



Final Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement and Preliminary Section 4(f) Evaluation

July 2021



Federal Aid No. 999-M(161)S
ADOT Project No. 999 SW 0 M5180 01P



This page intentionally left blank.



**Interstate 11
Final Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement
and Preliminary Section 4(f) Evaluation**

Project No. M5180 01P / Federal Aid No. 999-M(161)S

Submitted pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c), 49 U.S.C. 303, and 33 U.S.C. 1251

By the

**FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION *and*
ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

With

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
(Cooperating Agency),

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION
(Cooperating Agency),

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
(Cooperating Agency),

US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
(Cooperating Agency),

US BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
(Cooperating Agency),

US BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
(Cooperating Agency),

US ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
(Cooperating Agency),

US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
(Cooperating Agency),


US FOREST SERVICE, CORONADO NATIONAL FOREST
(Cooperating Agency), and

ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT
(Cooperating Agency)

John S. Halikowski, Director
Arizona Department of Transportation


Date of Approval 6-23-2021
ADOT

Karla S. Petty, Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration, Arizona


Date of Approval 6-24-2021




This page intentionally left blank.



Abstract

This Final Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement and Preliminary Section 4(f) Evaluation (Final Tier 1 EIS) evaluates alternatives for the Interstate 11 (I-11) Corridor in Santa Cruz, Pima, Pinal, Maricopa, and Yavapai Counties, Arizona. The purpose of I-11 is to provide a high-priority, high-capacity, access-controlled transportation corridor to serve population and employment growth; support regional mobility; connect metropolitan areas and markets; enhance access to support economic vitality; and provide alternate regional routes to facilitate emergency evacuation and defense access.

This Final Tier 1 EIS is presented in a condensed format per Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Technical Advisory T 6640.8A, *Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents*. The condensed format avoids duplication of content presented in the Draft Tier 1 EIS that remains unchanged or does not affect the NEPA decisions to be made.

The Draft Tier 1 EIS provided information for the public, agencies, and tribes to comment on the analysis of a set of Build Corridor Alternatives, including a Recommended Alternative. Each Build Corridor Alternative is a 2,000-foot-wide corridor, within which a future alignment would be located (Figure I-2). The assumed ultimate typical cross section for the I-11 facility is approximately 400 feet wide, but the specific alignment location and width would be refined as part of the Tier 2 analyses.

Based on the analysis presented in the Draft and Final Tier 1 EIS, and after consideration of public and stakeholder input received during the public comment period for the Draft EIS, FHWA and ADOT identified a Preferred Alternative in this Final Tier 1 EIS that is different than the Recommended Alternative in the Draft Tier 1 EIS. This Final Tier 1 EIS evaluates the Recommended Alternative from the Draft Tier 1 EIS, the Preferred Alternative, and the No Build Alternative to characterize the potential effects of each on the social, economic, and natural environments. The No Build Alternative represents the existing transportation system, with committed improvement projects that are programmed for funding.

The Preferred Alternative balances transportation needs with impacts to the natural and human environment and stakeholder input. The condensed format allows the reader to understand the rationale for changes between the Recommended Alternative and Preferred Alternative and the potential environmental impacts and avoidance and mitigation associated with the Preferred Alternative.

This Final Tier 1 EIS documents the NEPA study completed to date, culminating in the identification of the Preferred Alternative. This process included technical analysis, coordination with study partners such as Cooperating Agencies, Participating Agencies, and Tribal Governments, as well as the review and consideration of public input received at study milestones.

This Final Tier 1 EIS will be available for a 30-day review period for federal, state, and local agencies and private organizations, and members of the public who provided substantive comments on the Draft Tier 1 EIS (23 CFR 771.125(f)). FHWA and ADOT will sign a Record of Decision and post it on the project website no sooner than 30 days after publication of the Final Tier 1 EIS.



ADOT is committed to providing equal access to electronic and information technology for people with disabilities in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 508), as amended. If you require assistance or wish to report an issue related to the accessibility of any content in this document, please contact the ADOT Civil Rights Office at 602.712.8946.



Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Americans with Disabilities Act

Pursuant to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and other nondiscrimination laws and authorities, ADOT does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability. Persons that require a reasonable accommodation based on language or disability should contact Laura Douglas, ADOT Community Relations Project Manager, at 602.568.7721 or ldouglas@azdot.gov. Requests should be made as early as possible to ensure the State has an opportunity to address the accommodation.

De acuerdo con el Título VI de la Ley de Derechos Civiles de 1964, la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA por sus siglas en inglés) y otras normas y leyes antidiscriminatorias, el Departamento de Transporte de Arizona (ADOT) no discrimina por motivos de raza, color, origen nacional, sexo, edad o discapacidad. Las personas que requieran asistencia (dentro de lo razonable) ya sea por el idioma o discapacidad deben ponerse en contacto con la Laura Douglas al 602.568.7721 o ldouglas@azdot.gov. Las solicitudes deben hacerse lo más antes posible para asegurar que el Estado tenga la oportunidad de hacer los arreglos necesarios.





This page intentionally left blank.



Contents

ABSTRACT V

APPENDICES.....XV

FIGURESXVI

TABLES.....XXI

ACRONYMSXXV

EXECUTIVE SUMMARYES-1

 ES.1 Project Background ES-1

 ES.2 Scope of Final Tier 1 EIS ES-1

 ES.3 Need for the Proposed Facility ES-2

 ES.4 Purpose of the Proposed Facility ES-2

 ES.5 Alternatives Considered ES-3

 ES.5.1 Purple, Green, Orange, and Recommended End-to-End Alternatives ES-3

 ES.5.2 No Build Alternative ES-3

 ES.5.3 Preferred Alternative..... ES-4

 ES.6 Comparison of Recommended and Preferred Alternatives ES-4

 ES.6.1 Summary of Alignment Differences between the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives ES-4

 ES.6.2 Purpose and Need Comparison ES-7

 ES.6.3 Comparison of Impacted Resources ES-9

 ES.7 Coordination and Outreach ES-11

 ES.7.1 Coordination and Outreach for Draft Tier 1 EIS ES-11

 ES.7.2 Draft Tier 1 EIS Outreach and Public Review Period ES-12

 ES.7.3 Coordination and Outreach Since Draft Tier 1 EIS..... ES-12

 ES.8 Funding, Implementation, and Phasing ES-12

INTRODUCTION AND READER’S GUIDE.....I-1

 Condensed Final Tier 1 EISI-1

 Recommended Versus Preferred Build Corridor AlternativesI-1

 Final Tier 1 EIS OrganizationI-3

 GeographiesI-4

 Tier 1 AnalysisI-4

1 PURPOSE AND NEED1-1

 1.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS1-1

 1.1.1 Purpose of and Need for Proposed Facility.....1-1

 1.1.2 Other Desirable Outcomes1-2



- 1.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS1-2
 - 1.2.1 Arizona Travel Demand Model Update1-2
 - 1.2.2 Economic Centers Figure Update1-6
 - 1.2.3 Population and Employment Projections.....1-6
- 2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DRAFT TIER 1 EIS2-1**
 - 2.1 Recommendations from Prior Plans and Studies.....2-1
 - 2.2 Alternatives Development Process2-1
 - 2.3 End-to-End Build Corridor Alternatives2-3
 - 2.4 Comparison of Alternatives2-3
- 3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES3-1**
 - 3.1 Introduction.....3-1
 - 3.2 Summary of Key Environmental Impacts3-1
 - 3.3 Land Use and Section 6(f).....3.3-1
 - 3.3.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS3.3-1
 - 3.3.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS3.3-4
 - 3.3.3 No Build Alternative3.3-6
 - 3.3.4 Recommended Alternative3.3-6
 - 3.3.5 Preferred Alternative.....3.3-7
 - 3.3.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.3-9
 - 3.4 Recreation3.4-1
 - 3.4.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS3.4-1
 - 3.4.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS3.4-1
 - 3.4.3 No Build Alternative3.4-2
 - 3.4.4 Recommended Alternative3.4-2
 - 3.4.5 Preferred Alternative.....3.4-3
 - 3.4.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.4-4
 - 3.5 Community Resources, Title VI, and Environmental Justice.....3.5-1
 - 3.5.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS3.5-1
 - 3.5.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS3.5-2
 - 3.5.3 No Build Alternative3.5-4
 - 3.5.4 Recommended Alternative3.5-4
 - 3.5.5 Preferred Alternative.....3.5-13
 - 3.5.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.5-14
 - 3.6 Economic Impacts3.6-1
 - 3.6.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS3.6-1
 - 3.6.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS3.6-2
 - 3.6.3 No Build Alternative3.6-2
 - 3.6.4 Recommended Alternative3.6-2



- 3.6.5 Preferred Alternative.....3.6-5
- 3.6.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.6-6
- 3.7 Archaeological, Historical, Architectural, and Cultural Resources3.7-1
 - 3.7.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS3.7-1
 - 3.7.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS3.7-2
 - 3.7.3 No Build Alternative3.7-3
 - 3.7.4 Recommended Alternative3.7-3
 - 3.7.5 Preferred Alternative.....3.7-9
 - 3.7.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.7-15
- 3.8 Noise3.8-1
 - 3.8.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS3.8-1
 - 3.8.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS3.8-3
 - 3.8.3 No Build Alternative3.8-6
 - 3.8.4 Recommended Alternative3.8-7
 - 3.8.5 Preferred Alternative.....3.8-8
 - 3.8.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.8-9
- 3.9 Visual and Aesthetics3.9-1
 - 3.9.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS3.9-1
 - 3.9.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS3.9-2
 - 3.9.3 No Build Alternative3.9-4
 - 3.9.4 Recommended Alternative3.9-4
 - 3.9.5 Preferred Alternative.....3.9-5
 - 3.9.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.9-6
- 3.10 Air Quality.....3.10-1
 - 3.10.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS3.10-1
 - 3.10.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS3.10-2
 - 3.10.3 No Build Alternative3.10-2
 - 3.10.4 Recommended Alternative3.10-3
 - 3.10.5 Preferred Alternative.....3.10-3
 - 3.10.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.10-5
- 3.11 Hazardous Materials3.11-1
 - 3.11.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS3.11-1
 - 3.11.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS3.11-2
 - 3.11.3 No Build Alternative3.11-2
 - 3.11.4 Recommended Alternative3.11-2
 - 3.11.5 Preferred Alternative.....3.11-3
 - 3.11.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.11-3
- 3.12 Geology, Soils, and Prime and Unique Farmlands3.12-1
 - 3.12.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS3.12-1



- 3.12.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS3.12-2
- 3.12.3 No Build Alternative3.12-2
- 3.12.4 Recommended Alternative3.12-2
- 3.12.5 Preferred Alternative.....3.12-2
- 3.12.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.12-3
- 3.13 Water Resources.....3.13-1
 - 3.13.1 Regulatory Setting3.13-1
 - 3.13.2 Methodology3.13-8
 - 3.13.3 Affected Environment3.13-10
 - 3.13.4 Environmental Consequences.....3.13-21
 - 3.13.5 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.13-49
- 3.14 Biological Resources.....3.14-1
 - 3.14.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS3.14-1
 - 3.14.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS3.14-2
 - 3.14.3 No Build Alternative3.14-4
 - 3.14.4 Recommended Alternative3.14-4
 - 3.14.5 Preferred Alternative.....3.14-14
 - 3.14.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.14-20
- 3.15 Temporary Construction-related Impacts3.15-1
 - 3.15.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS3.15-1
 - 3.15.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS3.15-1
 - 3.15.3 No Build Alternative3.15-1
 - 3.15.4 Recommended Alternative3.15-1
 - 3.15.5 Preferred Alternative.....3.15-2
 - 3.15.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.15-2
- 3.16 Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitment of Resources3.16-1
 - 3.16.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS3.16-1
 - 3.16.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS3.16-1
 - 3.16.3 No Build Alternative3.16-2
 - 3.16.4 Recommended Alternative3.16-2
 - 3.16.5 Preferred Alternative.....3.16-2
 - 3.16.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.16-2
- 3.17 Indirect and Cumulative Effects.....3.17-1
 - 3.17.1 Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS3.17-1
 - 3.17.2 Summary of Changes Since Draft Tier 1 EIS3.17-3
 - 3.17.3 No Build Alternative3.17-6
 - 3.17.4 Recommended Alternative3.17-6
 - 3.17.5 Preferred Alternative.....3.17-7
 - 3.17.6 Mitigation and Tier 2 Analysis.....3.17-10



3.18 Required Permits and Actions3.18-1

4 DRAFT PRELIMINARY SECTION 4(F) EVALUATION4-1

4.1 Introduction..... 4-1

4.2 Refinements Since Draft Tier 1 EIS 4-1

4.3 Alternatives Evaluated..... 4-1

4.4 Regulatory Context and Methodology 4-7

4.4.1 Applicability..... 4-7

4.4.2 Definitions of Use 4-7

4.4.3 Types of Section 4(f) Approvals 4-8

4.4.4 Section 4(f) Evaluation Process 4-9

4.4.5 Officials with Jurisdiction 4-12

4.5 Identification of Section 4(f) Properties 4-12

4.5.1 Parks, Recreation Areas, or Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges 4-13

4.5.2 Historic Sites..... 4-38

4.6 Assessment of Use of Section 4(f) Properties..... 4-45

4.6.1 No Build Alternative (2040)..... 4-45

4.6.2 Build Corridor Alternatives – No Use..... 4-46

4.6.3 Build Corridor Alternatives – Use Evaluation..... 4-89

4.6.4 Constructive Use 4-106

4.7 Corridor-wide Avoidance Analysis..... 4-108

4.7.1 Avoidance Alternative Feasibility and Prudence Standards 4-109

4.7.2 No Build Alternative (2040)..... 4-109

4.7.3 Location Alternatives 4-110

4.7.4 Alternative Actions..... 4-111

4.8 Least Overall Harm Analysis 4-112

4.9 All Planning to Minimize Harm 4-113

4.10 Coordination 4-114

4.10.1 NEPA and Section 4(f) Coordination Activities..... 4-114

4.10.2 Programmatic Net Benefit for Tucson Mitigation Corridor 4-124

4.11 Summary of Findings 4-125

4.12 Future Tier 2 Analysis 4-125

5 COORDINATION AND OUTREACH5-1

5.1 Summary of Outreach and Coordination for Draft Tier 1 EIS..... 5-1

5.2 Draft Tier 1 EIS Outreach and Public Review Period..... 5-3

5.3 Title VI, Environmental Justice, and Limited English Proficiency 5-4

5.4 Comments on Draft Tier 1 EIS 5-6

5.5 Coordination and Outreach Since Draft Tier 1 EIS 5-8



5.6 Next Steps and Final Tier 1 EIS Public Review Process5-9

6 PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE6-1

6.1 Summary of Recommended Alternative in the Draft Tier 1 EIS6-1

6.2 No Build Alternative6-2

6.3 Input on the Recommended Alternative6-5

6.3.1 I-19: Nogales to Sahuarita6-5

6.3.2 Sahuarita to Marana6-7

6.3.3 Marana to Casa Grande6-10

6.3.4 Casa Grande to Buckeye6-13

6.3.5 Buckeye to Wickenburg (Maricopa and Yavapai Counties)6-16

6.4 Rationale for the Preferred Alternative6-19

6.4.1 I-19: Nogales to Sahuarita6-19

6.4.2 Sahuarita to Marana6-20

6.4.3 Marana to Casa Grande6-25

6.4.4 Casa Grande to Buckeye6-28

6.4.5 Buckeye to Wickenburg (Maricopa and Yavapai Counties)6-31

6.5 Comparison of End-to-End Recommended and Preferred Alternatives6-34

6.5.1 Summary of Alignment Differences between the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives6-34

6.5.2 Purpose and Need Comparison6-36

6.5.3 Comparison of Impacted Resources6-37

6.6 Capital, Operations, and Maintenance Costs6-39

6.7 Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved6-41

6.8 Funding, Implementation, and Phasing6-42

6.8.1 Funding6-42

6.8.2 Planning and Programming6-43

6.8.3 Phasing6-44

6.8.4 Tier 2 Analysis6-44

7 SUMMARY OF MITIGATION AND TIER 2 ANALYSIS7-1



Appendices

- Appendix A Glossary
- Appendix B References
- Appendix C List of Preparers
- Appendix D List of Recipients
- Appendix E Supplemental Documentation for the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences
 - Appendix E2 Travel Forecasting Methods and Analyses Report
 - Appendix E7 Section 106 Consultation Summary and Programmatic Agreement
 - Appendix E8 Technical Memorandum: I-11 Noise Report Addendum
 - Appendix E9 Visual Effects on Selected Viewpoints and Landscapes
 - Appendix E13 Water Resources Technical Memorandum
 - Appendix E14 Biological Resources
- Appendix F Section 4(f) Evaluation Supporting Documents
 - Appendix F1 Applicability of Identified Wildlife Areas as Section 4(f) Properties for the I-11 Tier 1 EIS
 - Appendix F2 Section 4(f) Constructive Use White Papers
 - Appendix F3 Correspondence Related to Preliminary Section 4(f) Evaluation
- Appendix G Public Involvement Summary Report
- Appendix H Comments on Draft Tier I EIS and Responses
 - Appendix H1 Standard Responses
 - Appendix H2 Cooperating Agency Comments on Draft Tier 1 EIS and Responses
 - Appendix H3 Participating Agency Comments on Draft Tier 1 EIS and Responses
 - Appendix H4 Public Advocacy Organization Comments on Draft Tier 1 EIS and Responses
 - Appendix H5 Public Comments on Draft Tier 1 EIS and Responses
 - Appendix H6, Form Letter Comments on Draft Tier I EIS and Responses
 - Appendix H7 Comments Received after Comment Deadline
 - Appendix H8 Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Tier 1 EIS



Figures

Figure ES-1. Preferred Alternative 5

Figure I-1. Recommended and Preferred Alternatives 2

Figure I-2. Tier 1 versus Tier 2 Level of Detail 5

Figure 1-1. Average Weekday Level of Service, 2040 1-4

Figure 1-2. Updated Map of Key Economic Centers and Growth Areas in the I-11 Study Area 1-8

Figure 2-1. Draft Tier 1 EIS Build Corridor Alternatives 2-2

Figure 3.5-1. Minority Demographics: Nogales to Casa Grande 3.5-7

Figure 3.5-2. Minority Demographics: Casa Grande to Buckeye 3.5-8

Figure 3.5-3. Minority Demographics: Buckeye to Wickenburg 3.5-9

Figure 3.5-4. Low-Income Demographics: Nogales to Casa Grande 3.5-10

Figure 3.5-5. Low-Income Demographics: Casa Grande to Buckeye 3.5-11

Figure 3.5-6. Low-Income Demographics: Buckeye to Wickenburg 3.5-12

Figure 3.6-1. Updated Map of Key Economic Centers and Growth Areas in the I-11 Study Area 3.6-3

Figure 3.7-1. Potential Levels of Impact on Archaeological Sites and Historic Structures in the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives 3.7-12

Figure 3.7-2. Potential Levels of Impact on Historic Districts and Buildings in the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives 3.7-13

Figure 3.10-1. Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas along the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives 3.10-4

Figure 3.13-1. South Section Active Management Areas, Sole Source Aquifers, Groundwater Wells, and Impaired Waters 3.13-12

Figure 3.13-2. Central Section Active Management Areas, Sole Source Aquifers, Groundwater Wells, and Impaired Waters 3.13-13

Figure 3.13-3. North Section Active Management Areas, Sole Source Aquifers, Groundwater Wells, and Impaired Waters 3.13-14

Figure 3.13-4. South Section Potential Waters of the US and Wetlands 3.13-17

Figure 3.13-5. Central Section Potential Waters of the US and Wetlands 3.13-18

Figure 3.13-6. North Section Potential Waters of the US and Wetlands 3.13-19



Figure 3.13-7. South Section FEMA Floodplains3.13-22

Figure 3.13-8. Central Section FEMA Floodplains.....3.13-23

Figure 3.13-9. North Section FEMA Floodplains3.13-24

Figure 3.13-10. South Section Active Management Areas, Sole Source Aquifers,
Groundwater Wells, and Impaired Waters – Recommended and Preferred Alternatives ...3.13-35

Figure 3.13-11. Central Section Active Management Areas, Sole Source Aquifers,
Groundwater Wells, and Impaired Waters – Recommended and Preferred Alternatives ...3.13-36

Figure 3.13-12. North Section Active Management Areas, Sole Source Aquifers,
Groundwater Wells, and Impaired Waters – Recommended and Preferred Alternatives ...3.13-37

Figure 3.13-13. South Section Potential Waters of the US and Wetlands –
Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.13-38

Figure 3.13-14. Central Section Potential Waters of the US and Wetlands --
Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.13-39

Figure 3.13-15. North Section Potential Waters of the US and Wetlands –
Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.13-40

Figure 3.13-16. South Section FEMA Floodplains – Recommended and Preferred
Alternatives3.13-42

Figure 3.13-17. Central Section FEMA Floodplains – Recommended and Preferred
Alternatives3.13-43

Figure 3.13-18. North Section FEMA Floodplains – Recommended and Preferred
Alternatives3.13-44

Figure 3.14-1. Biotic Communities in the South Section.....3.14-5

Figure 3.14-2. Biotic Communities in the Central Section3.14-6

Figure 3.14-3. Biotic Communities in the North Section3.14-7

Figure 3.14-4. Large Intact Block Clusters.....3.14-10

Figure 3.14-5. Wildlife Linkages in the South Section3.14-15

Figure 3.14-6. Wildlife Linkages in the Central Section3.14-16

Figure 3.14-7. Wildlife Linkages in the North Section3.14-17

Figure 3.17-1. Recommended Alternative Area of Influence3.17-8

Figure 3.17-2. Preferred Alternative Area of Influence3.17-9

Figure 4-1. Purple Alternative4-2

Figure 4-2. Green Alternative.....4-3



Figure 4-3. Orange Alternative.....4-4

Figure 4-4. Recommended Alternative4-5

Figure 4-5. Preferred Alternative.....4-6

Figure 4-6. Section 4(f) Properties in the Corridor Study Area – Purple, Green, and Orange Alternatives – South Section.....4-29

Figure 4-7. Section 4(f) Properties in the Corridor Study Area – Recommended and Preferred Alternatives – South Section.....4-30

Figure 4-8. Section 4(f) Properties in the Corridor Study Area – Purple, Green, and Orange Alternatives – Central Section.....4-31

Figure 4-9. Section 4(f) Properties in the Corridor Study Area – Recommended and Preferred Alternatives – Central Section.....4-32

Figure 4-10. Section 4(f) Properties in the Corridor Study Area – Purple, Green, and Orange Alternatives – North Section4-33

Figure 4-11. Section 4(f) Properties in the Corridor Study Area – Recommended and Preferred Alternatives – North Section4-34

Figure 4-12. Bradshaw-Harquahala Planning Area Map4-50

Figure 4-13. Build Corridor Alternatives near Vulture Mine RMZ.....4-51

Figure 4-14. Section 4(f) Properties – Purple, Green, and Orange Alternatives – South Section4-61

Figure 4-15. Section 4(f) Properties – Recommended and Preferred Alternatives – South Section4-62

Figure 4-16. Section 4(f) Properties – Purple, Green, and Orange Alternatives – Central Section4-63

Figure 4-17. Section 4(f) Properties – Recommended and Preferred Alternatives – Central Section4-64

Figure 4-18. Section 4(f) Properties – Purple, Green, and Orange Alternatives– North Section4-65

Figure 4-19. Section 4(f) Properties – Recommended and Preferred Alternatives – North Section4-66

Figure 4-20. Pima Community College Desert Vista Campus – Preferred Alternative East Option or Orange Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor).....4-68

Figure 4-21. La Mar Park – Preferred Alternative East Option and Orange Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor).....4-69

Figure 4-22. Julian Wash Greenway and Archaeological Park – Preferred Alternative East Option and Orange Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor)4-70



Figure 4-23. Francisco Elias Esquer Park – Preferred Alternative East Option and Orange Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor).....4-71

Figure 4-24. Sweetwater Wetlands Park and USDA Tucson Plant Materials Center – Preferred Alternative East Option and Orange Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor)4-72

Figure 4-25. Rillito River Park, Pima Prickly Park, and Camino de la Tierra Trailhead – Preferred Alternative East Option and Orange Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor)4-73

Figure 4-26. Cortaro Farms Canal – Preferred Alternative East Option or Orange Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor).....4-74

Figure 4-27. Picacho Peak State Park and Picacho Pass Skirmish Site - Overland Mail Co. Stage Station – Preferred, Purple, or Orange Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor).....4-75

Figure 4-28. Cañada del Oro (Christina-Taylor Green Memorial River Park), Ted Walker Park, Mike Jacob Sports Park, and Santa Cruz River Park – Preferred Alternative East Option and Orange Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor)4-76

Figure 4-29. Rillito Vista Neighborhood Park – Preferred Alternative East Option and Orange Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor).....4-77

Figure 4-30. San Lucas Community Park – Preferred Alternative East Option and Orange Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor).....4-78

Figure 4-31. West Pinal (Kortsen) Park – Orange Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor).....4-79

Figure 4-32. Buckeye Hills Regional Park – Accommodate (Preferred, Green, or Orange Alternative); Robbins Butte Wildlife Area – No Use or Potential De Minimis Use (Recommended, Preferred, Green, Orange Alternative); and Public Land Order 1015 Lands – Accommodate (Recommended, Preferred, Purple, Green, or Orange Alternative).....4-80

Figure 4-33. Public Land Order 1015 Land Parcels and Maricopa Trail – Recommended or Purple Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor)4-81

Figure 4-34. Otero Cemetery – Preferred, Recommended, Purple, Green, or Orange Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor).....4-82

Figure 4-35. Tumacácori National Historic Park and Tumacácori National Monument and Museum – Preferred, Recommended, Purple, Green, or Orange Alternative (Accommodate in the Corridor).....4-83

Figure 4-36. Canoa Ranch Rural Historic District (Historic Hacienda de la Canoa) – Preferred, Recommended, Green, and Orange Alternatives (Accommodate in the Corridor).....4-84

Figure 4-37. Palo Verde Regional Park – Preferred, Recommended, Purple, or Green Alternative (Shift the Corridor)4-86



Figure 4-38. Anamax Park – Preferred, Recommended, Green, or Orange Alternative (Shift the Corridor)4-87

Figure 4-39. Downtown Tucson (North) Section 4(f) Properties – Preferred Alternative East Option and Orange Alternative4-91

Figure 4-40. Downtown Tucson (South) Section 4(f) Properties – Preferred Alternative East Option and Orange Alternative4-92

Figure 4-41. Tucson Mitigation Corridor – Preferred Alternative West Option, Recommended, Purple, or Green (CAP Design Option) Alternative4-98

Figure 5-1. Distribution of Public Comments Originating in Arizona5-7

Figure 6-1. Draft Tier 1 EIS Recommended Alternative and Final Tier 1 EIS Preferred Alternative6-3

Figure 6-2: No Build Alternative Capacity Improvements6-4

Figure 6-3. Nogales to Sahuarita with Recommended Alternative6-6

Figure 6-4. Sahuarita to Marana with Recommended Alternative6-8

Figure 6-5. Marana to Casa Grande with Recommended Alternative6-12

Figure 6-6. Casa Grande to Buckeye with Recommended Alternative6-14

Figure 6-7. Buckeye to Wickenburg with Recommended Alternative6-18

Figure 6-8. Nogales to Sahuarita with Preferred Alternative6-21

Figure 6-9. Sahuarita to Marana with Preferred Alternative6-22

Figure 6-10. Marana to Casa Grande with Preferred Alternative6-26

Figure 6-11. Casa Grande to Buckeye with Preferred Alternative6-29

Figure 6-12. Buckeye to Wickenburg with Preferred Alternative6-32

Figure 6-13. Preferred Alternative6-35



Tables

Table 1-1. Purpose and Need Metrics 1-1

Table 1-2. Average Weekday Traffic and Level of Service, 2018 and 2040 (No Build Alternative)..... 1-3

Table 1-3. Peak Period Travel Times from Nogales to Wickenburg in Afternoon, 2018 and 2040 (No Build Alternative) 1-5

Table 1-4. Peak Period Travel Times for City Pairs in Afternoon, 2018 and 2040 (No Build Alternative)..... 1-6

Table 1-5. Comparison of 2040 Population Projections..... 1-8

Table 1-6. Comparison of 2040 Employment Projections..... 1-8

Table 3.3-1. Draft Tier 1 EIS Existing Land Use Designations 3.3-2

Table 3.3-2. Draft Tier 1 EIS Planned Land Use Designations..... 3.3-3

Table 3.3-3. Land Use Plans 3.3-4

Table 3.3-4. Changes to Existing and Planned Land Use Categories between the Draft and Final Tier 1 EIS 3.3-6

Table 3.3-5. Summary of Existing Land Use in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives 3.3-7

Table 3.3-6. Summary of Planned Land Use in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives..... 3.3-7

Table 3.3-7. Summary of Land Management and Special Designated Lands in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives 3.3-8

Table 3.4-1. Inventory of Recreational Properties in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives by Geography 3.4-3

Table 3.5-1. Communities in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridor of the Recommended Alternative 3.5-5

Table 3.5-2. Inventory of Acres in Minority and Low-Income Communities in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives 3.5-6

Table 3.5-3. Communities in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridor of the Preferred Alternative 3.5-13

Table 3.6-1. Summary of Potential Economic Impacts 3.6-1

Table 3.6-2. Summary of Potential Impacts on Economic Indicators for the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives..... 3.6-5

Table 3.7-1. Summary of Draft Tier 1 EIS Assessment of Impacts on Cultural Resources 3.7-2



Table 3.7-2. Extent of Prior Cultural Resource Survey and Recorded Archaeological Sites and Historic Structures in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.7-4

Table 3.7-3. Temporal Classification of Recorded Archaeological Sites and Historic Structures in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.7-4

Table 3.7-4. Archaeological Sites and Historic Structures that may Warrant Preservation in Place in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.7-5

Table 3.7-5. NRHP Eligibility of Archaeological Sites and Historic Structures in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.7-6

Table 3.7-6. NRHP-listed and Determined Eligible Historic Districts and Buildings in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.7-7

Table 3.7-7. Preliminary NRHP Eligibility Evaluations of Unrecorded Historic-Period Properties in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.7-7

Table 3.7-8. Traditional Cultural Properties in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.7-8

Table 3.7-9. Summary of Comparison of Impacts on Cultural Resources: Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.7-11

Table 3.8-1. Noise Abatement Criteria3.8-2

Table 3.8-2. Summary of Predicted 2040 Traffic Noise Levels3.8-3

Table 3.8-3. Summary of Predicted 2040 Traffic Noise Levels at Major Parks and Recreation Areas3.8-5

Table 3.8-4. Summary of Predicted 2040 Traffic Noise Levels – No Build Alternative3.8-7

Table 3.8-5. Summary of Potential Noise Impacts for the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.8-7

Table 3.9-1. Acreage Summary of BLM VRM Classes in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Purple, Green, and Orange Alternatives3.9-3

Table 3.9-2. Acreage Summary of BLM VRM Classes in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.9-5

Table 3.10-1. National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Criteria Pollutants3.10-2

Table 3.13-1. Active Management Areas in the 2,000-foot-wide Build Corridor Alternatives3.13-28

Table 3.13-2. Sole Source Aquifers in the 2,000-foot-wide Build Corridor Alternatives3.13-29



Table 3.13-3. Groundwater Wells in the 2,000-foot-wide Build Corridor Alternatives3.13-30

Table 3.13-4. Miles of Impaired Waters in Proximity to the 2,000-foot-wide Build Corridor Alternatives3.13-30

Table 3.13-5. Miles of Potential Waters of the US in the 2,000-foot-wide Build Corridor Alternatives3.13-31

Table 3.13-6. Acres of National Wetlands Inventory Wetlands and Key Potential Wetlands in the 2,000-foot-wide Build Corridor Alternatives.....3.13-32

Table 3.13-7. Acres of FEMA Floodplains in the 2,000-foot-wide Build Corridor Alternatives3.13-33

Table 3.13-8. Comparison of the Potential Impacts on Water Resources in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Purple, Green, and Orange Alternatives3.13-48

Table 3.13-9. Comparison of the Potential Impacts on Water Resources in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended Alternative to the Purple, Green, and Orange Alternatives3.13-48

Table 3.13-10. Comparison of the Potential Impacts on Water Resources in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.13-48

Table 3.14-1. Summary of Biotic Communities and Acreage in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.14-4

Table 3.14-2. Acreage of Riparian and Important Bird Area Habitats in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives.....3.14-8

Table 3.14-3. Summary of Large Intact Block Fragmentation and Area (hectares) in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives3.14-11

Table 3.14-4. Summary of Area (hectares) of Fragments Lost from Existing Large Intact Blocks in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives 3.14-13

Table 3.17-1. Additions to Draft Tier 1 EIS Table 3.17-2 (Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions).....3.17-4

Table 4-1. Potential Parks, Recreation Areas, and Wildlife/Waterfowl Refuges in the Corridor Study Area4-14

Table 4-2. Historic Sites in the Corridor Study Area4-39

Table 4-3. Section 4(f) Properties Outside the Build Corridor Alternatives Where No Use Would Occur4-46

Table 4-4. Section 4(f) Properties in the Build Corridor Alternatives (Potential Use).....4-53

Table 4-5. Summary of Use by Build Corridor Alternatives4-57

Table 4-6. Summary of Comments from Officials with Jurisdiction Over Section 4(f) Properties.....4-114



Table 5-1. Public Hearings (2019)5-3

Table 5-2. Source of Comments5-6

Table 5-3. Form of Comments5-7

Table 5-4. Agency Coordination Opportunities5-8

Table 5-5. Tribal Engagement (2019–2020)5-9

Table 6-1. Miles of Waters of the US in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the
Recommended and Preferred Alternatives6-25

Table 6-2. Characteristics of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives6-36

Table 6-3. Considerations in Meeting the I-11 Purpose and Need: Recommended and
Preferred Alternatives6-36

Table 6-4. Comparison of Resources in the 2,000-foot-wide Corridors of the
Recommended and Preferred Alternatives6-38

Table 6-5. Total Project Cost of the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives6-40

Table 6-6. Annual Maintenance Costs for the Recommended and Preferred Alternatives6-41

Table 7-1. Mitigation and Tier 2 Commitments7-3



Acronyms

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| AAC | Arizona Administrative Code |
| ACEC | Area of Critical Environmental Concern |
| ACHP | Advisory Council on Historic Preservation |
| ADA | Americans with Disabilities Act |
| ADEQ | Arizona Department of Environmental Quality |
| ADOT | Arizona Department of Transportation |
| ADWR | Arizona Department of Water Resources |
| AGFD | Arizona Game and Fish Department |
| amsl | Above Mean Sea Level |
| ARS | Arizona Revised Statute |
| ASLD | Arizona State Land Department |
| ASTM | ASTM International |
| AWLWG | Arizona Wildlife Linkages Working Group |
| AZDA | Arizona Department of Agriculture |
| AZGS | Arizona Geological Survey |
| AZPDES | Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System |
| AZTDM | Arizona Statewide Travel Demand Model |
| BLM | Bureau of Land Management |
| BNSF | Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad |
| BUILD | Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development |
| CAA | Clean Air Act |
| CAG | Central Arizona Governments |
| CAP | Central Arizona Project |
| CAVSARP | Central Area Valley Storage and Recovery Project |
| CAWCD | Central Arizona Water Conservation District |
| CDP | Census Designated Place |
| CEQ | Council on Environmental Quality |
| CERCLA | Comprehensive Environmental Resource Conservation and Liability Act |
| CESA | Cumulative Effects Study Area |
| CFR | Code of Federal Regulations |
| CO | Carbon Monoxide |
| CO ₂ | Carbon Dioxide |



| | |
|----------|--|
| CT | Census Tract |
| CWA | Clean Water Act |
| dBA | a-weighted decibel |
| DOI | US Department of the Interior |
| DOT | Department of Transportation |
| EIS | Environmental Impact Statement |
| EO | Executive Order |
| EPA | Environmental Protection Agency |
| ERMA | Extensive Recreation Management Area |
| ESA | Endangered Species Act |
| FAA | Federal Aviation Administration |
| FAST Act | Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act |
| FEMA | Federal Emergency Management Agency |
| FHWA | Federal Highway Administration |
| FPPA | Farmland Protection Policy Act |
| FR | Federal Register |
| FRA | Federal Railroad Administration |
| FTA | Federal Transit Administration |
| FUDS | Formerly Used Defense Site |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| HDMS | Heritage Data Management System |
| I | Interstate |
| KOP | Key Observation Point |
| LE | Listed as Endangered under the ESA |
| LEDPA | Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative |
| LIB | Large Intact Block |
| LOS | Level of Service |
| LT | Listed as Threatened under the ESA |
| LU | Landscape Unit |
| LUST | Leaking Underground Storage Tank |
| LWCFA | Land and Water Conservation Fund Act |
| MAG | Maricopa Association of Government |
| MAP-21 | Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act |
| MBTA | Migratory Bird Treaty Act |



| | |
|-------------------|---|
| mph | miles per hour |
| MPO | Metropolitan Planning Organization |
| MS4 | Municipal Separate Stormwater Sewer System |
| MSAT | Mobile Source Air Toxic |
| N/A | Not Applicable |
| NAAQS | National Ambient Air Quality Standards |
| NAC | Noise Abatement Criteria |
| NAR | Noise Abatement Requirements |
| NDOT | Nevada Department of Transportation |
| NEPA | National Environmental Policy Act |
| NHL | National Historic Landmark |
| NHPA | National Historic Preservation Act |
| NO ₂ | Nitrogen Dioxide |
| NPDES | National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System |
| NPS | National Park Service |
| NRCS | Natural Resources Conservation Service |
| NRHP | National Register of Historic Places |
| NWI | National Wetlands Inventory |
| O ₃ | Ozone |
| °C | degrees Celsius |
| °F | degrees Fahrenheit |
| PAG | Pima Association of Governments |
| PEL | Planning and Environmental Linkage |
| PM | Particulate Matter |
| PM ₁₀ | Particulate Matter less than ten microns |
| PM _{2.5} | Particulate Matter less than 2.5 microns |
| ppb | parts per billion |
| ppm | parts per million |
| Project Team | Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Department of Transportation, and their consultants |
| RCRA | Resource Conservation and Recovery Act |
| REMI | Regional Economic Models, Inc. |
| RMP | Resource Management Plan |
| RMZ | Recreation Management Zone |



| | |
|--------------|--|
| RTC | Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada |
| RTP | Regional Transportation Plan |
| SAFETEA-LU | Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users |
| SAVSARP | Southern Area Valley Storage and Recovery Project |
| SCMPO | Sun Corridor Metropolitan Planning Organization |
| SDWA | Safe Drinking Water Act |
| SEAGO | South Eastern Arizona Governments Organization |
| Section 106 | Portion of the National Historic Preservation Act |
| Section 6(f) | Section of the 1965 Land and Water Conservation Fund Act |
| SERI | Species of Economic and Recreational Importance |
| SGCN | Species of Greatest Conservation Need |
| SHPO | State Historic Preservation Office |
| SIP | State Implementation Plan |
| SPRR | Southern Pacific Railroad |
| SR | State Route |
| SRMA | Special Recreation Management Area |
| STIP | State Transportation Improvement Program |
| STRAHNET | Strategic Highway Network |
| Study Area | I-11 Corridor Study Area |
| SWAP | Arizona State Wildlife Action Plan 2012–2022 |
| TIP | Transportation Improvement Plan |
| TNM | Traffic Noise Model |
| UPRR | Union Pacific Railroad |
| US | United States |
| US Institute | US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution |
| USACE | United States Corps of Engineers |
| USAF | United States Air Force |
| U.S.C. | United States Code |
| USDA | United States Department of Agriculture |
| USDOT | United States Department of Transportation |
| USEPA | United States Environmental Protection Agency |
| USFS | United States Forest Service |
| USFWS | United States Fish and Wildlife Service |



| | |
|-------|--|
| USGS | United States Geological Survey |
| UST | Underground Storage Tank |
| VP | Viewpoint |
| VRM | Visual Resource Management |
| WQARF | Water Quality Assurance Revolving Fund |



This page intentionally left blank.