



NORTH

- Corridor 1:** Begin following MAG Alt 3, Tie to US 60 North of Queen Creek(QC) Wash
- Corridor 2:** Begin following MAG Alt 3, Tie to US 60/SR 79 near Florence Junction
- Corridor 3:** Begin following MAG Alt 7, Tie to US 60/SR 79 near Florence Junction
- Corridor 4:** Begin following MAG Alt 3, Head south, west of CAP Cross CAP south of QC Wash Connect to US 60/SR 79 south of QC Wash
- US 60 Realignment Corridor**

- DRAFT -
 Preliminary Planning Document
 Not for Public Distribution:
 Concepts are preliminary and
 subject to change/modification.

03-04-08



**Williams Gateway Freeway
Evaluation of Tier 1 Corridor**

04/08/2008

Tier 1 Criteria	Description	Potential Performance Measures	Corridor 1	Corridor 2	Corridor 3	Corridor 4	Comments
Mobility	Regional Connectivity	Provides east-west, high-speed regional connectivity. Provides seamless connections with existing or planned regional facilities.	2 1	3 3	3 3	3 3	Corridor 4 provides a wider regional connectivity by serving larger areas to the east (Globe) and south, but provides less direct east-west connectivity. Corridors 2 and 3 provide more regional access/connectivity than Corridor 1. Corridor 1 connects to US 60 too far north of Florence Junction.
	Separation of Regional Freeways	Lateral separation between freeways and freeway-to-freeway system interchanges.	1	2	3	4	Corridor 4 provides better separation from US 60 in the south and west direction. Corridor 2 somewhat parallels US 60 west of Florence Junction for a distance. Corridor 3 provides greater separation from US 60 than Corridor 2. Corridor 1 would create a system TI just north of Florence Junction, which may create a potential bottleneck.
	Accommodate Multi-Modal Transportation	Accommodate multi-modal or alternative mode of transportation either parallel to or crossing the freeway.	4	4	4	4	All the alternatives provide equal opportunities to accommodate multi-modal modes of transportation.
	Facilitates local network connectivity within the study limits	Use of non-section-line alignment(s) to avoid conflicts and promote compatibility with local street infrastructure. Absence of potential bottlenecks.	3	3	3	3	Initially, there was an assumption that the Queen Creek Wash and the CAP canal are barriers that are expensive to cross. In discussions with agency stakeholders, it is assumed that these are not prohibitive barriers, and that all potential street networks can tie to the proposed corridors equally.
Land Use	Supports Superstition Vistas/ASLD land use based on past development patterns	Directness and quality of access to major economic nodes in the area.	2	4	4	3	Both Corridors 2 and 3 cross through Superstition Vista lands, on both sides of the Queen Creek Wash. Corridor 4, while not capturing the areas north of Queen Creek Wash, covers a wide area of the potential development. Corridor 1, being so far north and close to US 60, provides the least amount of potential new access to these lands. Finally, ASLD supports Corridor 2 in meeting the future demand for Superstition Vista.
	Supports Area Local Development Plan (Williams Gateway Area Strategic Development Plan, GM Proving Grounds, and Phoenix-Mesa Airport Master Plan) Objectives	Contribution to achievement of specific objectives listed in various regional, published development plans.	4	4	3	4	Corridor 3 is further south than desired to achieve this goal.
	Supports existing land use in Pinal County	Amount of adjacent employment; number of dwelling units within close proximity of the corridor.	2	3	3	4	This criteria is based on being adjacent to the highest level of existing development. Currently within this study area, this is focused near Queen Creek.
	Supports existing land use in Maricopa County	Amount of adjacent employment; number of dwelling units within close proximity of the corridor.	4	4	2	4	Corridors 1, 2 & 4 are adjacent to employment areas.
	Residential/Commercial Impacts	Impacts to existing residential/commercial developments	2	2	1	1	Evaluations based on current developments/impacts within the various corridors.
	Consistent with Pinal County Comprehensive Plan (Future Improvements)	Consistency of corridor with proposed circulation network and planned service to activity centers.	2	3	1	4	
	Consistent with Maricopa County Comprehensive Plan (Future Improvements)	Consistency of corridor with proposed circulation network and planned service to activity centers.	4	4	2	4	

Note: Least Desirable = 1
Most Desirable = 4

**Williams Gateway Freeway
Evaluation of Tier 1 Corridor**

04/08/2008

Tier 1 Criteria	Description	Potential Performance Measures	Corridor 1	Corridor 2	Corridor 3	Corridor 4	Comments
Environmental Compatibility	Natural (e.g., biological, geological, Water resources)	Relative impacts to: sensitive wildlife or habitat; water resources including flood retarding structures, floodplains/floodpools, and potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S.; and known sensitive geological formations or areas.	4	2	2	3	Corridor 1 has the least impact to major washes with no new crossings. Corridor 4 will cross the Queen Creek Wash in an area that is already highly disturbed, avoiding the wider, natural segments of the Wash. Corridors 2 & 3 would require new crossings of the Queen Creek Wash in areas that are currently natural and undisturbed.
	Physical (e.g., cultural, historic, recreational, noise, air, hazardous materials)	Relative impacts to: known cultural or historic resources; existing or planned recreational areas or rails; or proximity to sensitive customers; hazardous material sites.	4	2	1	2	Corridor 3 <i>directly</i> impacts known cultural sites in Maricopa County. Corridors 2 & 3 may impact potential cultural sites along Queen Creek Wash, however, at this time there are no direct known conflicts. At this time, there are no anticipated conflicts with Corridor 1. Both Corridors 3 and 4 would have potential noise impacts due to proximity to existing residential sites.
	Socioeconomic (e.g., environmental Justice)	Impacts to protected populations.	3	3	3	3	All alternatives potentially impact protected populations.
Community Input	Consistent with input from agencies and stakeholders (consistent with Scoping Report Issues, Concerns, and Opportunities [ICOs])	Quantity and cogency of supportive quality or state of being persuasive comments from agencies and stakeholders.	1	4	2	3	
	Consistent with input from local residents (Scoping Report ICOs)	Quantity and cogency of supportive comments from local residents.					(No basis for judgment at this time)
		Total:	43	50	40	52	

Note: Least Desirable = 1
Most Desirable = 4