. Subsequent purpose and need statements for future individual project NEPA efforts may include specific goals. Address with a section in chapter 1 outlining why/how the study came together and outline how the study will proceed after the NAR.	A
15	EX-1	Executive Summary	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Since this a multi-modal study has Mike Sanders (Bicycle Coordinator) from ADOT been part of this process?	HDR	D	ADOT identified the personnel they wanted directly involved, and Mike Sanders was not included. Mike has been included in the e-mails.	D
16	EX-1	Executive Summary	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Other than the extension to Dunlap Avenue, the light rail projects are not near-term improvements that will have a significant effect on the viability of the corridor.	HDR	D	Valley Metro identified these projects and requested they be included under the near-term improvement list for the light rail network.	D

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
17	EX-1	Purpose of Study	COP	Public Transit Department	<p>"The Spine study's intended key outcome will be an improvement strategy documented as the I-10/I-17 Corridor Master Plan to appropriately manage travel demand and travel improvements in the I-10 and I-17 corridors through 2040."</p> <p>Why is the I-10 from the Stack to the Split omitted from the study? What percent of the daily interstate traffic in the region flows on the I-10 from the Stack to the Split versus the I-17 from the Stack to the Split?</p> <p>The I-10 from the Stack to the Split is in the corridor study width (Figure EX-1) but not discussed in the Chapter 5 Transit Service?</p>	HDR	D	<p>I-10/I-17 Corridor Master Plan is not looking at I-10 between the Stack and the Split because the tunnel cannot be widened anymore. A separate study is being planned for that segment.</p> <p>Will explain in Chapter 1 why the I-10 inner loop is in the study area but not part of the studied corridor.</p>	A
18	ExSum		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	In the segment profiles, please be consistent with transit/carpool/vanpool, bike/ped, and Title VI references. Ex: Town of Guadalupe population is described, but no mention of EJ.	HDR/Jacobs	D/A	<p>Ex Summary is not meant to be consistent. It only hits the highlights of each section that have been deemed significant problems or differentiators.</p> <p>Guadalupe's EJ population is described in Chapter 2 (pg. 2-22)</p>	D/A
19	ExSum		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Please mention the cities involved in the Overview.	HDR	A	Will comply	A
20	ExSum		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Near Term Improvements - says 'to be built in the next 5 years and are included in the RTP'; Please review the Valley Metro section on dates of opening and modify text or project listings accordingly.	HDR	D	Valley Metro identified these projects and requested they be included under the near-term improvement list for the light rail network. We will add clarification that Valley Metro identified the light rail projects as the near-term projects.	D
21	ExSum		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Near Term Improvements - should the Alameda and Guadalupe bike/ped bridges be included?	HDR	D	The ped bridges are included in the near-term improvements within the I-10 ramp improvements between SR-143 and US-60 and the additional general purpose lanes in each direction projects.	D
22	ExSum		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	The ExSum is silent on public involvement. Please include.	HDR	D	There is a section for public feedback for every segment in which we received a general theme in comments.	D
23	EX3		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	The Transit Infrastructure Issues seems to be focused on the built environment, which is only one factor into optimizing transit routes and providing transit service to commuters. Since transit is based on operations, operations should be brought into the needs report.	HDR	D	Chapter 5 includes a description of the existing transit infrastructure (built environment) and transit operations. Examples of the transit operations information documented in Chapter 5 includes operating hours, days of service, and quantity of daily scheduled transit trips in the study area (e.g. Table 5-1 Express Bus Operations; Table 5-3 Light Rail Operations; Table 5-4 Local Bus Operations). Transit operations performance data are provided in separate tables (e.g. Table 5-6 Commuter Express Performance). If additional operations information is desired to be incorporated into the report, we can discuss what specific elements are desired.	D

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
24	Executive Summary	EX-3	COP	Public Transit Department	How were the arterial segments chosen? Some are missing. For example, east-to-west arterials crossing I-17 omits Van Buren Street and there is no mention of north-to-south arterials crossing I-17 and I-10?	HDR	D	The east/west arterial segments chosen include significant east/west regional movements that notably impact the Spine corridor travel movements north of the stack. All other Spine corridor crossings not designated as corridors of interest have significantly less crossing volumes due to land use and the presence of SHIA, South Mountain, and the Salt River. Clarify why we choose these arterials in Chapter 4.	A
25	EX-3	Executive Summary	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	If possible the I-10 East RAPID bus service from the Pecos Park-and-Ride service should not only have direct access to the freeway but the HOV system to add convenience, time savings and limited weaving (see Agency and Public Feedback) and highest commuter bus service in this segment.	HDR	D	This is one of the alternatives that will be assessed within the next stage of the Spine study.	D
26	Executive Summary	EX-4	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	<i>Transit Infrastructure Issues</i> : The highest commuter bus ridership occurs within the I-10 from the Stack to downtown Phoenix (the forgotten corridor) with the I-17 RAPID (51 trips), the I-10 West RAPID (25 trips), Express 562/563 (16 trips), Express 573 (8 trips), and the Express 571 (8 trips). The SR-51 RAPID also feeds the I-10 near downtown Phoenix with 26 trips per weekday.	HDR	D	A majority of the commuter express buses that originate in the west valley do use the segment of I-10 between the Stack and Downtown Phoenix (this segment of the regional freeway network is not a focus of the Spine Study). However, the number of scheduled daily transit trips is not significantly different than what is provided on I-10 through the Broadway curve. Will explain in Chapter 1 why the I-10 inner loop is in the study area but not part of the studied corridor.	A
27	EX4		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Western and Highline canals cross the I-10. Are there bike/ped facilities that go with these crossings?	HDR	D	There are gravel access/maintenance roads that appear to be currently used as a walking path and neither have freeway crossings. Freeway crossings were suggested in the alternative workshop and will be evaluated in the next phase of the Spine project.	D
28	EX4		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Need a date for the first bullet	HDR/Jacobs	C	The date for the LUST site data is located in Chapter 2. The Ex Summary is only a high level gap analysis and is not meant to delve into detail.	A
29	EX4		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	The Transit Infrastructure section mentions ridership, but doesn't do this in any other section else. This needs to be consistent. Please review data on commuters on the I-17 RAPID routes.	HDR	C	Will state at the beginning of the Executive Summary that it only hits the high points/exceptional items of the report and is not meant to be comprehensive or consistent in the information presented.	A
30	EX4		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Last bullet under Comm & Econ. Factors - Of what?	HDR	A	of the Interstate corridor.	A
31	EX5		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	LUST - please spell out	HDR	D	LUST is spelled out in the first bullet under Segment I2 (Environmental and Community Issues)	D

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
32	EX5		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	3rd Bullet under Infrastructure Age/Condition. Please explain the impact: does this have a negative impact on XXX? A positive impact on XXX? Cause a safe/unsafe XXXX?	HDR	D	Quantifying and cataloging the existing conditions. Analysis was not conducted on the impact of the non-standard interchanges. Age and condition of structure will be used when deciding what infrastructure should be replaced as part of the alternatives that will be under consideration.	D
33	EX5		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	There are 2 bullets related to floodplains and drainage under Infrastructure Age/Condition. Should these be part of environmental?	HDR	D	Drainage is an engineering and environmental issue and does not need to be covered in both sections. It has been addressed in the engineering section.	D
34	EX5		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Bike/Ped Infrastructure - please describe the current facility or lack of facilities in this segment.	HDR	D	Executive summary is only for identifying issue. Chapter 6 describes the state of the existing bike/ped infrastructure.	D
35	EX-5	Executive Summary	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Good that the Near-Term Improvement Plan (auxiliary Lanes) will attempt to address some of the issues in Segment 13.	HDR	D	--	D
36	EX-5	Executive Summary	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Ten lanes required in the northbound direction. Again, this isn't going to take place due to cost, impacts on communities and the inability to build out of congestion.	HDR	A	10 lanes will not happen. The statement is for illustrative purposes only. Will delete the bullet.	A
37	EX-6	Executive Summary	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	What is the national average for PCCP age? (75 years by 2040). Is 30 years accurate for this climate?	HDR	D	No information on national average. 30 years comes directly from ADOT website	D
38	EX-6	Executive Summary	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	(Segment 14) Additional bicycle/pedestrian bridges to remove barriers for connectivity and alternate modes.	HDR	D	This is an alternative that was captured in the alternative workshop and will be analyzed during the alternative analysis.	D
39	EX6		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Bike/Ped Infrastructure - please describe the mile intersection environment at the intersections if possible.	HDR	D	Executive summary is only for identifying issue. Chapter 6 is for describing the state of the existing bike/ped infrastructure.	D
40	EX5		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Transit Infrastructure is silent on ridership information.	HDR	A	The EX Summ is meant only to highlight problem areas. The ridership data is shown in table 5-8. There is inadequate data to show SOV equivalents.	D
41	EX7		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Transit Infrastructure, 3rd bullet contradicts the Transit Inf. Description on EX4. The information presented needs to be modified due to the difference in frequency of trips on the I-17 and on the I-10. The factors for capacity are not the same on I-10 and I-17, consider changing this to passenger #/ridership #.	HDR	A	Add note in the EX Summ to refer to Table 5-5 and 5-6 for ridership data.	A

**I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary**

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
42	EX-7	Executive Summary	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	What about adding existing and proposed bicycle improvements from the Bicycle Master Plan?	HDR	C	<p>The Phoenix Bicycle Master Plan will also be referenced, but if Phoenix believes there are elements in that plan that should be included in the Spine Study that could contribute to the Spine purpose and need, please be specific as to which improvements you are referring to.</p> <p>Will add a reference to City of Phoenix Bike and City of Chandler bike master plans. No changes to the map.</p>	A
43	EX-7	Segment I5	COP	Public Transit Department	<i>Transit Infrastructure Issues</i> : Study area for the North Stack – should mention that the Happy Valley Park-and-Ride was built to provide additional commuter service in the I-17 corridor and take some pressure off of the Bell Road Park and Ride. The Bell Road Park and Ride was at ~94% capacity in 2014.	HDR	A	Transit Comment for Chapter 5 - Transit Infrastructure Issues: Study area for the North Stack – should mention that the Happy Valley Park-and-Ride was built to provide additional commuter service in the I-17 corridor and take some pressure off of the Bell Road Park and Ride. The Bell Road Park and Ride was at ~94% capacity in 2014.	A
44	EX-8	Segment A1	COP	Public Transit Department	Transit Infrastructure Issues: Should mention that Express Routes 520, 521 and 522 travel arterial streets and have no formal park and ride along the freeway to be a more efficient commuter bus route.	HDR	A	<p>Transit Comment for Chapter 5 - Transit Infrastructure Issues: Should mention that Express Routes 520, 521 and 522 travel arterial streets and have no formal park and ride along the freeway to be a more efficient commuter bus route.</p> <p>The off-freeway circulation can be documented in the in the report.</p>	A
45	EX8		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Is the Priest Drive description correct? The arterial in Guadalupe is 25-35 mph, sidewalks, and 1 lane in each direction.	HDR	D	Yes, it is correct	D
46	EX9		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Please list the cities in the 'local' TMC description	Kimley-Horn	A	Will comply	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
47	EX10		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	The transit section is lacking, and verify the S. Central HCT corridor opening date.	HDR	C	Opening dates are dependent on City of Phoenix priorities yet to be publicly established. Will add a section in Chapter 1 that acknowledges that Prop 104 has passed and that it will affect the Spine corridor and will be a major PHX initiative moving forward. Add the maps prepared for the proposition. Will use Prop 104 information in subsequent phases of the Spine study.	A
48	EX11		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	The transit section is lacking and is focused on freight railroad	HDR	C	Clarify up front what the impact is of the freight RR crossing on transit. (Reorder sentence structure)	A
49	EX12		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Camelback Rd is missing and the Light Rail descriptions are inconsistent	HDR	A	Will add missing arterials and clarify light rail description.	A
50	P1-1		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Please remove "such as buses". The transit analysis should not be limited, due to the nature of the document.	HDR	A	Will comply	A
51	1.1.3		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Include documentation of reasoning of why the previous studies were stopped. What was the reasoning, local agencies, regional agencies, change in direction, not in agreement on proposed solutions, FAA conflicts?	HDR	D	Third paragraph states, "ADOT and MAG agreed, and FHWA accepted, the decision to rescind the studies in 2012 after it was determined that separate studies may not result in the best overall plan and that many of the studies' recommendations were not prudent."	D
52	1.2		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	52Same comment as #	HDR	C	Same as comment #1	D
53	Figure 1.2		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Check the color on L202 S. Mtn, is there a Transit Study happening in Tempe?	HDR	D	Color for SMF changes because it goes outside the study area and is masked. There is a high capacity transit study planned in Tempe.	D

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
54	1--3	Introduction and Background	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Add Pecos/40th Street and Baseline/24th Street park-and-rides to map.	HDR	D	The Phoenix data was obtained from the City of Phoenix in Sept/Oct 2014. The cutoff date for incorporating new data sets into Spine was December 2014 because of the public meetings. Therefore all data sets are from the Sept/Oct 2014 timeframe. Pecos/40th St is shown on the map. 24th St and Baseline Park-and-Ride opened on April 2015. Add disclaimer at the beginning to state best attempts to get latest and most current.	D
55	1--4	Introduction and Background	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Should a discussion on the City's participation in the Ladders of Opportunity, Mayor's Challenge, Tiger Grants and the Complete Streets Program be included here?	HDR	C	Will add section 1.4 to talk about programs that have the ability to shape future transportation policy within this study area. (Key Commerce Corridors, MOVE 2050, etc)	A
56	2.1		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	1st Paragraph, last 2 sentences don't seem to match. The studies were stopped, but recommendations have been included in the RTP updates?	Jacobs	A	Remove "and subsequent updates" form 2nd to last sentence in 1st paragraph or add "through the 2010 MAG RTP Update".	A
57	Figure 2-6		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	ACDC Floodway should be included	Jacobs	A	Add GIS data layer to figure.	A
58	2.2.2		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Please include a description of the square miles per city in the Study Area	Jacobs	A	Calculate using GIS database.	A
59	2.2.2 & Table 2-5		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Can you break out the analysis between Residential and Commercial, and then further breakdown Residential for Single Family, Dwelling units, Density, etc.?	Jacobs	D	Residential and commercial acreages are identified. Land use in the study area does not present any unique physical attributes that warrant special consideration not typically accounted for on the types of projects that may be considered; however, further disaggregation of acreage data by land use type can inform the future alternatives selection process through comparison of the extent of displacements and property acquisitions by type.	D
60	Figure 2-7		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	In the Key, it should be Figure 2-7 not 2-6. Figure 2.7 may need to be redone based on #37 comment.	Jacobs	A	Will update figure # in key. Comment #37 concern the PCCP pavement age discussion in the Executive Summary.	A
61	2.2.2		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Please include zero car households and the other transit planning factors that Valley Metro uses for transit planning. This shows the likelihood of transit ridership.	Jacobs	D	Zero-auto HH, HH income, and transit origin and destination data will be assessed as part of the evaluation of alternatives.	D
62	2--9	Environmental Concerns	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	The number of Brownfield sites is very low, is this accurate?	Jacobs	D	Potential hazardous materials site counts are based on 2013 and earlier EPA and ADEQ data. For the purposes of the PEL/NAR it is sufficient for highlighting the importance of this resource within the expanded study area for future alternatives comparison.	D

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
63	2--18	Socio-economic	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Can you include the recently passed Phoenix General Plan Update?	Jacobs	A	A reference to the 2015 Phoenix General Plan will be added to the 'Regulatory Setting' discussion.	A
64	2--18	Socio-economic	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Phoenix will want to see the specific areas where residents/businesses would be displaced and communities impacted. Environmental justice concerns.	Jacobs	A	Figures 2-6, 2-7, and 2-8 will be used as overlays to perform this analysis when we evaluate the alternatives in the next phase of the study.	A
65	2--18	Socio-economic	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Will the growing trend for infill development and residents moving back into the city part of the analysis? Expanding employment centers in outlying areas such as Norterra that may change the trip patterns?	Jacobs	A	The socioeconomic information used in the MAG models accounts for this trend based on projected land uses. Further more employment changes over time are addressed in chapter 9 of the NAR.	A
66	P.2-22		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Title VI - Targeted outreach. What is the Public Outreach Plan to work with the Title VI communities related to this study effort? Was there targeted Title VI public input related to this report?	Jacobs	A	During the public comment process the team published newspaper advertising in both the Spanish newspaper, Presna Hispana, and the African American newspaper, <i>The Arizona Informant</i> . MetroQuest was available in English and Spanish, and all public meeting handouts (comments forms, fact sheets) were available in English and Spanish. A public meeting was held in South Phoenix in a predominantly Hispanic neighborhood. The study team also attended community events. Consultant team to add additional section to Chapter 10 summarizing the Title VI outreach Activities. Also, Consultant team to add table outlining location of agency and public meetings and other community events, date, and attendance.	A
67	Figure 2-9 & 2-10		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Key title needs to be adjusted	Jacobs	A	Will change figure key to match correct sequence (Figure 2-9 & Figure 2-10 replacing Figure 2-7 & 2-8 in key).	A
68	P2-25		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Scatter and Sherd - These are not common terms outside of an environmental analysis. Should be defined or provide description.	Jacobs	A	Will add description of sherd - "historic or prehistoric fragment of pottery", scatter - "scattered cultural artifacts and debris".	A
69	3--9	Capacity Needs	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	If the corridor is not widened what are the projected percentages using other selected corridors? What improvements are needed?	Wilson	A	The base condition analysis (Figures 3-4 and 3-5) already addresses where the traffic would go if nothing else but near term improvements were constructed in the corridor.	A
70	P3-9, 3.5		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Modify the statement that Travel times are anticipated to only increase in the future. 14 out of the 42 Travel times in Table 3-4 either stay the same or get better. 10 out of the 42 travel times in Table 3-4 PM stay the same or get better	Wilson	A	The statement can be modified to state that travel times will increase in the future in the majority of the corridor. In areas where travel time stays the same or decrease, this is due to near-term improvements plans between now and 2020.	A
70	P3-9, 3.5		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Modify the statement that Travel times are anticipated to only increase in the future. 14 out of the 42 Travel times in Table 3-4 either stay the same or get better. 10 out of the 42 travel times in Table 3-4 PM stay the same or get better	Wilson	A	The statement can be modified to state that travel times will increase in the future in the majority of the corridor. In areas where travel time stays the same or decrease, it is due to near-term improvements plans between now and 2020.	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
71	P3-12, Both Tables		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Please change the coloring. The coloring schematic presents a false picture as the red indicates a 'stop/warning;' as noted above, 24 out of 84 travel times either stay the same or get better.	Wilson	D	The coloring scheme used is meant to facilitate an at a glance understanding and that color scheme is universally understood.	D
72	3--21	Origin-Destination	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	How do these pairs and subsequent findings link to the Central Phoenix Framework Study?	Wilson	D	The Spine and CPHX analyses are not comparable. The O-D data in the NAR is based on a select link analysis and is intended to look at traffic contributions for certain segments on the interstate only. The O-D pairs in the CPHX study were selected for purposes of reporting travel times regardless of route under an 8M population scenario.	D
73	4--20	Crossing Corridors	COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Section 4.12.3 appears to be written only for the automobile.	HDR	D	Chapter 4 is focused on roadways. Chapters 5 and 6 are focused on transit and bike/ped respectively.	D
74	P4-20, 4.12.2		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Reword 'most significant physical infrastructure constraints.' The description below the segments list schools, signals, mid-block crossings. These are characteristics of the street and the users, which are more than just cars, they are pedestrians. The way the first sentence is written implies that these are negative factors and the goal is for free flow vehicles, or to have them 'work in the most efficient manner possible' for vehicles. This should not be the case. Safety should be a priority that takes into account the all users of the roadway	HDR	D	Chapter 4 focuses on the roadway only. Chapters 5 and 6 focus on the Transit and Bike/Ped facilities respectively. The use of the word "constraints" is not meant to convey a negative attribute, it is meant to convey the fact that schools, signals, and mid block crossings are restrictions to the capacity of the roadway.	D
75	P4-20, 4.12.3		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Reword 'most significant physical infrastructure constraints.' The description below the segments list schools, signals, mid-block crossings. These are characteristics of the street and the users, which are more than just cars, they are pedestrians.	HDR	D	Chapter 4 focuses on the roadway only. Chapters 5 and 6 focus on the Transit and Bike/Ped facilities respectively. The use of the word "constraints" is not meant to convey a negative attribute, it is meant to convey the fact that schools, signals, and mid block crossings are restrictions to the capacity of the roadway.	D
76	P4-21, Table 4-8		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	Please change the coloring or not have it at all. Red = bad or stop, when these are not negative characteristics of the street.	HDR	D	The characteristics identified are constraints of the roadway and reduce the roadway capacity. The coloring scheme used is meant to facilitate an at a glance understanding and the color scheme used is universally understood.	D

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
77	Transit Service Section		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	It is suggested to overhaul this section and expand to Transportation Demand Management (Transit, Carpool, and Vanpool Options). Carpooling should be a major topic in this area, as there is a large # of carpoolers in the region. HOV use and volumes need to be included related to carpooling and vanpooling. The majority of vehicles in the HOV system are carpoolers, not buses; HOV data is available for analysis. Carpooling and 'Schoolpooling' could and SHOULD be a major solution to address 'volumes' of SOV in the SPINE study area, more people, less cars. The Vanpool information presented seems insufficient. Valley Metro has origin and destination information on their vanpool fleet. Trips should be analyzed, as well as the density of destinations. It is recommended that the regional TDM program should be included and part of this analysis. The study area should include a state of the art TDM system as a possible solution; this area and the MAG region have a large opportunity to activate technology that benefits a user.	HDR	D/C	As a corridor master plan, TDM and TSM strategies will very likely be mentioned as elements of the recommended alternative, but the goal of the Spine Study is to identify the major elements of the plan that need to be programmed and scheduled for long range planning. TDM and TSM strategies will be part of solution, but TDM and TSM do not require substantial funding or infrastructure investments. As a result, they will be mentioned, but not studied in great deal at this level of development.	D
78	Transit Service Section		COP	Streets Transportation Dept.	A description of transit operations should be included as it is quite different than highways/arterials, and essential for day to day service.	HDR	D	Chapter 5 includes a description of the existing transit infrastructure (built environment) and transit operations. Examples of the transit operations information documented in Chapter 5 includes operating hours , days of service, and quantity of daily scheduled transit trips in the study area (e.g. Table 5-1 Express Bus Operations; Table 5-3 Light Rail Operations; Table 5-4 Local Bus Operations). Transit operations performance data are provided in separate tables (e.g. Table 5-6 Commuter Express Performance). If additional operations information is desired to be incorporated into the report, we can discuss what specific elements are desired. (See comment #23.)	D
79	Chapter 5	Overall	COP	Public Transit Department	The issue of excluding the I-10 corridor from the Stack to the Split is an issue of really defining the study area. The data sources vary considerably in this section, using data from 2013, 2014 and 2015. Consistency in the 'age' of the data should a priority. Significant route-level service changes have been made, particularly in Phoenix, in the last 1.5 years.	HDR	D	The I-10 inner loop was excluded from the Spine study as it will be a subject of a separate MAG study. Will explain in Chapter 1 why the I-10 inner loop is in the study area but not part of the studied corridor. In certain sections, we had to use data from the Valley Metro Park-and-Ride Survey (2013) because it was the last time Valley Metro performed and published vanpool counts that originated and/or terminated at a park-and-ride. Vanpool fleet and ridership are constantly evolving. The Valley Metro Regional Transit Performance Report (2014) was used because the values are based on a full year of data collection. Since we are still in 2015, more recent data is not available.	A/D
80	P5-1, opening paragraph		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Please separate into more paragraphs.	HDR	A	Will comply	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
81	P5-1, 5-1		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Inventory of Services, the 'Key bus corridors' sentence does not provide a clear picture. Bus riders are not using the I-17 as a transit corridor that provides transfer opportunities, then using the mile grid, local bus routes as transfer opportunities. Please rewrite.	HDR	A	<p>We will rename Table 5-2 from Vanpool Facilities and Transfer Opportunities to Vanpool Activity at Park and Ride Facilities. Rewrite last sentence of the vanpool paragraph to "Table 5-2 identifies the level of vanpool activity at publicly owned Park-and-Ride facilities within the study area."</p> <p>Section 5-1 provides a very general overview of the different types of services operating within the study area. Commuter type service, local fixed-route service, vanpool and LRT are introduced in this section. The verbiage does not intend to communicate that local fixed-route services operating orthogonal to I-17 serve as transfer opportunities from commuter routes operating on I-17, rather local fixed-route services adjacent to the I-17 corridor provide transfer opportunities to other transit services, excluding commuter services. Note: It is important to consider the interaction between local fixed-route services adjacent to the I-17 and other transit services and how it improves mobility. Each type of service is broken into sub-sections below the "Inventory of Services" section and explained in greater detail.</p>	A
82	P5-1, 5-1		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Vanpool should be separated in described in much greater detail.	HDR	A	Vanpool is listed under the Interstate/HOV-based services.	D
83	P5-1, 5.1.1		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Change Title to Commuter Bus Routes. The first four sentences are fine; consider not delineating between the Express and RAPID routes after that. The analysis should be the data related to the Routes moving forward.	HDR	D	The RAPID and Express routes are differentiated only where the two different services are being compared in terms of service area (origin/ destination), ridership, frequency, etc. (Section 5.2.1, first paragraph only) Otherwise, they are referred to as commuter express service.	D
84	P5-1, Table 5-1		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Include the Origin and Destination in the route description or a new column.	HDR	D	The origin and destination for all Express and RAPID routes are listed in bullet form, and also in the text (Section 5.1.1)	D
85	P5-1,		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	First sentence after table, consider rewriting. There is no context or relation back to the Table, and frequency may not be a factor. The overriding factor may be # of trips, and commuter preference (time of trip). Needs further investigation. Please highlight the 480 and 450 with the high # of trips and frequency.	HDR	A	Table 5-1 is referenced in the first sentence in the commuter express section. It can be referenced again within the same paragraph, providing more context for the table. Place emphasis on the 480 and 450. Add frequency	A
86	5--1	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	The second half of the paragraph under 5.1 does not read well. Transfer opportunities at the I-17 corridor? This would only happen at Metro center. A	HDR	A	Remove verbiage from text. See comment 81.	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
87	5.1	Transit Service	COP	Public Transit Department	The Spine study's intended key outcome will be an improvement strategy documented as the I-10/I-17 Corridor Master Plan to appropriately manage travel demand and travel improvements in the I-10 and I-17 corridors through 2040." Why is the I-10 from the Stack to the Split omitted from the study?	HDR	D	The I-10 inner loop was excluded from the Spine study as it will be a subject of a separate MAG study. Will explain in Chapter 1 why the I-10 inner loop is in the study area but not part of the studied corridor.	A
88	5.1	Inventory of Services	COP	Public Transit Department	The Spine Study is silent on the Express/RAPID services that utilize the I-10 between the Stack and downtown Phoenix. Also omitted from the Spine Study Inventory are two RAPID routes – Central South Mountain East & West. These RAPID routes utilize park and rides (27th Avenue & Baseline Road and 24th Street & Baseline Road) and travel via Baseline Road and Central Avenue to downtown Phoenix at peak times. The I-10 from the Stack to downtown Phoenix (the forgotten corridor) has a significant inventory of commuter bus service with the I-17 RAPID (51 trips), the I-10 West RAPID (25 trips), Express 562/563 (16 trips), Express 573 (7 trips), and the Express 571 (8 trips). The SR-51 RAPID also feeds the I-10 near downtown Phoenix with 26 trips per weekday.	HDR	D/A	A majority of the commuter express buses that originate in the west valley do use the segment of I-10 between the Stack and Downtown Phoenix (this segment of the regional freeway network is not a focus of the Spine Study). However, the number of scheduled daily transit trips is not significantly different than what is provided on I-10 through the Broadway curve. (See response to comment #26.) Will explain in Chapter 1 why the I-10 inner loop is in the study area but not part of the studied corridor. Figure 5-1 shows South Mountain RAPID services, but they are not included in the narrative in Section 5.1.1 because the section is focused on Interstate\HOV-based services. We can add the information to Section 5.1.2 (Parallel and Intersecting Service).	A
89	5.1	Inventory of Services	COP	Public Transit Department	Paragraph following Table 5-1. Paragraph indicates that RAPID route on the I-17 originates and operates entirely with the study area. In fact, the I-17 does not originate and operated entirely within the study area – it begins at Happy Valley Road and I-17 park and ride plus it utilizes the I-10 between the Stack and downtown Phoenix.	HDR	A	On page two, the first paragraph indicates that the I-17 RAPID Route originates at the Happy Valley Park-and-Ride located at Happy Valley Road and I-17, and terminates at Central Station. Include that the Happy Valley Park-and-Ride is located just north of the study area. Also, last paragraph on page one, indicate that the I-17 RAPID Route originates just north of the study area at the Happy Valley Road Park-and-Ride.	A
90	5--2	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Include 24th Street/Baseline Park-and-Ride on the map. In addition, you can probably eliminate all the bus stop markings and just use say typically stops are a quarter mile for these local routes. Very difficult to read.	HDR	D	The Phoenix data was obtained from the City of Phoenix in Sept/Oct 2014. The cutoff date for incorporating new data sets into Spine was December 2014 because of the public meetings. Therefore all data sets are from the Sept/Oct 2014 timeframe. Spine Engineering working group wanted all the bus stops to be shown on the map so in street and bus pullouts could be differentiated. Will add a disclaimer at the beginning of the report to state best attempts to get latest and most current as of December 2014.	D

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
91	5--3	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Could you use a modified Valley Metro route map?	HDR	C	Will include the Valley metro map of service (2 maps) within the study area with date at the beginning of the transit section and then show the transit maps the Spine team created.	A
92	5--3	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Add Baseline/24th Street Park-and-Ride to table 5-2.	HDR	D	The Phoenix data was obtained from the City of Phoenix in Sept/Oct 2014. The cutoff date for incorporating new data sets into Spine was December 2014 because of the public meetings. Therefore all data sets are from the Sept/Oct 2014 timeframe. 24th St and Baseline Park-and-Ride opened on April 2015. Add disclaimer at the beginning to state best attempts to get latest and most current.	D
93	P5-3, 5.1.1		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Consider rewriting. Focus on explaining information linked back to the route # and do not delineate between express/RAPID, it doesn't help with analysis. Consider including a map of the routes; it is hard to read through the text and gain a full picture of the routes.	HDR	C	RAPID and express services are differentiated based on a stated preference by City of Phoenix Public Transit Department staff on multiple studies previously completed. If there is a preference to stop this practice we can address it in the NAR text. Will drop the use of Express and Rapid to describe bus routes and will combine those two types of service under commuter buses. Will incorporate VM commuter route map for the region, fixed local service and LTR within the study area in this section	A
94	P5-3, 5.1.1		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Vanpool. Consider separating out the vanpool section. A group of people with similar 'commute' needs. Valley Metro has a wealth of information including historical, origins, and destination, fleet, etc. Consider including data analysis that relate to the destination of the vanpools that are in the SPINE study area. Commute trips.	HDR	A	Vanpool is listed under the Interstate/HOV-based services. (Same as COP comment #82.)	D
95	P5-3, 5.1.2		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	5-10 pm	HDR	C	Will update local fixed route bus service time to 5 AM - 10 PM	A
96	P5-5		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	3rd and 4th Paragraph: Consider rewording; it is confusing.	HDR	A	The text will be revised.	A
97	P5-5, 5.2.1		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	It's suggested to work with Valley Metro for their performance data analysis. The delineation between the Express and RAPID routes are not needed for the analysis, please use the route #. The 1st and 2nd routes do not read clearly, and either repeat information or conflict.	HDR	A/C	Valley Metro will be consulted on the data used for the performance analysis. Express / RAPID delineation - use commuter service	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
98	P5-5, 5.2.1		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Please coordinate with Valley Metro to see if they use standing room on the commuter buses for a performance indicator. Please use their information and performance metrics. Consider removing standing trips from the analysis. At the end of this section, please include the TLCP information about funding being cut for future frequency upgrades.	HDR	D	Standing room is not a performance indicator. Standing room was included to illustrate the sitting to standing room ratio. With an average occupancy rate of 41%, most commuter express routes provide seating for each passenger. On rare occasions, a passenger may need to stand. While seating is not a performance indicator, the percentage of people standing on a commuter bus may lead to increasing the number of trips, obtaining larger buses, etc.	D
99			COP	Public Transit Department	Omitted 'key' (see discussion on page 5-5 on local versus key local bus routes) local routes on Van Buren, Central, 27th Avenue. Need to define (in the legend) "Key Bus Corridor" as that conflicts with the subsequent narrative discussion on "key" local bus routes. The graphic shows RAPID routes on I-10 between Stack and downtown Phoenix along with the SR-51 RAPID but no discussion of the 'load' and use in the rest of the study?	HDR	A/D	The route designation for each route will be reviewed and updated as needed. Will add a discussion on how the key routes were selected. A majority of the commuter express buses that originate in the west valley do use the segment of I-10 between the Stack and Downtown Phoenix (this segment of the regional freeway network is not a focus of the Spine Study). Will explain in Chapter 1 why the I-10 inner loop is in the study area but not part of the studied corridor.	A
100	P5-5	Commuter Express	COP	Public Transit Department	Paragraph discusses various commuter routes – indicates Express 575 and I-10 East RAPID terminate at Central Station. Those routes terminate at the State Capitol after servicing Central Station.	HDR	A	Express 575 terminates at Central Station, not the state capitol. I-10 East RAPID terminates at the state capitol.	A
101	P5-5	Table 5-2	COP	Public Transit Department	Route 122 no longer serves the Metro center Transit Center.	HDR	A	Route 122 change was effective July, 2013. The text will be revised. Add disclaimer at the beginning to state best attempts to get latest and most current.	A
103	P5-5		COP	Public Transit Department	Route 108 no longer serves the Pecos Park and Ride.	HDR	D	The Phoenix data was obtained from the City of Phoenix in Sept/Oct 2014. The cutoff date for incorporating new data sets into Spine was December 2014 because of the public meetings. Therefore all data sets are from the Sept/Oct 2014 timeframe. Route 108 change was effective April 2015 Add disclaimer at the beginning to state best attempts to get latest and most current.	D
104	P5-5	Light Rail Transit	COP	Public Transit Department	Weekend service on light rail is operated at 15 minute frequency not 20 minute.	HDR	A	Saturday service operates on 15 minute frequencies during the peak, and 20 minute frequencies during off-peak. Sunday operates on 20 minute frequencies all day. Update table 5-3, along with text.	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
105	P5-5	Table 5-3	COP	Public Transit Department	Hours of light rail hours of operation should be represented by the first FULL trip of the day and the last FULL trip of the day.	HDR	A	Update Table 5-3 Mon-Thurs: 4:40 - 12:05 Friday: 4:40 - 3:05 Saturday: 5:00 - 3:05 Sunday: 5:00 - 12:05	A
106	P5-5	Local Fixed-route Bus	COP	Public Transit Department	2nd paragraph: The region does not consistently have 30 minute frequency on weekends. 3rd paragraph: The key local route designation also includes annual ridership (must be over 1M per year).	HDR	A	Delete comment pertaining to consistent 30-minute frequencies. Will consider including that weekday ridership must exceed 1 million to qualify as key local. The text currently reads that the key local designation is based on three factors. One of the factors is past performance, so will be more specific if required.	A
107	P5-4	Figure 5-2	COP	Public Transit Department	Omitted park and ride at 24th Street and Baseline Road. No park and ride exists at Elliot Road and 48th Street (no formal park and ride as express route does not stop at that location). Omitted future light rail platform at 48th – 50th Street on Washington for A Bridge to Independent Living (ABIL). No park and ride exists at 35th Avenue and Greenway Road.	HDR	D/A/D/A	The Phoenix data was obtained from the City of Phoenix in Sept/Oct 2014. The cutoff date for incorporating new data sets into Spine was December 2014 because of the public meetings. Therefore all data sets are from the end of 2014 timeframe. 24th St & Baseline Park-and-Ride opened April, 2015 Comment 107: No park and ride exists at Elliot Road and 48th Street (no formal park and ride as express route does not stop at that location) – This is still an informal PNR for local bus service, but it should be removed from the map. Omitted future light rail platform at 48th – 50th Street on Washington for A Bridge to Independent Living (ABIL). This stop is in Phoenix Prop 104, but design work hasn't started yet. No park and ride exists at 35th Avenue and Greenway Road. This is still an informal PNR for local bus service, but it will be removed from the map. Add disclaimer at the beginning to state best attempts to get latest and most current.	D/A/D/A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
108	P5-5	Local Fixed-route Bus	COP	Public Transit Department	2nd paragraph: Several key local bus routes operate at 15-minute frequencies, or better (8, 10, 12 minute frequencies exist during peak periods), during peak periods. 4th paragraph: Omitted Route 3 (Van Buren) as crossing I-17. Omitted numerous local routes that cross I-10/I-17 in the north-south direction.	HDR	A/C	Several key local bus routes operate at 15-minute frequencies, or better (8, 10, 12 minute frequencies exist during peak periods), during peak periods. This should say operate at 15 minute frequencies "or better". 4th paragraph omitted Route 3 (Van Buren) as crossing I-17 and omitted numerous local routes that cross I-10/I-17 in the north-south direction. These routes have been omitted because they are not on "designated key bus corridors". The routes can be added if desired. Key bus corridors are the same as corridors of interest.	D
109	5--5	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Please work with CoP and Valley Metro to verify that number of seats and standing room is the measurement used for commuter bus routes. Standing on commute trips is discouraged due to safety in longer commuter trips in freeway corridors.	HDR	D	Number of seats and standing room is not a performance measurement. Valley Metro performance measurements include: Boardings per hour, Boardings per trip, Farebox recovery, and On-time performance.	D
110	P5-5	Commuter Express	COP	Public Transit Department	This section discusses weekday ridership and average occupancy. Again, this ignores the bulk of the express/RAPID commuter routes – those using the I-10 between the Stack and downtown Phoenix. 2nd paragraph: The region uses a maximum load criterion of 1.25 the seat capacity, not 1.5 as used in the study. 3rd paragraph: On time performance should be broken out by commuter versus local. Need to include I-10 commuter routes between Stack and downtown Phoenix.	HDR	D/A/A	Section - A majority of the commuter express buses that originate in the west valley do use the segment of I-10 between the Stack and Downtown Phoenix (this segment of the regional freeway network is not a focus of the Spine Study). Will explain in Chapter 1 why the I-10 inner loop is in the study area but not part of the studied corridor. 2nd Paragraph - This information will be updated in the report. 3rd Paragraph - On time performance will be broken out by local and express.	A
111	P5-6	Commuter Express	COP	Public Transit Department	2nd to last sentence in partial paragraph at the top of the page: Should clarify that the I-10 corridor on time performance is the corridor identified in the study and does not include all commuter service in the I-10 corridor (although it should).	HDR	D	A majority of the commuter express buses that originate in the west valley do use the segment of I-10 between the Stack and Downtown Phoenix (this segment of the regional freeway network is not a focus of the Spine Study). Will explain in Chapter 1 why the I-10 inner loop is in the study area but not part of the studied corridor.	A
112	P5-6	Tables 5-5 & 5-6	COP	Public Transit Department	These tables are incomplete with the omission of over half of the commuter service in the Spine study area, i.e., I-10 between the Stack and the Split.	HDR	D	A majority of the commuter express buses that originate in the west valley do use the segment of I-10 between the Stack and Downtown Phoenix (this segment of the regional freeway network is not a focus of the Spine Study). Will add a section in Chapter 1 explaining why the I-10 inner loop is in the study area but not part of the studied corridor.	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
113	P5-7	Table 5-8	COP	Public Transit Department	This table has omitted 3 key local routes – Route 0 (Central Avenue), Route 3 (Van Buren), and Route 27 (27th Avenue). In addition, Routes 7, 8, 16, 56, and 108 have been omitted. The study document needs to define transit route selection for the study.	HDR	A	This information will be updated in the report.	A
114	P5-8	Commuter Express	COP	Public Transit Department	RAPID system expansion, along with BRT are elements of the proposed T2050 Transportation Plan.	HDR	D	It is recognized that the recent passage of the 2050 Transportation Plan could have some impacts to the content of the Needs Assessment Report(NAR), however, at this time, MAG's position is that Prop 104 is just a funding stream, not a prioritized, programmed, and adopted transportation plan. We recognize that Phoenix is working on developing this prioritized program, but it is our understanding that this will not be available for 3-6 more months in an adopted form. As such, a forward will be added to the NAR stating: "It understood that the passage of the 2050 Transportation Plan will or could contain projects that contribute to the goals and objectives of the Spine Study. Since the 2050 program has yet to be developed and adopted by the Phoenix City Council, we are not able to incorporate it into the Final NAR. However, as information becomes available, it will be considered as the Spine alternatives screening process advances over the next year." Will add a section in Chapter 1 that acknowledges that Prop 104 has passed and that it will affect the Spine corridor and will be a major PHX initiative moving forward. Add the maps prepared for the proposition. Will use Prop 104 information in subsequent phases of the Spine study.	A
115	P5-8	Vanpool	COP	Public Transit Department	This section needs more attention. Valley Metro has a plethora of vanpool data to show just how valuable this alternative transportation mode is to the region.	HDR	D	Duplicate of 82	D
116	P5-8, Table 5-9		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Is Table 5-9 needed since it is explained that it is a weakness? Or should it be highlighted that carpooling, is a factor (1.2 passengers) ?	HDR	A	Table 5-9 will be removed.	A
117	P5-8, Table 5-10		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Please modify to include the whole study area into this analysis, and not just the freeways, due to the fact that a number of commuters use the local arterials, the local bus, and the light rail in this area.	HDR	D	The intention of the analysis in this section was to focus on transit mode share in the freeway corridors only.	D
118	P5-8, Table 5-10		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Please modify the table to include carpooling, vanpooling, and transit for the full picture.	HDR	A	Carpool and vanpool data by freeway segment and time of day will be researched and included if available.	A
119	P5-8, 5.4.1		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Please include the TLCP service cut information in here, update the vanpool section accordingly.	HDR	A		D

**I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary**

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
120	P5-9		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Update the S. Central opening date	HDR	D	Opening dates are dependent on City of Phoenix priorities yet to be publicly established. Will add a section in Chapter 1 that acknowledges that Prop 104 has passed and that it will affect the Spine corridor and will be a major PHX initiative moving forward. Add the maps prepared for the proposition. Will use Prop 104 information in subsequent phases of the Spine study.	A
121	5--9	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Are the estimated completion dates in table 5-11 current?	HDR	D	Northwest Phase 1 opening date is current. All other corridors are subject to potential changes in priority established by the City of Phoenix. Will add a section in Chapter 1 that acknowledges that Prop 104 has passed and that it will affect the Spine corridor and will be a major PHX initiative moving forward. Add the maps prepared for the proposition. Will use Prop 104 information in subsequent phases of the Spine study.	A
122	5--10	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Good discussion on TSP.	HDR	D	Thanks	D
123	5--10	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Under ramp meter bypass, ADOT and COP came up with a draft plan to use the frontage road for buses to bypass the two ramp meter lanes. However, the gore point would need to be modified for additional weaving distance. Also change status of 24th Street/Baseline Park-and-Ride.	HDR	C/D	Need more information. Never supplied to team. The Phoenix data was obtained from the City of Phoenix in Sept/Oct 2014. The cutoff date for incorporating new data sets into Spine was December 2014 because of the public meetings. Therefore all data sets are from the Sept/Oct 2014 timeframe. 24th St & Baseline Rd Park and Ride opened April 2015. Add disclaimer at the beginning to state best attempts to get latest and most current.	D
124	P5-10 & 5-11		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	The majority of HOV users are carpoolers, and clean air plate holders. Please update and modify the section accordingly to include information about carpoolers, vanpoolers, and transit.	HDR	D	HOV facilities discussion on page 5-10 addresses this comment. Discussion on 5-11 addresses transit use.	D

**I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary**

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
125	P5-10	Local Fixed-route Bus	COP	Public Transit Department	Significant local fixed-route bus expansion and improvements are elements of the T2050 Transportation Plan.	HDR	D	<p>It is recognized that the recent passage of the 2050 Transportation Plan could have some impacts to the content of the Needs Assessment Report(NAR), however, at this time, MAG's position is that Prop 104 is just a funding stream, not a prioritized, programmed, and adopted transportation plan. We recognize that Phoenix is working on developing this prioritized program, but it is our understanding that this will not be available for 3-6 more months in an adopted form. As such, a forward will be added to the NAR stating: "It understood that the passage of the 2050 Transportation Plan will or could contain projects that contribute to the goals and objectives of the Spine Study. Since the 2050 program has yet to be developed and adopted by the Phoenix City Council, we are not able to incorporate it into the Final NAR. However, as information becomes available, it will be considered as the Spine alternatives screening process advances over the next year."</p> <p>Will add a section in Chapter 1 that acknowledges that Prop 104 has passed and that it will affect the Spine corridor and will be a major PHX initiative moving forward. Add the maps prepared for the proposition. Will use Prop 104 information in subsequent phases of the Spine study.</p>	A
126	P5-10	Park and Rides	COP	Public Transit Department	A significant number of park and rides are elements of the T2050 Transportation Plan.	HDR	D	<p>It is recognized that the recent passage of the 2050 Transportation Plan could have some impacts to the content of the Needs Assessment Report(NAR), however, at this time, MAG's position is that Prop 104 is just a funding stream, not a prioritized, programmed, and adopted transportation plan. We recognize that Phoenix is working on developing this prioritized program, but it is our understanding that this will not be available for 3-6 more months in an adopted form. As such, a forward will be added to the NAR stating: "It understood that the passage of the 2050 Transportation Plan will or could contain projects that contribute to the goals and objectives of the Spine Study. Since the 2050 program has yet to be developed and adopted by the Phoenix City Council, we are not able to incorporate it into the Final NAR. However, as information becomes available, it will be considered as the Spine alternatives screening process advances over the next year."</p> <p>Will add a section in Chapter 1 that acknowledges that Prop 104 has passed and that it will affect the Spine corridor and will be a major PHX initiative moving forward. Add the maps prepared for the proposition. Will use Prop 104 information in subsequent phases of the Spine study.</p>	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
127	P5-11	Table 5-13	COP	Public Transit Department	<p>The table is missing the 24th Street & Baseline Road park and ride – opened in April 2015.</p> <p>The route connections column is ‘old’ information and needs to be updated with current local bus information. For example, Route 19C will be eliminated in October 2015; Route 122 does not service the Metro center Mall Transit Center; Route 60 does not service the 19th Avenue and Camelback Road park and ride; the Central South Mountain West RAPID services the 27th Avenue and Baseline Road park and ride; and Route 108 does not service the 40th Street and Pecos Road park and ride.</p>	HDR	D/A/D	<p>The Phoenix data was obtained from the City of Phoenix in Sept/Oct 2014. The cutoff date for incorporating new data sets into Spine was December 2014 because of the public meetings. Therefore all data sets are from the Sept/Oct 2014 timeframe.</p> <p>24th St and Baseline Park and Ride opened April 2015.</p> <p>With the exception of Route 122 and South Mountain Rapid, changes occurred after the data cutoff date.</p> <p>Add disclaimer at the beginning to state best attempts to get latest and most current.</p>	D/A/D
128	P5-11	Bus Stops	COP	Public Transit Department	<p>What is the source of this data? The Public Transit Department has recently updated the bus stop data. Staff should be contacted to provide the most recent, correct data.</p>	HDR	D	<p>The Phoenix bus stop data was obtained from the City of Phoenix Public Transit Department in Sept/Oct 2014. The cutoff date for incorporating new data sets into Spine was December 2014 because of the public meetings. Therefore all data sets are from the Sept/Oct 2014 timeframe.</p> <p>The 2014 dataset will be evaluated to confirm what was current at that time.</p> <p>Add disclaimer at the beginning to state best attempts to get latest and most current.</p>	D
129	P5-12, 5.6	Park and Ride Use and Table 5-16	COP	Public Transit Department	<p>This data is ‘old’. Newer data exists for park and ride use. The table is missing the 24th Street and Baseline Road park and ride.</p> <p>Table should include all regional park and riders to accurately portray commuter options and use.</p>	HDR	D/A	<p>The Phoenix data was obtained from the City of Phoenix in Sept/Oct 2014. The cutoff date for incorporating new data sets into Spine was December 2014 because of the public meetings. Therefore all data sets are from the Sept/Oct 2014 timeframe.</p> <p>24th St and Baseline Park and ride opened April 2015</p> <p>Ridership data will be updated.</p> <p>Add disclaimer at the beginning to state best attempts to get latest and most current.</p>	D/A
130	P5-12, 5.6		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	<p>Change title of section to Non SOV; Transit, Carpool, Vanpool; or something of that nature. "Attract choice riders to shift to riding transit, carpooling, or vanpooling." "the incentive to not drive alone." HOV text should be revised to include carpoolers, vanpoolers when transit is mentioned. Site specific issues related to carpoolers, vanpoolers, and transit riders are summarized. . .</p>	HDR	A	<p>This section specifically pertains to transit capital performance; however, we can incorporate additional information regarding vanpool, carpool, etc. as available.</p>	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
131	P5-12, 5.6		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Segment I2: Please check data, the I-17 has the largest commuter transit ridership.	HDR	D	Data is correct. The data was recorded in 2013. This is the most recent data available (by segment) for traffic counts on the I-10 and I-17. Conditions may have changed.	D
132	P5-12, 5.6		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	For all segments, please include relevant carpool, HOV use, Vanpool, and transit information accordingly.	HDR	A	Additional information regarding vanpool, carpool, etc. can be incorporated as available.	A
B	P5-13		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	"potential travel time savings that non-SOV users can offer"	HDR	A	This information will be updated in the report.	A
134	P5-13		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Consider revising the S. Central Light Rail statement. The bus and LRT operators fully coordinate operations plan, timing, scheduling, etc.	HDR	D	LRT uses traffic signal priority, potentially causing buses operating orthogonal to Central Avenue to encounter delays at Central Avenue.	D
135	P5-13		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	The statement about the railroad crossing seems out of place. Is the data showing that on time performance is affected?	HDR	D	At-grade railroad crossings can significantly affect bus operations and performance. Buses can be delayed for several minutes.	D
136	P5-13		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	For the Key Findings section, please include all information related to carpooling, vanpooling, and HOV uses with transit information. If the HOV lane has more availability, or not in use (Table 5-15) please include this as part of the summary	HDR	A		D
137	5--9	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Are the estimated completion dates in table 5-11 current?	HDR	D	Same as COP comment #121.	D
138	5--10	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Good discussion on TSP.	HDR	D	Duplicate of 122	D
139	5--10	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Under ramp meter bypass, ADOT and COP came up with a draft plan to use the frontage road for buses to bypass the two ramp meter lanes. However, the gore point would need to be modified for additional weaving distance. Also change status of 24th Street/Baseline Park-and-Ride.	HDR	D	Duplicate of 123	D
140	5--11	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Emphasize the use of passenger facilities for Carpool or Vanpool also.	HDR	C	Please clarify what specific passenger facilities exist for carpool and vanpool. Will expand the Park and Ride section to include how they are used to facilitate vanpooling and carpooling.	A
141	5--12	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Don't combine the use of 27th Avenue PnR with the two under utilized LRT pnrs at 19th Avenue and Montebello. These two may be slated for future redevelopment and as the LRT extends these become obsolete. This does not necessarily occur with bus facilities.	HDR	A	The text will be updated as suggested.	A
142	5--13	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Usage of HOV should be stated for transit, carpool and vanpool users (non-SOV).	HDR	A		D
143	5--13	Transit Service	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	The impact on bus service by TSP and the railroads at the discussed locations is minimal, if any.	HDR	D	Duplicate of 135	D

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
144	P6-1		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Please utilize the Valley Metro onboard survey for information on how transit users access transit. The majority of transit riders walk or bike to the stop. Please include information as appropriate.	HDR	A	The Transit O&D Study will be reviewed for bike and ped access to transit data and will be reported in this chapter.	A
145	6--1	Bike/Ped	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Under 6.2, pedestrian facilities should provide direct connections to transit stops.	HDR	A	Will comply	A
146	6--2	Bike/Ped	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Good conclusion at end 6.4.	HDR	D	Thanks	D
147	P7-1		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	It is noted that specific improvements to address safety issue and crashes are hard to identify at this type of high level analysis. To understand the problem at each intersection, corridor, location, the characteristics and functionality of the roads need to be addressed. If solutions want to be actuated, safety assessments are needed, there is no blanket safety solution.	HDR	C	Will add an intro to this section that discusses the level of safety analysis.	A
148			COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Overall questions related to this safety section are: How will this data be used to inform decisions/solutions? Will there be a goal and measures attached to safety in the SPINE study? Reduce the # of fatalities at intersections?	HDR	D	The safety analysis looked for large scale safety problems and was validated with public input. This information has led to proposed safety focused alternatives but will also be used as a secondary screening tool for other alternatives that do not specifically target safety issues.	D
149			COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Please include the #'s on all of the Figures related to what Very Low, Low, Moderate, High mean. Consider keeping those keys consistent on all Figures in this section.	HDR	D	These figures were developed, reviewed, and approved by the Spine Engineering and Safety working group (City of Phoenix was represented in this working group). It was specifically decided in the working group not to associate numbers with the levels. See the Appendix I for the detailed information.	D
150	P7-18		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Table 7-12, change location to Intersection	HDR	A	Will revise table to clarify segments and interchanges.	A
151	P8-1		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	City of Phoenix submits two documents related to this section: Final ICM in the PHX metro area 3-27-2013 and the Master List - ITS Spin Projects 9-30-14. Please include the technical analysis completed by the affected cities, Maricopa County, ADOT, and MAG. The analysis recommends that five factors are implemented together for active traffic management to be successful, and includes the operations cost which are also critical to an Active Traffic Management program working. It is also noted, that these two documents, are not fully inclusive of the ITS system needs in the City of Phoenix to implement ACT; points in the system would need to be upgraded to handle future implementation and additional work to document costs is needed.	Kimley-Horn	A	We do have those reports, and will be factoring those needs and projects identified as part of the longer-term options and alternatives. Agree that there is still some work to be done to fully capture system upgrade/expansion/resource costs. We are also including recommendations from the PHX ITS Strategic Plan. Will coordinate with HDR to be sure both are included on the Master List. We will carry this comment into to the ITS/Technology Alternatives. Recommend updating the intro paragraph on Page 8-1, 8.1. to revise the 2nd to last sentence in the intro paragraph. "A key part of operations are those staff resources, systems and strategies....."	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
152	P9-5		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Figure 9-4 & 9-5, Should the jobs/sq mile key match the Figure 9-1 and 9-2?	Wilson	D	Figures 9-1 and 9-2 were developed by the Spine team while Figures 9-4 and 9-5 were developed by MAG for a separate study.	D
153	P10-2, 10.3.2		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Include the number of attendees and input provided.	Jacobs	D	Included in Appendix J	D
154	P10-4		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Please identify the key findings from the public input process so they can be integrated into the report, proposed and documented needs, and upcoming actions can respond to the input.	Jacobs	D	Findings are summarized in Chapter 10 in text, word clouds, and heat maps. Additionally, input is summarized in the Ex Summary in the segment profiles. It is included in full in Appendix J	D
155	10--14	Agency and Public Feedback	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Summary needed at end of section.	Jacobs	A	Summary can be added to describe next steps in the PI process, and how input will be used in the study.	A
156	P11-1		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	The first sentence of paragraph 4 does not match with 3rd Paragraph from the Overview, in the Ex Sum at the beginning of the report. This sentence implies that the proposed action is freeway operations. Please revise to make consistent.	Jacobs	A	Will comply.	A
157	P11-1		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	It is not clear on how the 4 guides were developed. Items missing: Safety, Multi-Modal opportunities, Technology, Finding Efficiencies in the Right of Way	Jacobs	D	The 4 'guides' are not intended to be inclusive. Capacity/Demand, system linkage, social/economic issues, roadway (infrastructure) deficiencies capture elements of the suggested additional items than can be used to establish the purpose and need for the project in a general sense. The "guides" are from FHWA's TA6640.8A. No change.	D
158	11--1	Need and Purpose	COP	Street Transportation Dept.	The Need and Purpose section doesn't seem to include discussion of travel options and adding efficiency to the existing corridor.	Jacobs	D	The need for the proposed action indicates the need to balance capacity with demand and create linkages in an integrated (roadway, multimodal, ITS) system. The purpose and need was reviewed by the EWG and follows NEPA requirements for the future PEL and related documents.	D
159	P11-3		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Figure 11-3 & Figure 11-5, the maps were created in 2008; please verify the 2040 map is using current growth assumptions.	Jacobs	A	Has been verified	A
160	P11-5, 11.2.2		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	"If deficiencies are found in the network, analysts can suggest the types of improvements to the region's transportation network necessary to address the deficiencies, in addition to testing the suggested improvements to assess their effectiveness." The recommended type of traffic analysis tools, limit the analysis and solutions. The Overview in the ExSum indicates that multimodal solutions will be explored, and a full range of regional transportation modes and concepts will be evaluated. Are there other tools out there to aid in developing and assessing multi modal solutions? MMLOS, Bike/Ped accessibility, any ideas about TDM analysis for a system, other transit ridership models to aid in prediction, etc.? Any need to include land use changes - shorter trips, more dense places?	Jacobs	D	See response to comment 11 The tools used are considered "state-of-the-practice". Reference can be made that other tools are available. Land use changes creating shorter trips and denser places would be considered an alternative and not part of purpose and need. Address with a section in chapter 1 outlining why/how the study came together and outline how the study will proceed after the NAR.	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Response
161	P11-19, 11.3		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Please incorporate the public input, and relate how the key public input points relate to the 8 preferred solutions/actions.	Jacobs	D	Public input was used to develop these 8 solutions/actions.	D
162	P11-19, 11.3		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	Under the preferred solutions would include actions to, please consider modifying to incorporate the following: address safety as it's own topic, include technology into this section (it can provide improvements for operations, and communicating travel choice (TDM) to commuters), including travel choices as an action "provide a transportation system that gives people a choice to drive alone, carpool, use transit, walk, bicycle, and or telecommute", Involve the public and community residents if recommendations include purchasing new right of way, Utilize existing ROW.	Jacobs	D	These issues were discussed by the environmental working group. As suggested by your comment, these suggestions are specific solutions and will be evaluated later in the process. As written, the purpose and need solutions are general and generally include your specific suggestions.	D
163	P11-19, 11.4		COP	Street Transportation Dept.	The major points are silent on safety, bicycle pedestrians, transit users, carpooling, vanpooling, and the public input received and how it's being included to define the major points of the transportation problem in the corridor. Revise as appropriate.	Jacobs	D	See response to comment 162	D

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
1	EX-4	Segment I2: I010, Baseline Road to Split (Environmental and Community Issues)	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	The section notes proposed improvements need FAA review and approval and conform to the current PHX Airport Layout Plan. Please consider modifying the statement to: "Proposed improvements near Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport would require Federal Aviation Administration review and approval and would need to conform to all current FAA Advisory Circulars, statutes and associated regulations including the Sky Harbor Airport Layout Plan, at the time of design and implementation."	Jacobs	A	Will comply (see response to FHWA comment #51 (p. 2-26) regarding use of would vs. could. See below). FHWA Comment# 51: Will delete 'any', change first "would" to "could" and second "would" to "may".	A
2	2-18	2.2 Socioeconomic Environment - Regulatory Setting	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	Please note there are additional FAA regulations when developing near the airport, that should be adhered to.	Jacobs	A	Will modify to include "FAA Advisory Circulars, statutes and associated regulations" from the previous comment.	A
2	2-18	2.2 Socioeconomic Environment - Regulatory Setting	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	Please note there are additional FAA regulations when developing near the airport, that should be adhered to.	Jacobs	A	Will modify to include "FAA Advisory Circulars, statutes and associated regulations" from the previous comment.	A
3	2-20	2.2 Socioeconomic Environment - Employment	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	The report notes that Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport, the workplace of many City of Phoenix employees lies within the study area. The airport and associated Sky Harbor Center is a major employment center and although many City of Phoenix employees work at the airport, it would be better to note the true scale of the Airport as an employment center for the region (not just the City of Phoenix). The last Economic Impact Study from 2011 listed 54,990 employees and 43,090 work on airport property. This is from multiple employers but all in one location. This is compared to only 1,005 City of Phoenix employees at the Airport or 2-3% on airport employees.	Jacobs	A	Will modify to indicate that Sky Harbor Intl. Airport is " the workplace of many City of Phoenix employees as well as a regional employment center".	A
4	2-26	2.3 Summary of Identified Issues (Segment I2)	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	Please consider noting the FAA regulations and advisory circulars in addition to the FAA review and approval and PHX Airport Layout Plan	Jacobs	A	Will comply (see response to SHIA comment #1, p. EX-4)	A
5	4-18	4.11 Aviation Impacts	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	The first paragraph states that Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport is a huge economic generator for the City of Phoenix. The airport brings in economic impact to the entire metropolitan area, not specific to the City of Phoenix. Please revise the statement to "huge economic generator to the Phoenix Metropolitan Area, County and even State, any issue..."	HDR	A	Will comply	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
6	4-18	4.11 Aviation Impacts	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	The second paragraph notes that there are existing penetrations to aircraft safety surfaces and other encroachments that the FAA is aware of and they are existing conditions. These are the existing conditions but if there are modifications or potential improvements, the City of Phoenix Aviation Department will request that these obstructions be mitigated and any encroachments be accounted for and discussed with the Airport and the FAA.	HDR	A	Will add to the text that the Spine study will evaluate how existing penetrations to aircraft safety surfaces can be eliminated or mitigated if there is an alternative that addresses the area where the penetrations exist.	A
7	5-1	5 Transit Service	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	The opening paragraph mentions the "Phoenix Sky Train" twice. Please use the official trademarked name of PHX Sky Train, when in print.	HDR	A	Will comply	A
8	H-3	Title 14 Part 77 Runway Surface	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	Please include how the Part 77 surfaces are calculated, as noted in the other surface descriptions.	HDR	A	Will expand narrative	A
9	H-3	Title 14 Part 77 Runway Surface	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	Please consider revising or removing the following statement, "Part 77 surface violations are typically not considered a fatal flaw by the FAA." This may be a pattern that has been observed in the past, but this determination is ultimately with the FAA and the City of Phoenix Aviation Department would ask that this continue to be up to the FAA and this report not offer a predetermined outcome on the importance of these surfaces.	HDR	A	Will revise narrative	A
10	H-4	Appendix H - Airspace Analysis	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	The last paragraph appears to be an opinion statement on the operation of the Airport, by stating that the Departure Surface penetration is not an issue for Runway 7R/25L. It is a true statement that the two light poles noted are existing and the Runway is currently used primarily, although not exclusively, as an arrival runway. This may appear acceptable under current operating conditions, but the Airport maintains that all surfaces, including the DEP should be adhered to. Any obstructions that may affect current or future operations, regardless of the typical operations, we would ask that they be mitigated and meet the airspace surface thresholds. Additionally, the DEP for Runway 7L/25R could potentially have impacts to the area in the study. Please consider adding this to the Figure H-4.	HDR	A	Will provide additional surface to graphic.	A
11	H-4	Appendix H - Airspace Analysis	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	Please consider adding the Threshold Siting Surfaces to the Airspace Analysis. These surfaces may have conflicts with the alternatives identified by future phases of this project.	HDR	A	Will add new graphic - I've got the dimensions in order to create new exhibit. I will need to add new text.	A
12	H-6 thru H-8	Figures H-1, H-2, H-3, H-4	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	Please review the scale on these graphics as they do not seem to be correct.	HDR	A	Concur....scale needs to be corrected and shown in feet, not miles.	A
13		Appendix H - One Engine Inoperative	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	The City of Phoenix has adopted the ICAO One Engine Inoperative Surface as the Airport Height Zoning, which is different than the OEI listed in Appendix H and shown on Figure H3. Please consider using the alternative OEI metrics.	HDR	A	Will modify the text and graphic to show the ICAO One Engine Inoperative Surface.	A

**I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary**

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
14	General	General Comment	SHIA	City of Phoenix Aviation Department (MM)	General Comment: The report notes several times that there are existing light pole obstructions to various airspace surfaces. Just because these are existing, does not mean the City of Phoenix Aviation Department is supportive of the obstructions and actually request they be mitigated. We understand this project may or may not address some or all of the obstruction issues. We would like to request to continue to discuss this issue as the project continues to move forward. The City of Phoenix Aviation Department previously had an agreement with ADOT to reduce light poles in this vicinity. This document could be used as a reference to which light poles may be affected by future projects included in this study.	HDR	A	Will add to the text that the Spine study will evaluate how existing penetrations to aircraft safety surfaces can be eliminated or mitigated if there is an alternative that addresses the area where the penetrations exist.	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
1	EX-1, 1-1	Overview and intro	FHWA	Ed Stillings	Is it 40% of Interstate traffic or all traffic?	HDR	A	Will clarify by adding Interstate to "I-10 and I-17 Interstate corridor. The Interstate corridor is . . ."	A
2	2-1	Intro	FHWA	Ed Stillings	ADOT 2009a and 2009b in parens, what does that mean?	Jacobs	D	These are document citations included in the References section of the NAR.	D
3	2-4	transportation conformity	FHWA	Ed Stillings	FHWA and the Federal Transit... (delete MAG)	Jacobs	A	Reference to MAG will be removed from 4th sentence, last paragraph of this section.	A
4		ch 11	FHWA	Ed Stillings	Rebecca Yedlin should review this section	Jacobs	D	No further action	D
5	2-1	Section 2.1	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	"existing level of disturbance"?	Jacobs	A	Revise to read "the potential for the proposed project alternatives to cause significant adverse environmental effect to the resource."	A
6	2-1	Section 2.1, Table 2-1	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	"In addition, commercial and residential centers within the expanded study area are assessed under other resource areas including land use and air quality"?	Jacobs	A	Remove "In addition, commercial and residential centers within the expanded study area are assessed under other resource areas including land use and air quality" from sentence.	A
7	2-2	Section 2.2	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	did ADOT EPG's various technical specialists review their correspond section?	Jacobs	D	No. Because the EPG technical specialist reviewed the EBR, which was incorporated into the NAR, the EPG planner at the time, did not believe it was necessary to recirculate the NAR to the tech specialists.	D
8	2-2	Section 2.2	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Consider changing to "associated with" to "recommended by", "contained in", or "summarized within."	Jacobs	A	Will substitute "recommended by".	A
9	2-2	Section 2.2.1	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	CFR - defined previously? (see pg 2-4)	Jacobs	A	CFR first used in Table 2-1. Will spell out with first reference in text.	A
10	2-4	Section 2.2.1 - Eight-Hour Ozone	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Define "parts per million" (ppm)	Jacobs	A	Will add "ppm" after first use of phrase.	A
11	2-4	Section 2.2.1 - Eight-Hour Ozone	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Use ppm instead of "parts per million"	Jacobs	A	Will substitute "ppm" for "parts per million".	A
12	2-4	Section 2.2.1	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	DELETE: 'PM2.5 (particulate matter that is 2.5 microns in diameter or less): The region is in attainment for PPM2.5.	Jacobs	A	Will remove.	A
13	2-4	Section 2.2.1 - Transportation Conformity	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	(CRF) - defined previously?	Jacobs	A	CFR (?) defined previously in Table 2-1. First reference in text inset graphic on p. 2-2. Will spell out.	A
14	2-6	Section 2.2.1 - Carbon Monoxide	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	CRF - be consistent with citations throughout document	Jacobs	D	CFR used after this point in the chapter.	D
15	2-6	Section 2.2.1 - Carbon Monoxide	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Define earlier "parts per million" and then use "ppm"	Jacobs	A	Will comply.	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
16	2-8	Section 2.2.1 - Haz Mat	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Change were to was	Jacobs	A	Will change in second sentence, 1st paragraph of this section.	A
17	2-9	Section 2.2.1 - Safe Drinking Water Act/Toxic Substances Control Act	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Citation consistency	Jacobs	A	Will resolve use of § instead of 'Section'.	A
18	2-10	Section 2.2.1 - LQGs	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Cite (Figure 2-3)	Jacobs	A	Will include reference.	A
19	2-10	Section 2.2.1 - Superfund	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Cite (Figure 2-3)	Jacobs	A	Will include reference.	A
20	2-10	Section 2.2.1 - RCRA Sites	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Cite (Figure 2-3)	Jacobs	A	Will include reference.	A
21	2-10	Section 2.2.1 - Toxic Release Inventory	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Cite (Figure 2-3)	Jacobs	A	Will include reference.	A
22	2-10	Section 2.2.1 - Toxic Substance Control Act	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Cite (Figure 2-3)	Jacobs	A	Will include reference.	A
23	2-13	Section 2.2.1 - Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Resources	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Didn't explain how the existing hazmat info would be used in PEL or master plan	Jacobs	D	Under "Environmental Concerns and Recommendations for Future Analysis" section on p. 2-10, the discussion of existing data can be used as a guide to avoid known sites, high remediation costs and extensive agency coordination for future decision-making, with the acknowledgment that the data is at least 2 years old and needs to be updated.	D
24	A	Section 2.2.1 - Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Resources	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	"and must be protected in place" - qualifies for protection	Jacobs	A	"must be protected in place" will be replaced with "qualifies for protection".	A
25	2-13	Section 2.2.1 - Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Resources	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	add a park rec area, and refuge section	Jacobs	A	Reference to parks, recreation areas, and refuges in included in the de minimis finding discussion.	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
26	2-13	Section 2.2.1 - Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Resources	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	de minimis finding: See markups	Jacobs	A	Comment from ADOT EPG on PDF markup of de minimis discussion in EBR have been incorporated.	A
28	2-14	Section 2.2.1 - Affected Environment	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	add sentence explaining these are known 4(f) & there could be more identified during future analysis	Jacobs	A	Will add	A
29	2-14	Section 2.2.1 - Environmental Concerns and Recommendations for Future Analysis	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Delete: "Avoidance is the recommended approach for this resource because it is unlikely that any land taken from this portion of the park could be replaced in kind or could be approved by the National Park Service."	Jacobs	A	Will comply.	A
30	2-16	Section 2.2.1 - Environmental Concerns and Recommendations for Future Analysis	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	how will this info be used in PEL & Master plan or defer to NEPA?	Jacobs	D	The information in this NAR will be used to support the alternatives screening process for the PEL and Masterplan. The information will also later be used to support future NEPA ED's associated with projects resulting from the master plan.	D
31	2-16	Section 2.2.1 - Water Resources	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	"is administered by ADEQ" - Add "or EPA" (or limit discussion to study area.	Jacobs	A	Will comply.	A
32	2-16	Section 2.2.1 - Water Resources	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	no discussion regarding permits and process	Jacobs	A	Will add discussion of permits - nationwide, individual, pre-construction notifications.	A
33	A	Section 2.2.1 - Affected Environment	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	First bullet - add s to water	Jacobs	A	Will add 's' to 'water' describing Salt River.	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
34	2-16	Section 2.2.1 - Affected Environment	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Seventh bullet - add s to water	Jacobs	A	Will add 's' to 'water' describing Tempe Drain.	A
35	2-18	Section 2.2.2 - Regulatory Setting	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Last paragraph - delete "any". Change would to could.	Jacobs	A	Will delete "any", change "would" to "could" in last paragraph under Regulatory Setting.	A
36	2-18	Section 2.2.2 - Environmental Concerns and Recommendations for Future Analysis	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Why is this section not in every resource discussed?	Jacobs	D	There are 7 critical resource elements discussed: air quality, hazardous materials, 4(f)/6(f), land use & jurisdiction, socioeconomics, Title VI/EJ, and cultural resources and this section is included for each. The three primary reasons for selecting the critical resources are described on page 2-1.	D
37	2-22	Section 2.2.2 - Affected Environment	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	no other demographic info?	Jacobs	D	The available data presented in the NAR that covers the expanded study area is limited to minority population and below poverty densities. During the alternatives screening process for the PEL and Masterplan, additional demographic data may be necessary to define communities of comparison for a future EJ assessment and protected populations for a future Title VI assessment.	D
38	2-22	Section 2.2.2 - Environmental Concerns and Recommendations for Future Analysis	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	"Continued coordination with the lead environmental agency would determine whether to adhere to the source and categories of environmental justice data to be analyzed" ???	Jacobs	A	Revise sentence to read, "The analysis will be included in the alternatives development and screening process."	A
39	2-22	Section 2.2.3 - Cultural Resources	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Maybe should move before 4(f)/6(f) Section, then can shorten that section (move some to this one)	Jacobs	A	Will comply.	D
40	2-22	Section 2.2.3 - Cultural Resources	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Define National Historic Preservation Act with (NHPA)	Jacobs	A	Will comply.	A
41	2-22	Section 2.2.3 - Regulatory Setting	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	NHPA	Jacobs	A	Will use NHPA after initially defining.	A

**I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary**

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
42	2-22	Section 2.2.3 - Regulatory Setting	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Third paragraph - replace perused with reviewed	Jacobs	A	Will comply.	A
43	2-25	Section 2.2.3 - Affected Environment	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	"a build alternative" - they are adversely affected?	Jacobs	D	An "adverse effect" is possible if cultural resource sites such as the Hohokam Village are unavoidable but would only be determined by the alternatives analysis including a build alternative.	D
44	2-25	Section 2.2.3 - Affected Environment	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	change statuses to status	Jacobs	A	Will comply.	A
45	2-25	Section 2.2.3 - Affected Environment	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	change statuses to status	Jacobs	A	Will comply.	A
46	2-26	Section 2.2.3 - Environmental Concerns and Recommendations for Future Analysis	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	make font consistent	Jacobs	A	Will comply.	A
47	2-26	Section 2.2.3 - Environmental Concerns and Recommendations for Future Analysis	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Fifth and sixth bullet and last paragraph - "a build alternative" See previous comment	Jacobs	A	Will comply.	A
48	2-26	Section 2.2.3 - Environmental Concerns and Recommendations for Future Analysis	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Last paragraph - how will this inform the PEL/Master Plan	Jacobs	D	The Section 106 information in this NAR will be used to support the alternatives screening process for the PEL and Masterplan. The information will also later be used to support future NEPA ED's associated with projects resulting from the master plan.	D

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Response By	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
49	2-26	Section 2.2.3 - Environmental Concerns and Recommendations for Future Analysis	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	Last paragraph - "See Appendix D for the study's PEL information" Shouldn't this be an overall discussion point?	Jacobs	A	The text is intended to refer the reader to a list of cultural resources sites, which are included in PEL Appendix C. The PEL is App. D of the NAR. Revise to read "See Appendix D for a complete list of cultural resource sites identified in the PEL."	A
50	2-26	Section 2.3 - Summary of Identified Issues	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	refer to a Fig with segments	Jacobs	A	Will include reference to Figure X in the NAR.	A
51	2-26	Section 2.3 - Summary of Identified Issues	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	"Any proposed improvements near Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport would require Federal Aviation Administration review and approval and would need to conform to the SHIA layout plan." Delete any and change the two would to could.	Jacobs	A	Will delete 'any', change first "would" to "could" and second "would" to "may".	A
52	Chapt 11	General	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	As for Chapter 11, I only have two minor comments:	Jacobs	D	No further action	D
53	11-8	Figure 11-7	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	What does "without congestion" mean? LOS C? LOS D?	Wilson	D	Congestion means LOS E or F. Without Congestion means LOS D or better. Will remove the wording "without congestion."	D
54	11-19	5th Bullet	FHWA	Rebecca Yedlin	fix extra space at end	Jacobs	A	Will fix	A

**I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary**

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
1	EX-5	Transit Infrastructure	Valley Metro	Robert Forrest	South Central LRT will be going under I-17 and although the current height of the I-17 bridge structure is sufficient Valley Metro would prefer to increase the clearance under the bridge.	A	This is not a deficit; however, we can add a comment regarding Valley Metro's desire for greater clearance under the I-17 bridge over Central Ave. This is a future desire based on a proposed plan, not an existing need.	A
2	EX-11	Transit Infrastructure	Valley Metro	Robert Forrest	The Capitol I-10 West Project will be cross over 19th Ave and the RailRoad and crossing over 27th Ave between the westbound and eastbound I-10 lanes.	A	This is not a deficit; however, we can add a comment regarding Valley Metro's proposed plans.	A
3	EX-6		Valley Metro	Robert Forrest	The West Phoenix Central Glendale project will be crossing over I-17 at Camelback or Glendale.	A	This is not a deficit; however, we can add a comment regarding Valley Metro's proposed plans.	A
4	EX-7		Valley Metro	Robert Forrest	The Northwest Phase II Extension will be crossing over I-17 at Mountain View.	A	This is not a deficit; however, we can add a comment regarding Valley Metro's proposed plans.	A
5	5-3	5.1.2	Valley Metro	Robert Forrest	There is a total of 28 light rail stations and not 32.	D	There are 32 station platforms located at 28 general station areas. We can clarify this in the text.	D
6	5-3	5.1.2, Table 5-3	Valley Metro	Robert Forrest	Not sure why you have N/A listed for Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Friday service is the same as Monday - Thursday except it runs longer at night. Saturday runs 15 minutes until 8PM then it runs 20 minutes. Sunday it runs 20 minutes all day. In the last column "early morning/evening/weekends" i suggest removing the word weekends and you have rows showing the weekend service.	A	The table will be updated to remove the last column (early mornings/evening/weekends). The frequencies will be updated in the Table.	A
7	5-3	5.1.2	Valley Metro	Robert Forrest	The third sentence. I would remove "Valley Metro" so the sentence will read "Within the study area, light rail serves"	A	The text will be updated as suggested.	A
8	5-4	Figure 5-2	Valley Metro	Robert Forrest	For the Northwest Phase II Extension wuoi are missing two proposed stations. We are looking at on at 25th and Dunlap and one on Mountain View north of the canal. You are also missing a number of stations for South Central. They are: Lincoln, Buckeye, Audubon, Broadway, Roeser, Southern, Baseline.	A	The maps can be updated to reflect the proposed changes.	A
9	5-9	Table 5-11	Valley Metro	Robert Forrest	South Central is currently in the RTP as being completed in 2034.	A	The table will be updated as suggested.	A
10	5-9	5.4.2	Valley Metro	Robert Forrest	Northwest Phase I - This project is under construction and the station locations are set. They are located at Glendale, Northern, and Dunlap. The PNR is at Dunlap and there is no transit center.	A	The first paragraph will be replaced with the following: "Valley Metro's Northwest Extension Phase I is a 3.2-mile expansion of light rail service on North 19th Avenue. The project, which is currently under construction, will extend light rail service north on 19th Avenue from Montebello Avenue to Dunlap Avenue. The extension is programmed to be open for revenue service in 2016."	A
11	5-9	5.4.2	Valley Metro	Robert Forrest	Northwest Phase II will cross over I-17 and end at the Metrocenter.	A	While Valley Metro is planning to cross I-17 to serve the Metrocenter Mall, the I-17 crossing has not yet been incorporated into the MAG RTP. In addition, a fiscally constrained financial plan has not been established to fund the I-17 crossing. We can add the I-17 crossing in the description, but will need to include a disclaimer about it not being in the RTP as of the publication of the NAR.	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
12	5-1	5	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Note circulators in study area.	D	The local circulators do not contribute to the problem or the solution of the Spine corridor	D
13	5-1	5	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Be consistent with calling Express with capital E.	A	Changing all Express and Rapid bus designations to "commuter bus"	A
14	5-1	5	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Modes listed in section five should be listed/explained in sections below in the order presented in section 5.	A	The text will be updated as suggested.	A
15	5-1	5	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	For demand response in the paragraph, say: "Demand response, also know as Dial-a-Ride, provides...".	A	The text will be updated as suggested.	A
17	5-1	5	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	In the paragraph note that at the 44th St.Washington St. LRT station there is also a Transit Center.	A	The text will be updated as suggested.	A
18	5-1	5	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Note in the paragraph and expand through the document other Transit Demand Management strategies done in the study area.	A	We will note that these program exist in section 5-1; however, we are not going to go into detail because these programs do not significantly contribute to transit operations.	A
19	5-1	5	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	List the order of bullet point organizations as: Valley Metro, MAG, ADOT, Cities of CHN/PHX/TEM.	A	The text will be updated as suggested.	A
20	5-1	5.1	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Note that there are many more Express routes that use the I-10 in the study area for a very short distance.	A	These other routes do serve the study area but do not operate on the study corridor.	D
21	5-1	5.1	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	The term key local shows up but there is no explanation of it or our recent TSPM efforts (were the term came from).	D	The Local Fixed-Route Bus section in 5.1.2 explains the difference between local and key local routes in detail. Page three, last paragraph.	D
22	5-1	5.1.1	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	RAPIDs have a Friday lite schedule.	A	The text will be updated as suggested. Add footnote to table 5-1	A
23	5-1	5	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Question. How does this section support the goals of the study?	D	The transit section is provided to describe the current transit infrastructure and identify the needs today and into the future. This is no different than the rest of the chapters in the report for their respective topics.	D
24	5-3	5.1.1	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Can the last Express paragraphs in that section (including bullet points) be represented with maps instead of text?	D	The text does provide information that a map could not illustrate, so we do not believe a map is the best way to convey this information. For example, the corridors where it operates non-stop service, certain stops it makes from origin to destination.	D
25	5-3	5.1.1	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Last paragraph in Express section notes 522 with limited stop service; explain where the limited stop service is provided.	D	Limited-stop service verbiage was used to denote the express nature of the service. The origin and terminus of each express route is provided within the text. If the terminus was the State Capitol, the stop at Central Station was included to illustrate the connectivity and accessibility level provided to the passengers.	D
26	5-3	5.1.1	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Under vanpool section - we can put you in touch with VM staff that manages vanpool to understand if there are other vanpools originating in the area aprt from publicly owned PnRs.	D	We will note that these program exist in section 5-1; however, we are not going to go into detail because these programs do not significantly contribute to transit operations.	D
27			Valley Metro	Jorge Luna		D		D
28	5-3	5.1.1	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	The vanpool section notes "dedicated return time," change to "agreed upon return time."	A	The text will be updated as suggested.	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan
DRAFT Needs Assessment Report
Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
29	5-3	5.1.1	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Provide more on vanpool as a congestion relief tool. Note other TDM strategies in the study area as well as any private/handshake PnRs. Also, treat PnRs as a standalone item; for example, you show the 27th Ave./Baseline Rd. PnR but doesn't mention it in the text. Also, missing 24th St./Baseline PnR.	D	The Spine alternative evaluation process will have a section on TDM/TSM. We will note the programs exist in this document; however, we will not go into the details. 24th St/Baseline Rd PnR will not be included as it was established after the data cutoff date.	D
30	5-3	5.1.2	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	In the LRT section, note upcoming expansion, the NWE. Matrix 5-3 needs updating, for example, Friday's the LRT has 12 min. freq. and Saturday 15 min. Refer to transit book.	A	The text will be updated as suggested.	A
31	5-3	5.1.2	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Based on terminology used in the text (e.g., local and key local routes), VM's Transit Standards and Performance Measures work should be noted in the text as the source of info.	A	Mention VM TSPM Document.	A
32	5-2, 5-4		Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Use consistent symbology on maps.	A	Will comply	A
33	5-5	5.1.2	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Second paragraph in this page notes "these routes have been examined for service span, frequency and performance." Note that the results are in the following sections.	A	The text will be updated as suggested.	A
34	5-5	5.1.2	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Third paragraph, verify if all those routes in the paragraph are key locals if it is supposed to flow from the above paragraph.	D	Table 5-4 route designation is based on the tables from the TSPM document.	D
35	5-5	5.2.1	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Note the period where the data was drawn from, for example it says 2,218 avg. wkdy. ridership, but from when?	D	We used the best available date. We will review the footnotes to ensure the accuracy of the data dates.	D
36	5-5	5.2.1	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	In the commuted express paragraph, it says: on average, the commuter express routes in the study area currently operate with a 41% occupancy rate (explain what that means).	A	The text will be updated as suggested.	A
37	5-6	5.2.1	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Table 5-6, remove "Bob Antila."	A	The text will be updated as suggested.	A
38	5-7	5.2.3	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	General note: should rider profiles (from 2010 O&D) be included here and the transit dependent make-up of the study area and their direction of travel (in or outside the corridor).	D	Transit service in the Spine study area is mature and well developed. The approach suggested in the comment is appropriate for new markets with limited or no transit service. The Spine study transit needs assessment was based on transit performance and availability; however, demographic and socioeconomic data is documented in the environmental chapter (Chpt 2).	D
39	5-7	5.2.3	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Table 5-8, note the months analyzed. Also, what is the intent of including such operating metrics for the entire route? Should the analysis be done within the study area?	A/D	The footnotes will document the age of the data. The entire route was analyzed because the Spine study is evaluating how people move within and through the Spine study area; therefore, the performance of the entire route was evaluated.	A
40	5-8	5.4	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Should the Phoenix initiative be mentioned?	A	The PHX initiative will be discussed in the forward of the NAR because it occurred after the Dec 2014 cutoff date.	A

I-10/I-17 "Spine" Corridor Master Plan

DRAFT Needs Assessment Report

Comment Summary

Comment #	Page #	Report Section	Agency	Reviewer	Reviewer Comment	Initial Disp.	Response	Final Disp.
41	5-9	5.4.2	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Table 5-11 best fits as a map, consider modifying.	D	While a map shows the locations, it does not include all the other information associated with each of the items.	D
42	5-11	5.5.1	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	With bus stops, consider noting bicycle boardings on bus in study area as well as wheel chair boardings; help understand any traffic flow impact and emphasize accessibility.	D	This level of detail is not appropriate for the Spine corridor master plan.	D
43	5-12	5.5.2	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Note what makes some of the PnRs most productive (DHOVs, slip ramps, service frequency, etc.).	A	Will document the factors that were found to be relevant to make PnRs productive through the 2013 VM PnR Study.	A
44	5-12	5.5.2	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Note that weekly PnR data is available. Let us know if it is needed.	D	This data is consistent with what is currently shown in the report.	D
45	5-12	5.6	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	Change findings to Observations. Many items in this section were not fully talked about in the preceding portion of the text, it is confusing to draw the findings.	A	Will change "Key Transit Findings" to "Transit Summary" to be consistent with the rest of the report. Will add a statement in the intro paragraph in the summary that states, "The assessment of the current transit conditions yielded some general findings that identified potential needs."	A
46	5-13	5.6	Valley Metro	Jorge Luna	The inventory should note: fare vending machines, fare media outlets, paratransit and operating characteristics, other TDM strategies, and O&D or TRP data information to help understand the commuting patterns of the study area residents.	D	This level of detail for fare is not appropriate for the Spine corridor master plan. For comment responses to operating characteristics, TDM strategies, and O&D, see the comment responses above.	D

This page is intentionally left blank.