ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING
Results Memorandum

Sunset Road: Silverbell Road to I-10 Eastbound Frontage Road – Segment I,
Pima County
Project No. 4RTSUN

Screening Process Description

- **Geotechnical boring locations and site access issues** were discussed at the project site November 19, 2013. Attendees included NCS, PC Cultural, PCDOT, and EcoPlan.

- **Project Kickoff Meeting** was held on December 3, 2013. Attendees included representatives from Pima County and project consultants. The project was described briefly (Figure 1. Project Location) and the project-related roles and responsibilities were generally outlined. The meeting was followed by site visit as shown in Figure 2. Project Vicinity.

- **Environmental Coordination Meeting** was held on December 12, 2013. Attendees included representatives from Pima County, cooperating governments (City of Tucson and the Town of Marana), regulatory agencies (USACE and USFWS), and consultants from SGI, EcoPlan, and LJ Design. Meeting discussions focused on environmental and related technical issues, including required environmental documents and their sequence of submittal. Meeting agenda and minutes are attached.

- **USACE Agency Coordination Meetings** concerning Section 404 permitting issues were held on 12/19/2013 (preliminary discussion of key topics), and on 1/23/2014 (discussion of preliminary PJD and potential wetlands findings).

- **Biology Site Evaluation** EcoPlan reviewed the USFWS and AGFD databases to determine the presence of protected/listed/threatened and endangered species within the project area.

- **Cultural Resources Class I Inventory and Class III Survey** have been completed for the project area and are discussed in the Tres Rios del Norte – El Corazon Report (William Self Associates, November, 2012). Phase I (testing) is scheduled to be complete by the end of February 2014. Phase II (data recovery) will proceed at a later date TBD.

Identification of Technical Studies Completed During Screening Process

- A final Biological Evaluation report will be submitted to PCDOT in June 2014

- A final Preliminary Initial Site Assessment will be submitted to PCDOT (pending).

- A final Wetland Delineation and Jurisdictional Determination of Waters of the United States (Document was submitted to Pima County for review on 1/27/14) is expected to be submitted to USACE in February 2014.
Cultural Resources Class I inventory and Class III survey for the project have been completed (William Self Associates, November, 2012), testing and data recovery are underway.

Environmental Issues Identified During Screening Process

Biology

- Special Status Species occurring in the project area include: yellow-billed cuckoo, fulvous whistling-duck, western narrow-mouthed toad, cave myotis (bat species), Tumamoc globetberry, and a bat colony (no status).

- Native Plants. Removal of protected native vegetation, including cacti and desert trees and shrubs in the project area. Mitigation requirements will be based on the Pima County Environmentally Sensitive Roadway (ESR) process and FCD Floodplain Use Permit requirements. Mitigation measures outlined in the Clean Water Act, Section 404 are also applicable, typically through an In Lieu Fee (ILF).

- The Biological Evaluation report will address the presence of potentially listed, protected, and sensitive plants and animals. Coordination will occur as appropriate with the AGFD, and USFWS. The AGFD On-line Environmental Review Tool, USFWS Environmental Conservation Online System), and Pima County Multispecies Conservation Plan were consulted.

- Native plant inventory, and landscaping and mitigation plans will be developed in coordination with PC Cultural to avoid conflicts to studies in both disciplines.

Hazardous Materials

- A PISA (pending) will be conducted for the full project area, which will address known historical sand and gravel operations, agricultural use and dairy operations, as well as current placement of excavated material from another Pima County construction project in the old Sunset Pit. Should acquisition of a private parcel adjacent to Silverbell Road require demolition of structures, a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (pending) will be conducted for the property. The Phase I will include recommendations about whether asbestos and lead-based paint testing will be needed prior to demolition. PISA submittal is expected to PCDOT in spring 2014.

Section 401 and Section 404

- Field investigations regarding potentially jurisdictional wetlands and Waters of the U.S. within the project area were conducted throughout project area. A Wetland Delineation and Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination will be submitted to USACE in February 2014. Preliminary results indicate potential jurisdictional waters and special aquatic sites/wetlands.
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- A determination of permit type required (Nationwide or Individual) is expected to be made in the spring of 2014. The permit type chosen will be based on results of the PJD, and project engineering plan development. The PJD to be submitted to USACE for review in February 2014.

- If an Individual 404 permit is needed, a Section 401 State Water Quality Certification application must prepared and be submitted to ADEQ.

**Cultural**

- Cultural coordination with geotechnical studies for access and monitoring.

- Cultural testing and data recovery for full project area is underway by SWCA.

- The majority of the planned alignment crosses known cultural sites between the Santa Cruz River and I-10. Consultation has occurred for the area referred to as Tres Rios Del Norte. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has concurred with monitoring for future geotechnical studies and data recovery for the sites. Cultural testing began in January 2014. The testing and data recovery will cover the project limits west of I-10 to the river, in an area large enough to accommodate potential roadway design needs.

- Future Section 106 consultation may occur to designate the area along Silverbell Road as a Historic District. At present the USACE has no project along Silverbell Road to trigger a Programmatic Agreement for the Historic District. It is anticipated that the Sunset Road project will move forward prior to establishment of the Historic District.

- There is only one residence within the project area, and it is thought to be less than 50 years old. Current project plans do overlap a portion of the property, but avoid structures on the property.

*Suggestions on Addressing Issues through Design Modifications and/or Alternative Investigation*

- Impacts to cultural resources will be minimized or avoided by removal of key cultural site features during data recovery to be executed prior to construction.

- Design alternatives should be developed that avoid or minimize impacts to Wetlands and jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. in order to allow for a Section 404 Nationwide Permit and avoid the need for an Individual Permit. An IP will have higher impact to project budget and schedule.

- There is an overlap between PCRFCD and USACE mitigation needs. Both entities will need to be addressed, likely through an in-lieu fee for the USACE, with mitigation for PCRFCD through either on-site mitigation or in-lieu fee. This will be determined at a later date.
Identification of Any Additional Technical Analyses Needed

Technical analyses beyond the original scope of work for the Environmental Assessment and Mitigation Report are not necessary.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Project limits suitable for environmental clearance: Y ☑ N ☐

Limitations: Y ☑ N ☐ if yes, describe:

- Mitigation measures recommended by USACE.
- Mitigation measures for cultural monitoring and discovery

Follow-up actions: Y ☑ N ☐ if yes, describe:

- Section 404/401 Permitting
- Cultural testing and data recovery

Approval:

Environmental and Transportation Planning Division

Engineering Division: ________________________________

Environmental Planning Branch: ____________________

Attachments

1. Figure 1. Project Location
2. Figure 2. Project Vicinity
3. Completed Environmental Questionnaire
4. Environmental Impact Screening Summary Matrix
5. Environmental coordination meeting agenda and meeting minutes
6. Kickoff meeting agenda and meeting minutes
7. Cultural concurrence letter
8. AGFD On-Line Environmental Review Tool Receipt
9. USFWS Environmental Conservation Online System Results
Environmental Screening
Questionnaire for Establishing Potential Areas of Impact

INTRODUCTORY INFORMATION

Project Identification

• Project Name: Sunset Road: Silverbell Road to I-10 Eastbound Frontage Road – Segment I
• Pima County Project Manager: Jason Bahe

Project Location and Limits

• Location of project in Pima County: The project is in northeastern Pima County in the Tucson metropolitan area. Project limits include a very small segment within the City of Tucson, west of I-10 and just south of Sunset Road. The remainder of the project is in unincorporated county land. Town of Marana limits are about 1,500 feet to the northwest. The Town of Oro Valley limits are approximately 4 miles to the northeast. (See Figure 1 and 2 for project location).
• Limits of project: Sunset Road alignment from Silverbell Road to I-10 frontage road.

From end to end: Approximately 2,960 feet from connection to the I-10 frontage road to Silverbell Road.

From side to side: The planned future right-of-way (ROW) is 75 feet north and south of roadway centerline, total ROW width is 150 feet. The majority of the land needed for ROW is owned by Pima County Regional Flood Control District. One private parcel may be acquired between Silverbell Road and the Santa Cruz River.

Funding Source

• Funding source anticipated for use in construction project?

  County funding: Y ☒  N ☐
  Funding through: Pima County Department of Transportation (PCDOT) Project No.: 4RTSUN (Sunset Road: Silverbell Road to I-10 Eastbound Frontage Road – Segment I), Impact Fees and Pima Association of Governments Regional Transportation Authority Plan.

  Federal funding: Y ☐  N ☒
  No federal funding is programmed to date.

Other: Project is listed in the Pima County Association of Governments (PAG) Regional Transportation Plan—Sunset Road: Silverbell to I-10 to River, with a total cost of $24.8
Cost for Segment 1 alone is not currently available. Funding is also provided by the City of Tucson.

Source: Pima Association of Governments Transportation Improvement Program; 2014-2018 TIP, 5-Year Regional Transportation Improvement Program, adopted May, 2013.

Primary Project Purpose

- Primary purpose of project: This project will provide a new connection between Silverbell Road and Interstate 10 (I-10) to replace a previous bridge/connection that washed out during floods in 1983. The connection is critical to meet future travel demand needs and provide relief during re-construction of I-10 and the traffic interchanges at Ina Road and Ruthrauff Road.

  Modernize roadway: Y ☒ N ☐
  Increase capacity: Y ☒ N ☐
  Add bicycle lanes: Y ☒ N ☐
  Improve safety: Y ☒ N ☐

  Other: A bridge over the Santa Cruz River constructed at this location will provide a new all-weather crossing of the Santa Cruz River. It will also provide additional access to I-10 and traffic relief for future planned roadway projects.

Existing Conditions within Project Limits

- Roadway specifications?

  No roadway currently exists on the Sunset Road alignment. A prefabricated truss bridge over the river was destroyed during a flood event in October 1983. No structural components of that crossing remain. The remnants of the old Sunset roadway are primarily dirt, and only provide access to the Cal-Portland Company sand and gravel mining operation.

  The Santa Cruz River dominates the environment within the existing project site. A majority of the area is within the 100-year floodplain of the River, and the incised river channel prevents east-west access through the project area. The River within the project area is a relatively low gradient stream, dominated by shallow riffles over a sand and gravel substrate, flowing southeast to northwest. Surface drainage throughout the area is unimproved with no culverts, outfalls, or other drainage structures.

  Much of the area east of the River has been heavily disturbed by sand and gravel mining and off-road vehicles. The area west of the river is less disturbed, but includes multiple dirt roads and overhead power transmission lines and towers. Riparian vegetation is confined to areas
immediately adjacent to the Santa Cruz River. Upland vegetation is found throughout the project area in undisturbed areas.

Right-of-way: None.
Pavement width: NA
Number of through lanes in each direction: NA

- Number of turning lanes? NA
  Right-turn lanes: NA
  Left-turn lanes: NA
  Middle-turn lanes: NA

- Existing intersections?
  Number of signalized intersections: NA
  Number of unsignalized intersections: NA

Existing parking (e.g. on-street) Y □ N □

- Existing bike lanes? Y □ N □
- Existing sidewalk? Y □ N □
- Existing transit stops? Y □ N □
- Other: No public roadway currently exists on the planned Sunset Road alignment.

Project Components

- Anticipated specifications of the project? The project design is in the conceptual stages, thus detailed specifications are not available.

Amount of additional right-of-way to be acquired: A ROW transfer action between PCRFCD and PCDOT will be required.

Under 1 acre: □
1–5 acres: □
5–10 acres: □
Over 10 acres: × Approximately 2960 linear feet (Segment I only) of new roadway within a 150-foot ROW = 10.2 acres. This does not include possible acquisition of a private parcel at Silverbell Road. The determination of a full or partial acquisition of the private property is to be determined.

Change in the vertical or horizontal alignment: Y □ N □ NA
Connections between the new road and Silverbell Road and I-10 Frontage Road are expected to be made at existing grade. The bridged crossing of the Santa Cruz River will be elevated above the 100 year flood limits and allow for future multi-modal paths under the bridge along the river.

New alignment: Y ☐ N ☑

The project will extend Sunset Road from its current terminus at the I-10 frontage road to Silverbell Road, with a bridge crossing at Santa Cruz River.

Pavement width to be added: Planned pavement width = 66 feet, including 20 feet of pavement for two 10-foot wide multiuse paths.

Number of through lanes to be added: Two, one in each direction (11 foot lane widths).

Number of turn lanes to be added: Turning lanes at Silverbell Road and I-10 Frontage Road are to be determined.

Right-turn lanes: None

Left-turn lanes: None

Middle-turn lanes: One center turn lane (12 foot width)

Any associated parking (e.g., on-street): Y ☑ N ☐

Bicycle lanes to be added: Y ☐ N ☑ Paved cross-section will include 6-foot paved shoulder in each direction.

Sidewalk to be added: Y ☑ N ☐ A separate 10-foot paved multi-use path will be included on both sides of the roadway.

Landscaping to be added: Y ☑ N ☐

• Number of intersections to be signalized: It is anticipated that the Sunset/Silverbell Road intersection will be signalized. The need for a signal at Sunset/I-10 Frontage Road is to be determined.

Phasing

• Is the project:

A portion of a unified development plan? Y ☐ N ☑

The project is in the Regional Transportation Authority Plan (approved 2006). The Silverbell Road to I-10 Frontage Road is defined as Segment 1. Segment 2 is defined as from just west of I-10 Frontage Road to River Road. Thus, there is a slight overlap between the 2 segments.
One of a series of projects that may result in a cumulative set of environmental impacts on an identifiable area? Y ☑ N ☐

Traffic
• Existing average daily traffic (ADT) in the project area?
  Sunset Road is a new planned road, thus no traffic report is available. Traffic analysis for the connecting Silverbell Road and I-10 Frontage Road is not currently available.
• Projected ADT in the project area for the build year? To be determined through traffic analysis report.

Land Uses
• Existing adjacent land uses? Check all that apply and circle primary uses.
  Commercial (e.g., retail businesses, service businesses): Y ☐ N ☑
  Institutional (e.g., schools, hospitals, social services agencies): Y ☐ N ☑
  Residential (e.g., single-family houses, apartments, townhouses): Y ☑ N ☐
  Low density residential land use. There is a single residence east of Silverbell Road and several residences just west of Silverbell Road near the planned Sunset Road connection.
  Vacant lots: Y ☑ N ☐
  Lands within project area are primarily former sand and gravel mine areas or vacant lands.
  Industrial (e.g., light industry, heavy industry): Y ☑ N ☐ Cal–Portland Company (Sand and Gravel Mining)
  Recreational (e.g., parks, sports fields): Y ☑ N ☑
Source: Field reconnaissance and Pima County assessor’s records

Property Ownership
• Existing land ownership
  Majority public: ☑ Owned by Pima County, with a lease back agreement to Cal–Portland Company.
  Majority private: ☐
  About evenly divided between public and private: ☐
Source: Pima County Assessor’s records
ENVIRONMENTAL CATEGORIES

Drainage

• Will any storm water drain from the project discharge into detention or retention basins on site? Y ☒ N ☒

There are no existing detention or retention basins and the need for basins has not been determined. The planned roadway alignment crosses a large former mining pit that collects storm run-off. A portion of that pit will be filled for the roadway crossing; eventually the entire pit will be filled and leveled.

Section 401/404

• Are any culverts likely to be installed, replaced, or extended? Y ☒ N ☒
  Throughout project area, to allow normal surface flow

• Are there any bridges being upgraded, extended, or replaced? Y ☒ N ☒
  A new bridge over the Santa Cruz River will be added.

• Is there any bank protection required in the construction of this project? Y ☒ N ☒
  The need for bank protection or other measures to protect the bridge will be determined during design.

• Are there any wetlands within the project area? Y ☒ N ☒
  There are potential wetland features and other Waters of the US (including Santa Cruz River) within the project area. Submittal of the Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation is pending.
  Is it anticipated that there will be any discharge of dredged or fill material into “Waters of the United States”? Y ☒ N ☒
  Avoidance of Waters of the U.S. and wetlands is a project goal. However, it is expected that some impacts to Waters of the U.S. will occur and be addressed through the Section 404/401 permitting process.

Source: Field reconnaissance; Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination under development (EcoPlan, 2013).

Floodplain

• Is the project area within a 100-year floodplain delineated on the Federal Emergency Flood Insurance Rate Map? Y ☒ N ☒
  FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map #04019C 1666L, June 16, 2011.
If “yes,” will the project substantially modify the topography of the floodplain either by placement or removal of materials within the floodplain? Y ☑️ N ☐️ Impacts to the floodplain will be determined during the drainage analysis and roadway design.

Source: Preliminary design discussion with Pima County and Structural Grace, Inc.

**Biological Resources**

- Are there listed threatened, endangered, proposed, and/or candidate species likely to be found in the project vicinity? Y ☑️ N ☐️
  
  A Biological Evaluation for the area has not yet been conducted. Listed threatened, endangered or proposed and/or candidate species have been identified within 3 miles of the project area. Species of interest include: Lessor long-nosed bat, yellow-billed cuckoo, western narrow-mouthed toad, and migratory birds.

  Source: USFWS Arizona Ecological Services – Arizona Federally Listed Species in Pima County, October 2013.

- Are listed special status species likely to be found in the project vicinity? Y ☑️ N ☐️

- Are protected native plants likely to be found in the project vicinity? Y ☑️ N ☐️

- Are construction activities anticipated to remove/disturb any vegetation? Y ☑️ N ☐️

- Is the project within the Conservation Land System? Y ☑️ N ☐️
  
  Designated as an Important Riparian Habitat within the Santa Cruz River floodplain and Biological Core Area along the eastern edge of the floodplain.

- Is the project along a designated Scenic Route? Y ☑️ N ☐️
  
  While no roadway currently exists the project development will follow the Environmentally Sensitive Roadway guidelines


**Air Quality**

- Is the project in an:

  *Attainment area? Y ☑️ N ☐️*

  *Nonattainment area? Y ☑️ N ☐️*

  If “yes,” what are the pollutants of concern?

  *Maintenance area? Y ☑️ N ☐️* If “yes,” what are the pollutants of concern? Carbon monoxide.
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Source: Pima Association of Governments:

Noise

- Are there sensitive noise receptors in the area? Y ☒ N ☐
  If “yes,” identify type of noise receptors and briefly describe:

  Residences: There are single-family residences along Silverbell Road near the proposed Sunset Road-Silverbell Road intersection.

  Schools: None.

  Churches: None.

  Other: None.

- When the project is completed and used as anticipated, is it likely to contribute to an exceeded level of noise quality standards. Y ☐ N ☒
  A noise analysis is not yet available. The extent of impacts and ability to mitigate is to be determined. A noise analysis will be conducted for the project.

Source: Field reconnaissance, aerial photo review, Pima County MapGuide.

Utilities

- Will the construction include any utility involvement? Y ☒ N ☐
  If “yes,” what kind of work is anticipated?

  Utility relocation: To be determined. Multiple types of utilities are believed to be present, including overhead power, water, and wastewater.

  Temporary disconnection of service: To be determined.

  Utility replacement: To be determined.

- Are there any scheduled plans for utility upgrades in the vicinity that are not related to the project? Y ☐ N ☐ To be determined
  Unknown at this time. Coordination with utility companies will occur throughout design.

Hazardous Materials

- Is it likely that any hazardous wastes or hazardous substances in the past have been generated, treated, stored, released, discarded or disposed of on site or are any such wastes now accumulated on site? Y ☐ N ☐ Don’t know ☒
A Preliminary Initial Site Assessment (PISA) will be prepared to determine the potential for the presence of hazardous materials. Past land uses have included sand and gravel mine, agriculture, and a dump site associated with a former dairy.

Have any test borings been performed? Y □ N ☑

No test borings have been conducted for the discovery of hazardous materials.

If “yes,” were any wastes discovered on the premises in the course of the test borings or excavation work for the project? Y □ N □ NA

Source: Field reconnaissance and discussions with Pima County.

Historic Preservation

Are there any cultural resources (archaeological or historic) in the vicinity of the project area that are listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places? Y ☑ N □

Are any of the sites considered “Priority Cultural Resources”? Y ☑ N □

If the answer is “yes” to either or both of the preceding questions, please list the resource(s)/site(s): See Tres Rios Del Norte – El Corazon Cultural Resources Report prepared by William Self Associates, November, 2012.

Of those properties listed or eligible, are any located near enough to the project to be affected by the project location, construction, or anticipated future traffic? Y ☑ N □

Are there any structures likely to be 50 years old or older in, or adjacent to, the project area? Y □ N ☑

If “yes,” please list addresses below:

Sources: Tres Rios Del Norte – El Corazon Cultural Resources Report prepared by William Self Associates, November, 2012. Cultural Consultation by Pima County has been completed on the survey report (January 11, 2013). The consultation recommended monitoring during preliminary geotechnical testing and a testing and data recovery plan will be implemented in early 2014.

Visual Impact

Is the project likely to affect noticeably the views from adjacent properties? Y ☑ N □

If “yes,” briefly describe: The new roadway and bridge over the Santa Cruz River will be visible from the adjacent properties; however, the bridge structure should not impact distant views.
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- Is the project likely to cause a noticeable change in the foreground, middle-ground, or background views from the road? Y ☑ N ☐
  A change in the foreground looking northeast could occur for the few residences just west of Silverbell Road adjacent to the project area. The residences located along the Silverbell Road (at a lower elevation and within the project area) will notice a change in the middle-ground view looking northeast. No significant changes to the background views are expected, as the proposed project related structures will not preclude distant views.

Source: Field reconnaissance and preliminary design profiles.

Neighborhood/Social Impact

- Is there likely to be any commercial or residential displacement due to the construction of this project? Y ☑ N ☐ The need for a full property acquisition or partial acquisition will determine whether the single residential property will result in a relocation.

- Are there likely to be any temporary changes in:
  
  Business access: Y ☑ N ☐
  Parking: Y ☑ N ☐

- Are there likely to be any permanent changes in:

  Traffic service: Y ☑ N ☐
  The construction of a new bridged crossing of the Santa Cruz River will provide motorists with an additional option to travel between I-10 and Silverbell Road. This will be vital when the Ina Road Traffic Interchange at I-10 is reconstructed in 2016-2017.

  Traffic circulation: Y ☑ N ☐
  New bridge across the Santa Cruz River will allow access between I-10 and Silverbell Road. Parking: Y ☑ N ☐

- Is the project likely to affect continuity in neighborhoods in the vicinity? Y ☑ N ☐
  Source: Pima County Map Guide and aerial photography review.

LOCAL JURISDICTION/AGENCY COORDINATION

- Are there local jurisdictions and governmental agencies with which coordination is anticipated or has begun? Y ☑ N ☐

  City of Tucson: Department of Transportation
  Town of Marana
  Pima County Department of Transportation
  Pima County Regional Flood Control District
Note any issues for coordination that have been identified to date:

- Project will require Clean Water Act Section 404/401 permit (USACE)
- Riparian and wetland habitats are present along the Santa Cruz River (USACE, PCRFCD)
- Possible Overhead utility conflict (WAPA)
- Biological resources and protected plant/animal species (USFWS, AZGFD, Az. Department of Agriculture)
- Cultural resource site mitigation (Arizona SHPO, Pima County Cultural Resources and Historic Preservation Office)

Briefly describe coordination efforts planned or under way: The Environmental Coordination meeting occurred on December 12, 2013 (see Meeting Minutes) with local agencies and jurisdictions. A scoping letter is being developed that will be sent to local jurisdictions, agencies, interested parties, and adjacent landowners according to Pima County guidelines.

Source: Environmental Coordination meeting 12/12/2013.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

- Has a Public Involvement Plan been developed for the project? Y ☒ N ☐
  Public Involvement will be coordinated by Pima County and Structural Grace, Inc.

- Has a Citizen Advisory Committee been formed, or is one being formed? Y ☐ N ☒
  There is no Citizen’s Advisory Committee for the project.

- Have any public meetings been scheduled? Y ☐ N ☒
  If “yes,” have any meetings been held to date? Y ☐ N ☒
Public meetings are planned for this project, but have not been scheduled.

- Has any information useful to the project development been identified through public interaction to date? Y [ ] N [ ] NA
  
  If “yes,” briefly describe:

- Is there any known controversy over this project to date? Y [ ] N [ ]
  
  If “yes,” briefly describe:

Source:

PERMITS

- Anticipated permits and/or approvals?
  
  Section 404 Permit: Yes Too early to determine if Nationwide or Individual Permit.

  Section 401 Permit: Yes

  Sole Source Aquifer: No

State Historic Preservation Officer clearance: Yes, Cultural Survey report consultation is complete (January 11, 2013). Testing/Data recovery activities are pending.

Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit (AZDPES): Yes

Pima County Floodplain Use Permit (PCRFCD): Yes

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Permit (PDEQ): Yes, if structure demolition

Construction General Permit AZG2013-001 (ADEQ): Yes

Other: Pima County Roadway Design Manual, Chapter 4 – Environmentally Sensitive Roadway Design Guidelines; Pima County Department of Environmental Quality (Air Quality); Watercourse and Riparian Habitat Protection and Mitigation Requirements (Ordinance 2005-FC2)

Source: Clean Water Act Sections 404 and 401; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; National Historic Preservation Act; Pima County ordinances

Completed by: Michael R. Dawson, Senior Environmental Planner, EcoPlan Associates, Inc.

Date: February 7, 2014
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Figure 1 – Project Location
Figure 2 – Project Vicinity
Impact Summary Matrix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Affected Environmental Categories</th>
<th>Water Quality</th>
<th>100-Year Floodplain</th>
<th>Protected Watersheds</th>
<th>Visual Quality/Viewsheets</th>
<th>Protected Plants/Vegetation</th>
<th>Protected Animals/Wildlife</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Land Uses/Community Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicable to Project</td>
<td>Project Construction and Operation Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in the Vertical or Horizontal Alignment</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Alignment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Capacity (i.e., through lanes)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milling/Grading</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Access (e.g., driveways, intersections)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning and Grubbing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation (TBD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition (TBD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of Additional Right of Way</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Construction Easements</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge of Drudge or Fill Material</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channeling or Dredging</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauling (TBD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Signals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Drainage</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Equipment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detour Route</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = No involvement
X = Potential involvement, but no or minimal impact
M = Potential moderate impact
H = Potential high impact
TBD = To be Determined
NA = Not Applicable
Environmental Coordination Meeting
December 12, 2013, 1:00pm-2:30pm
Pima County Department of Transportation
4th Floor Conference Room
201 N. Stone Ave.
Tucson, AZ

Agenda

Project Overview (Jason Bahe, PCDOT Project Manager)

Cost Model

Technical Reports (Gloria Browne PCDOT / Mike Dawson EcoPlan, and team)

Review process and guidelines/formats for the following items/issues:

- Public Involvement/Scoping
- Biological Evaluation, Native plant inventory, landscaping and mitigation plans
- Preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation/404 Permitting
- Riparian evaluation and Floodplain Use Permit
- Cultural Resources
- Noise Analysis
- Air Quality Report
- Preliminary Initial Site Assessment/Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
- Environmental Screening Summary Matrix/Results Memorandum
- Environmental Assessment and Mitigation Report (EAMR)
- AZPDES Construction General Permit and SWPPP

- Project Schedule
Environmental Coordination Meeting
MINUTES
December 12, 2013, 1:30pm-2:30pm
Pima County Department of Transportation-4th Floor Conference Room, 201 N. Stone Ave.

1. Attendance
   PCDOT-Gloria Brown, Jason Bahe, Ellen Alster
   PC Cultural-Roger Anyon, Ian Milliken
   PC Real Property-Rex Ducher
   PCRFCD-Mike Cabrera, Marisa Rice
   City of Tucson-Jonathan Mabry
   Town of Marana-Paula Bleumer
   USACE-Kevin Grove
   USFWS-Scott Richardson
   SGI-Jim Glock
   EcoPlan-Mike Dawson, Patrick Blair, Anna Neuzil
   LJ Design-Lisa Ribes

2. Overview
   This meeting marked the kickoff for environmental and cultural studies required for the project, and was designed to provide project background information to project team and consulting or interested agencies and jurisdictions. Jason Bahe provided a Project Overview and discussion of the project stages. Mike Dawson briefly outlined the technical reports required for the project.

3. Discussion of Environmental Topics
   - **Public Involvement and Scoping:** Mike Dawson and Patrick Blair will develop the scoping distribution list and letters.
   - **Biological Evaluation:** A Biological Evaluation will be prepared to address potential Endangered Species Act protected plants and animals as well as Pima County Multi-Species Conservation Plan Covered Species. Coordination will occur with the Arizona Game and Fish Department and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Scott Richardson will be lead contact for USFWS. Native plant inventory, and landscaping and mitigation plans will be developed by Lisa Ribes. Lisa will coordinate the winter Releve inventory with Roger Anyon due to planned cultural test trenching planned in January/February 2014. Mitigation requirements will be based on the Pima County Environmentally Sensitive Roadway (ESR) process and FCD Floodplain Use Permit requirements.
   - **Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination/404 Permitting:** Mike Dawson noted the preliminary field work occurred on November 22, 23 2013. This work was conducted in conjunction with USACE (Kevin Grove) and PCRFCD (Mike Cabrera). Preliminary results
indicate the potential presence of special aquatic sites/wetlands. The PJD is expected to be submitted to PCDOT and USACE in early January 2014. Discussion amongst the group determined that the project needs to consider site access options, specifically regarding temporary crossing structures over the Santa Cruz River. A temporary crossing may preferred by contractor and cheaper, but working from either side of the river would likely reduce impacts to Waters of the US. A project goal is to avoid impacts to Waters of the US to the extent practicable. The determination of the need for a Nationwide Permit or Individual Permit will not be known until spring 2014.

- **Riparian Evaluation and Floodplain Use Permit**: The group discussed the overlap of FCD and USACE mitigation needs. Both entities will need to be address, likely through an in-lieu fee for the USACE and on-site mitigation for FCD. This will be determined later.

- **Cultural Resources**: There are two aspects relative cultural resources and the project. The majority of the Sunset Road planned alignment crosses known cultural sites between the Santa Cruz River and I-10. Cultural consultation has occurred for the area referred to as Tres Rios Del Norte. The State Historic Preservation Office has concurred with monitoring for future geotechnical studies and data recovery for the sites. Roger Anyon has a cultural firm under contract and testing is expected to begin in January 2014. The testing and data recovery will cover the Sunset Road project limits west of I-10 to the river, and will include enough area to address potential roadway design needs. In addition Section 106 Consultation is underway to designate area along Silverbell Road as a Historic District. The connection of Sunset Road to Silverbell Road may be affected by the Historic District designation. A pending Programmatic Agreement will be developed by Roger Anyon.

- **Noise Analysis**: Mike Dawson discussed the need for quantitative noise modeling. Due to the limited number of sensitive receptors present and elevated roadways near the receptors mitigation would be difficult and costly. Based on PCDOT noise procedures is it likely the cost per benefited receiver would exceed the allowable costs. The team may wish to consider only conducting a qualitative analysis given fairly certain result of no properties meeting the cost per benefited receiver criteria. This item will need further discussion.

- **Air Quality Report**: Mike Dawson noted a qualitative air quality analysis will be conducted. This analysis will consider the project status in the PAG Regional Air Quality Conformity Analysis and localized dust control measures during construction.

- **Preliminary Initial Site Assessment/Phase I Environmental Site Assessment**: A PISA will be conducted for the full project. A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment will be conducted for the single property on the project site, located along Silverbell Road as needed. At this stage the need for a partial or full acquisition is not known.

- **Environmental Screening Summary Matrix and Results Memorandum**: The matrix and memorandum will be completed in January by EcoPlan (contact Patrick Blair), and submitted to Pima County.

- **Environmental Assessment and Mitigation Report (EAMR)**: The EAMR is due by 07/25/14. This document covers the full range of environmental issues and includes a public review and Board of Supervisors approval.
4. Action Items
   - Mike Dawson and Patrick Blair will develop the scoping distribution list and letters for mailing in January 2014.
   - Patrick Blair to complete Environmental Screening Summary Matrix and Results Memorandum (January 2014)
   - SGI to consider temporary crossing options, and 404 Permit implications
   - Future discussion relative to noise analysis

Design Team Kickoff Meeting  
8:30 AM on December 3, 2013  
Pima County Public Works Building – 4th Floor PCDOT Large Conference Room  
201 N. Stone Avenue  
Tucson, AZ 85701

1. Introductions

2. Overall Big Picture  
   a. Segment I: Silverbell to I-10 – DCR/EAMR & PS&E  
   b. Segment II: West of I-10 to River Road – DCR (No EAMR)

3. Key Assumptions  
   a. No CAC  
   b. No Location Report  
      i. Alignment set (minor adjustments to avoid TBD hot spots)  
   c. Minimal work on I-10 and Silverbell to Segment I  
   d. Federal nexus to be avoided/minimized  
   e. 18 month design  
   f. 12 month construction  
   g. Cultural Resources effort handled separately  
   h. Project features will be the minimum required for functionality  
   i. Heavy coordination between PCRFCD, PCNRPR & PCDOT

4. Day-to-Day Approach to Project Management and Progress  
   a. Issues and Issue Resolutions will be tracked  
   b. Action Item List will be maintained  
   c. No Back Tracking on decisions  
   d. Monthly project progress meetings will be held at beginning of month  
   e. Mid-Monthly Over-the-Shoulder Reviews  
      i. Reports and Segment II plans to be reviewed during these OTS meetings  
   f. Plan submittal workshops to be limited to Segment I:  
      i. DCR/EAMR Level Plans  
      ii. Initial PS&E Level Plans  
      iii. Final PS&E Level Plans  
      iv. Proof of Copy Review
5. Roles and Responsibilities
   a. Keep PC and SGI Project Manager aware of all communications
   b. Identify key contacts for each discipline and any special coordination requests.
   c. Comment Resolution Process to occur at OTS review meetings and documented in real time.
   d. Visiting the site
      i. Stay clear of the mining operations
      ii. Drive only on visible / previous traveled ways
      iii. Lock combination is:  ????
      iv. Respect private property on west side
      v. Wear appropriate PPE (vests and closed toe shoes)
      vi. Watch out for snakes and other animals

6. Critical Coordination Efforts (Outside of PCDOT)
   a. Cultural Resources
      i. Impacts to be avoided where possible
      ii. Recovery to begin ASAP where necessary
   b. PCRFCD
      i. River Analysis coordination
      ii. River Park coordination/accommodation
   c. PCNRPR
      i. Future Park access needs
      ii. Future Park traffic volume estimates
   d. Utilities
      i. Sewer – PCRWRD
      ii. Water – Tucson Water (to be kept to a minimum)
      iii. WAPA – Poles to be avoided
      iv. TEP – Poles to be avoided
   e. ADOT
      i. Segment I connection to I-10
      ii. Segment II connection to I-10

7. Next Steps and ongoing Action Items
   a. Silverbell analysis
   b. Utility kick off
   c. Survey
   d. Set Monthly Progress and OTS Meeting Dates

8. Site Visit
Design Team Kickoff Meeting

MINUTES

8:30 AM on December 3, 2013
Pima County Public Works Building – Basement Room "C"
Tucson, AZ 85701

1. Introductions

Jason Bahe began the meeting at 8:33 am, calling for those present to introduce themselves and who they represent. Attendees were asked to sign in. A form was passed around for those attending to check/update their contact information (sign-in and contact information sheets attached).

2. Overall Big Picture
   a. Segment I: Silverbell to I-10 – DCR/EAMR & PS&E
   b. Segment II: West of I-10 to River Road – DCR (No EAMR)

Glock presented the overall project limits, noting the two differing segments and the overlap between them. He noted that final PS&E will be prepared for Segment I, with its construction to follow as soon as possible. Only a DCR will be prepared for Segment II. A copy of the basic alignment and phasing map is attached.

The following key assumptions were addressed. In addition, Glock noted that the alignment may shift to avoid the Western Area Power Administration poles. WAPA does have a categorical exclusion in place to allow for the replacement of their poles and raising their lines. The schedule is aggressive.

3. Key Assumptions
   a. No CAC
   b. No Location Report
      i. Alignment set (minor adjustments to avoid TBD hot spots)
   c. Minimal work on I-10 and Silverbell with Segment I
   d. Federal nexus to be avoided/minimized
   e. 18 month design
f. 12 month construction  
g. Cultural Resources effort handled separately  
h. Project features will be the minimum required for functionality  
i. Heavy coordination between PCRFCD, PCNRPR & PCDOT  

Design will need to anticipate future park and river-park plans. PCRFCD and PCNRPR will need to provide input on what this project will need to accommodate with respect to those plans that are just conceptual in nature at this point.

The following project management topics were covered.

4. Day-to-Day Approach to Project Management and Progress  
   a. Issues and Issue Resolutions will be tracked  
   b. Action Item List will be maintained  
   c. No Back Tracking on decisions  

Glock presented an example of the Issue / Action Resolution log (attached) that will be used on the project. The goal is to have issues and actions resolved and recorded to avoid backtracking. As an example, after meeting with PCDOT the design year for Segment I was established to be 2025 and 2040 for Segment II.

   d. Monthly project progress meetings will be held at beginning of month  
   e. Mid-Monthly Over-the-Shoulder Reviews  
      i. Reports and Segment II plans to be reviewed during these OTS meetings  

Monthly project progress meetings were tentatively set to be on the first Tuesday of the month at 1:30 pm. Mid-Monthly OTS reviews were tentatively set for the third Tuesday of the month at 1:30 pm. Meetings will be held in the 4th floor Pima County DOT conference room (availability not withstanding).

   f. Plan submittal workshops to be limited to Segment I:  
      i. DCR/EAMR Level Plans  
      ii. Initial PS&E Level Plans  
      iii. Final PS&E Level Plans  
      iv. Proof of Copy Review  

Workshops will only apply to Segment I. Segment II deliverables will be addressed in the Monthly Progress and Over the Should review meetings.

5. Roles and Responsibilities  
   a. Keep PC and SGI Project Manager aware of all communications  

Bahe and Glock noted that they need to be informed/copied of communications between the consultant team and agency staff. Generally, initial contacts should be made through Bahe.
b. Identify key contacts for each discipline and any special coordination requests.
c. Comment Resolution Process to occur at OTS review meetings and documented in real
time.
d. Visiting the site
   i. Stay clear of the mining operations
   ii. Drive only on visible / previous traveled ways
   iii. Lock combination is:  ????
   iv. Respect private property on west side
   v. Wear appropriate PPE (vests and closed toe shoes)
   vi. Watch out for snakes and other animals

6. Critical Coordination Efforts (Outside of PCDOT)
   a. Cultural Resources
      i. Impacts to be avoided where possible
      ii. Recovery to begin ASAP where necessary

Note that much of the area has cultural resources. Do not pick up shards and other
artifacts (which we saw on the afternoon field trip). Recovery should begin shortly.

b. PCRFCD
   i. River Analysis coordination

Note that the Sunset analysis will need to coordinate with El Corazon effort to the south.

   ii. River Park coordination/accommodation

Likewise, river park links need to be coordinated with other efforts.

c. PCNRPR
   i. Future Park access needs
   ii. Future Park traffic volume estimates

There will be the need to estimate potential traffic generation from future park activities
to determine if turn lanes, or pedestrians need special accommodation.

d. Utilities
   i. Sewer – PCRWRD
   ii. Water – Tucson Water (to be kept to a minimum)
   iii. WAPA – Poles to be avoided
   iv. TEP – Poles to be avoided

These are the utilities of concern to-date. A utility meeting will be scheduled for mid-
December
ADOT issues on Segment I will focus on at-grade intersection. Goal is to impact the existing intersection as little as possible. Segment II issues will expand to include not only interchange traffic operations, but bridge over UPRR as well.

7. Next Steps and ongoing Action Items
   a. Silverbell analysis

A technical study and memorandum will be prepared to address the intersection of Sunset and Silverbell. The key issue is whether to build out Silverbell to its ultimate cross section with this project, or to tie into Silverbell with an interim intersection. Silverbell falls under a “Historic District” designation, which may impact its ease of reconstruction.

   b. Utility kick off

A kick-off meeting is being scheduled for December.

   c. Survey

Survey is underway with aerials due at the end of January. The rough centerline is staked (although it may shift on the west end to avoid utilities poles).

   d. Set Monthly Progress and OTS Meeting Dates

As noted above, Progress meetings are planned for the first Tuesday of the month at 1:30 pm (starting January 7th) and the mid-month OTS meetings are planned for the third Tuesday of the month (starting January 21st). Team members should feel free to bring issues and actions needing resolution to Bahe’s and Glock’s attention so that they may be addressed at these meetings.

8. Site Visit

The team was encouraged to meet at the site (on Sunset Road, west of I-10) at 1 pm.

General Discussion

Glock went over the current schedule. The critical path includes survey, geotechnical work, bridge design and hydraulics. It is tentatively showing the completion of the bid documents before the end of February 2015. The 18 month design phase actually ends in mid-May. It is anticipated that there will be slippage, but the goal is to finish effort as soon as possible.
Ellis noted that the infiltration analysis will be occurring on the Rillito and Santa Cruz under a separate contract with NCS, but integrated into this design effort. The schedule and scope reflects the updated Roadway Design Manual. Project funding for Segment I is through the RTA, and Pima County Impact fees at this point. No federal funds are anticipated and the job will be treated as such. Segment II is dependent on ADOT’s timing of the I-10 mainline widening and traffic interchange reconstruction at Sunset.

Glock noted that an ftp site will be established (see attached ftp site access instructions). Bahe noted that a public project website will be set up on the County’s site.

The new PAG standard specifications will be used for this project.

Sunset is an Environmentally Sensitive Roadway and will follow ESR policies.

The roadway is anticipated to have a three lane cross section.

Design speed determination will be an early action item. It is anticipated to be posted at 45 mph (although after the meeting, it was noted that the Silverbell DCR calls for a 35 mph posted speed and 40 mph design speed – it was unclear from the report if this was referring to Sunset east or west of Silverbell).

There is a public art component associated with the project. The first panel review of the 35 artists is scheduled for December 10th. The artist will be responsible for artistic concepts to be included in the DCR’s of both Segments I & II, with a final public art piece for Segment I.

Dawson noted that there will be an Environmental kick-of-meeting on December 12th.

Four public meetings are anticipated. One to be held as soon as basic geometry is nailed down. Another during the 30 day comment period for the EAMR. The third near the completion of the design phase and the fourth as part of the preconstruction activities after the project is bid.

The meeting ended at 9:35 am.

The field trip consisted of walking Segment I from I-10 to the effluent flow in the Santa Cruz, meeting at where Sunset will cross the Rillito and traveling to the west end of the project between Silverbell and the Santa Cruz.
January 11, 2013

Roger Anyon
Cultural Resources Program Manager
Cultural Resources & Historic Preservation Office
201 North Stone Ave., 6th Floor
Tucson, AZ 85701

Re: Consultation on Tres Rios del Norte El Corazon Project

Dear Mr. Anyon:

Thank you for consulting with this office concerning the above-referenced project. Pursuant to the Arizona State Historic Preservation Act, I have reviewed the submitted cultural resources survey report, “A Cultural Resources Survey for the Tres Rios del Norte El Corazon Project, Pima County, Arizona,” as well as the information supplied in your January 4, 2013 cover letter. I have some comments.

1. Please note that this office can only make determinations for eligibility to the Arizona Register of Historic Places (ARHP). It is a federal agency’s responsibility to make determinations on eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places, and our office is then provided an opportunity to concur with that determination.

2. In addition to the three sites—AZ AA:12:11, 20, and 788(ASM)—acknowledged as having been previously determined ARHP-eligible, three additional sites were also previously determined eligible: AZ AA:12:10, 111, and 750(ASM). (This is not the consultant’s fault because this information is currently only available at our office. I am working with AZSITE staff to rectify this problem.) Site AZ AA:12:10(ASM) was described in our data base as having only a historic component. I agree that the prehistoric component is a contributing element to the site’s overall eligibility.

3. Of the remaining identified sites—AZ 12:306, 502, and 1088(ASM)—I agree that all are ARHP-eligible.

4. Site AZ 12:781(ASM) consisted of a human burial and three associated artifacts that were excavated and repatriated. While the site in the strictest sense may longer exist, the potential for additional burials nearby cannot be overlooked. I recommend that the area of the site be considered a sensitive area if and when it may be impacted by future activities.

5. I am unclear about two sections in the survey report concerning eligibility. Sites AZ 12:9(ASM) (page 51) and AZ 12:21(ASM) (page 69) were not relocated by the current survey and are described as either misplotted or destroyed and no longer possess integrity. Yet both sites are recommended in the report as eligible under criterion D. These
statements are contradictory and do not make sense to me. However, I recognize that you are not asking for an eligibility determination for these sites at this time, and the SHPO database has no record of a prior determination for these sites.

6. I am reluctant to concur with a proactive adverse effect determination. I believe that it is more appropriate to wait until an activity/undertaking is actually established that may have the potential for adverse effect before making or concurring with this finding. This also allows a federal agency to make this finding according to 36CFR800.5 without foreclosure by this office.

I appreciate your continued cooperation with this office in support of historic preservation requirements. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 602/542-7142, or email me at jcogswell@azstateparks.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James Cogswell, Ph.D.
Archaeological Compliance Specialist
State Historic Preservation Office
Arizona's On-line Environmental Review Tool
Search ID: 20140103022148
Project Name: Sunset Rd: I-10 to Silverbell
Date: 1/3/2014 9:57:19 AM

The Department appreciates the opportunity to provide in-depth comments and project review when additional information or environmental documentation becomes available.

Special Status Species Occurrences/Critical Habitat/Tribal Lands within 3 miles of Project Vicinity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>FWS</th>
<th>USFS</th>
<th>BLM</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bat Colony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coccozus americanus</td>
<td>Yellow-billed Cuckoo (Western U.S. DPS)</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>WSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dendrocygna bicolor</td>
<td>Fulvous Whistling-Duck</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrophryne olivacea</td>
<td>Western Narrow-mouthed Toad</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>WSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myotis velifer</td>
<td>Cave Myotis</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumamoca macdougall</td>
<td>Tumamoc Globeberry</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location Accuracy Disclaimer
Project locations are assumed to be both precise and accurate for the purposes of environmental review. The creator/owner of the Project Review Receipt is solely responsible for the project location and thus the correctness of the Project Review Receipt content.
Please review the entire receipt for project type recommendations and/or species or location information and retain a copy for future reference. If any of the information you provided did not accurately reflect this project, or if project plans change, another review should be conducted, as this determination may not be valid.

Arizona’s On-line Environmental Review Tool:

1. This On-line Environmental Review Tool inquiry has generated recommendations regarding the potential impacts of your project on Special Status Species (SSS) and other wildlife of Arizona. SSS include all U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service federally listed, U.S. Bureau of Land Management sensitive, U.S. Forest Service sensitive, and Arizona Game and Fish Department (Department) recognized species of concern.

2. These recommendations have been made by the Department, under authority of Arizona Revised Statutes Title 5 (Amusements and Sports), 17 (Game and Fish), and 28 (Transportation). These recommendations are preliminary in scope, designed to provide early considerations for all species of wildlife, pertinent to the project type you entered.

3. This receipt, generated by the automated On-line Environmental Review Tool does not constitute an official project review by Department biologists and planners. Further coordination may be necessary as appropriate under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and/or the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has regulatory authority over all federally listed species under the ESA. Contact USFWS Ecological Services Offices: http://arizonaes.fws.gov/.

Phoenix Main Office
2321 W. Royal Palm Road, Suite 103
Phoenix, AZ 85021
Phone 602-242-0210
Fax 602-242-2513

Tucson Sub-Office
201 North Bonita, Suite 141
Tucson, AZ 85745
Phone 520-670-6144
Fax 520-670-6154

Flagstaff Sub-Office
323 N. Leroux Street, Suite 101
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
Phone 928-226-0614
Fax 928-226-1099

Disclaimer:

1. This is a preliminary environmental screening tool. It is not a substitute for the potential knowledge gained by having a biologist conduct a field survey of the project area.

2. The Department’s Heritage Data Management System (HDMS) data is not intended to include potential distribution of special status species. Arizona is large and diverse with plants, animals, and environmental conditions that are ever changing. Consequently, many areas may contain species that biologists do not know about or species previously noted in a particular area may no longer occur there.

3. Not all of Arizona has been surveyed for special status species, and surveys that have been conducted have varied greatly in scope and intensity. Such surveys may reveal previously undocumented population of species of special concern.

4. HDMS data contains information about species occurrences that have actually been reported to the Department.

Arizona Game and Fish Department Mission

To conserve, enhance, and restore Arizona’s diverse wildlife resources and habitats through aggressive protection and
management programs, and to provide wildlife resources and
safe watercraft and off-highway vehicle recreation for the
enjoyment, appreciation, and use by present and future
generations.

Project Category: Transportation &
Infrastructure, Road construction
(including staging areas), Realignment/
new roads

Project Type Recommendations:

All degraded and disturbed lands should be restored to their natural
state. Vegetation restoration projects (including treatments of invasive
or exotic species) should have a completed site-evaluation plan
(Identifying environmental conditions necessary to re-establish native
vegetation), a revegetation plan (species, density, method of
establishment), a short and long-term monitoring plan, including
adaptive management guidelines to address needs for replacement
vegetation.

Based on the project type entered; coordination with Arizona
Department of Environmental Quality may be required
(http://www.azdeq.gov/).

Based on the project type entered; coordination with County Flood
Control districts may be required.

Based on the project type entered; coordination with State Historic
Preservation Office may be required
http://azstateparks.com/SHP/index.html

Based on the project type entered; coordination with U.S. Army Corps
of Engineers may be required
(http://www.spl.usace.army.mil/regulatory/phonedef.html)

During planning and construction, minimize potential introduction or
spread of exotic invasive species. Invasive species can be plants,
animals (exotic snails), and other organisms (e.g. microbes), which
may cause alteration to ecological functions or compete with or prey
upon native species and can cause social impacts (e.g. livestock
forage reduction, increase wildfire risk). The terms noxious weed or
invasive plants are often used interchangeably. Precautions should be
taken to wash all equipment utilized in the project activities before and
after project activities to reduce the spread of invasive species. Arizona
has noxious weed regulations (Arizona Revised Statutes, Rules
R3-4-244 and R3-4-245). See Arizona Department of Agriculture
website for restricted plants
http://www.azda.gov/PSD/quarantine5.htm. Additionally, the U.S.
Department of Agriculture has information regarding pest and invasive
plant control methods including: pesticide, herbicide, biological control
agents, and mechanical control:
http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usdahome. The Department regulates
the importation, purchasing, and transportation of wildlife and fish
(Restricted Live Wildlife), please refer to the hunting regulations for

During the planning stages of your project, please consider the local or
regional needs of wildlife in regards to movement, connectivity, and
access to habitat needs. Loss of this permeability prevents wildlife from
accessing resources, finding mates, reduces gene flow, prevents
wildlife from re-colonizing areas where local extirpations may have
occurred, and ultimately prevents wildlife from contributing to
ecosystem functions, such as pollination, seed dispersal, control of
prey numbers, and resistance to invasive species. In many cases,
streams and washes provide natural movement corridors for wildlife
and should be maintained in their natural state. Uplands also support a
large diversity of species, and should be contained within important
wildlife movement corridors. In addition, maintaining biodiversity and ecosystem functions can be facilitated through improving designs of structures, fences, roadways, and culverts to promote passage for a variety of wildlife.

Hydrological considerations: design culverts to minimize impacts to channel geometry, or design channel geometry (low flow, overbank, floodplains) and substrates to carry expected discharge using local drainages of appropriate size as templates. Aquatic wildlife considerations: reduce/minimize barriers to migration of amphibians or fish (e.g. eliminate falls). Terrestrial wildlife: washes and stream corridors often provide important corridors for movement. Overall culvert width, height, and length should be optimized for movement of the greatest number and diversity of species expected to utilize the passage. Culvert designs should consider moisture, light, and noise, while providing clear views at both ends to maximize utilization. For many species, fencing is an important design feature that can be utilized with culverts to funnel wildlife into these areas and minimize the potential for roadway collisions. Guidelines for culvert designs to facilitate wildlife passage can be found at http://www.azgfd.gov/hgis/guidelines.aspx.

Minimization and mitigation of impacts to wildlife and fish species due to changes in water quality, quantity, chemistry, temperature, and alteration to flow regimes (timing, magnitude, duration, and frequency of floods) should be evaluated. Minimize impacts to springs, in-stream flow, and consider irrigation improvements to decrease water use. If dredging is a project component, consider timing of the project in order to minimize impacts to spawning fish and other aquatic species (including spawning seasons), and to reduce spread of exotic invasive species. We recommend early direct coordination with Project Evaluation Program for projects that could impact water resources, wetlands, streams, springs, and/or riparian habitats.

Planning: consider impacts of lighting intensity on mammals and birds and develop measures or alternatives that can be taken to increase human safety while minimizing potential impacts to wildlife. Conduct wildlife surveys to determine species within project area, and evaluate proposed activities based on species biology and natural history to determine if artificial lighting may disrupt behavior patterns or habitat use.

Preconstruction - Consider design structures and construction plans that minimize impacts to channel geometry (i.e. width/depth ratio, sinuosity, allow overflow channels) to avoid alteration of hydrological function. Identify whether wildlife species use the structure for roosting or nesting during anticipated construction period. Plan the timing of construction/maintenance to minimize impacts to wildlife species. In addition to the species list generated by the Arizona's On-line Environmental Review Tool, the Department recommends that surveys be conducted at the bridge and in the vicinity of the bridge to identify additional or currently undocumented bat, bird, or aquatic species in the project area. To minimize impacts to birds and bats, as well as aquatic species, consider conducting maintenance and construction activities outside the breeding/maternity season (breeding seasons for birds and bats usually occur spring - summer). Examining the crevices for the presence of bats prior to pouring new paving materials. When bats are present, the top of the crevices should be sealed to prevent material from dripping or falling through the cracks and potentially onto bats. If bats are present, maintenance and construction (including paving and milling) activities should be conducted during nighttime hours, if possible, when the fewest number of bats will be roosting. Consider incorporating roosting habitat for bats into bridge designs. Minimize impacts to the vegetation community. A revegetation plan should be developed to replace impacted communities. Unavoidable impacts to vegetation should be mitigated on-site whenever possible. During construction: Erosion control structures and drainage features should be used to prevent introduction of sediment laden runoff into the waterway. Minimize in-stream construction activity. If culverts are planned, mitigate impacts to wildlife and fish movement. Guidelines for bridge designs to facilitate wildlife passage can be found at http://www.azgfd.gov/hgis/guidelines.aspx.
Recommendations will be dependant upon goals of the fence project and the wildlife species expected to be impacted by the project. General guidelines for ensuring wildlife-friendly fences include: barbless wire on the top and bottom with the maximum fence height 42", minimum height for bottom 16". Modifications to this design may be considered for fencing anticipated to be routinely encountered by elk, bighorn sheep or pronghorn (e.g., Pronghorn fencing would require 18" minimum height on the bottom). Please refer to the Department's Fencing Guidelines located at http://www.azgfd.gov/hgis/guidelines.aspx.

The Department recommends that wildlife surveys are conducted to determine if noise-sensitive species occur within the project area. Avoidance or minimization measures could include conducting project activities outside of breeding seasons.

The Department requests further coordination to provide project/species specific recommendations, please contact Project Evaluation Program directly.

Trenches should be covered or back-filled as soon as possible. Incorporate escape ramps in ditches or fencing along the perimeter to deter small mammals and herptefauna (snakes, lizards, tortoise) from entering ditches.

**Project Location and/or Species recommendations:**

Heritage Data Management System records indicate that one or more listed, proposed, or candidate species or Critical Habitat (Designated or Proposed) have been documented in the vicinity of your project (refer to page 1 of the receipt). Please contact:

- Ecological Services Office
- US Fish and Wildlife Service
- 2321 W. Royal Palm Rd.

The Department requests further coordination to provide project/species specific recommendations, please contact Project Evaluation Program directly.

- Ecological Services Office
- US Fish and Wildlife Service
- 2321 W. Royal Palm Rd.

**Recommendations Disclaimer:**

1. Potential impacts to fish and wildlife resources may be minimized or avoided by the recommendations generated from information submitted for your proposed project.
2. These recommendations are proposed actions or guidelines to be considered during preliminary project development.
3. Additional site specific recommendations may be proposed during further NEPA/ESA analysis or through coordination with affected agencies.
4. Making this information directly available does not substitute for the Department's review of project proposals, and should not decrease our opportunity to review and evaluate additional project information and/or new project proposals.
5. The Department is interested in the conservation of all fish and wildlife resources, including those Special Status Species listed on this receipt, and those that may have not been documented within the project vicinity as well as other game and nongame wildlife.
6. Further coordination requires the submittal of this initialed and signed Environmental Review Receipt with a cover letter and project plans or documentation that includes project narrative,
acreage to be impacted, how construction or project activity(s) are to be accomplished, and project locality information (including site map).

7. Upon receiving information by AZGFD, please allow 30 days for completion of project reviews. Mail requests to:

Project Evaluation Program, Habitat Branch
Arizona Game and Fish Department
5000 West Carefree Highway
Phoenix, Arizona 85086-5000
Phone Number: (623) 236-7600
Fax Number: (623) 236-7366

Terms of Use

By using this site, you acknowledge that you have read and understand the terms of use. Department staff may revise these terms periodically. If you continue to use our website after we post changes to these terms, it will mean that you accept such changes. If at any time you do not wish to accept the Terms, you may choose not to use the website.

1. This Environmental Review and project planning website was developed and intended for the purpose of screening projects for potential impacts on resources of special concern. By indicating your agreement to the terms of use for this website, you warrant that you will not use this website for any other purpose.

2. Unauthorized attempts to upload information or change information on this website are strictly prohibited and may be punishable under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act of 1986 and/or the National Information Infrastructure Protection Act.

3. The Department reserves the right at any time, without notice, to enhance, modify, alter, or suspend the website and to terminate or restrict your access to the website.

4. This Environmental Review is based on the project study area that was entered. The review must be redone if the project study area, location, or the type of project changes. If additional information becomes available, this review may need to be reconsidered.

5. A signed and initialed copy of the Environmental Review Receipt indicates that the entire receipt has been read by the signer of the Environmental Review Receipt.

Security:

The Environmental Review and project planning web application operates on a complex State computer system. This system is monitored to ensure proper operation, to verify the functioning of applicable security features, and for other like purposes. Anyone using this system expressly consents to such monitoring and is advised that if such monitoring reveals possible evidence of criminal activity, system personnel may provide the evidence of such monitoring to law enforcement officials. Unauthorized attempts to upload or change information; to defeat or circumvent security measures; or to utilize this system for other than its intended purposes are prohibited.

This website maintains a record of each environmental review search result as well as all contact information. This information is maintained for internal tracking purposes. Information collected in this application will not be shared outside of the purposes of the Department.

If the Environmental Review Receipt and supporting material are not mailed to the Department or other appropriate agencies within six (6) months of the Project Review Receipt date, the receipt is considered to be null and void, and a new review must be initiated.

Print this Environmental Review Receipt using your Internet browser's print function and keep it for your records. Signature of this receipt indicates the signer has read and understands the information.
Arizona's On-line Environmental Review Tool
Search ID: 20140103022148
Project Name: Sunset Rd: I-10 to Silverbell
Date: 1/3/2014 9:57:19 AM

please provide point of contact information regarding this Environmental Review.

Application or organization responsible for project implementation
Agency/organization: ____________________________
Contact Name: ________________________________
Address: ________________________________
City, State, Zip: ____________________________
Phone: ____________________________
E-mail: ____________________________

Person conducting search (if not applicant)
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U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Threatened and Endangered Species in Pima County

October, 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Species Group</th>
<th>Listing Status</th>
<th>Elevation (ft)</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acuna Cactus</td>
<td><em>Echinomastus erectocentrum var. acunensis</em></td>
<td>Flowering Plants</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1,000-4,000</td>
<td>Valleys, small knolls, gravel ridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiricahua Leopard Frog</td>
<td><em>Rana chiricahuensis</em></td>
<td>Amphibians</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>3,000-9,000</td>
<td>Pools, livestock tanks, lakes, reservoirs, streams, rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Least Tern</td>
<td><em>Sterna antillarum browni</em></td>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>&lt;2,000</td>
<td>Open, sparse vegetation, sandbars, gravel pits, shorelines, inland rivers, lakes, reservoirs, drainage systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Pupfish</td>
<td><em>Cyprinodon macularius</em></td>
<td>Fishes</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>&lt;4,000</td>
<td>Shallow small springs, marshes, high salinity and warm water, or low salinity and cold water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Tortoise</td>
<td><em>Gopherus agassizii</em></td>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td>T, C</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila Chub</td>
<td><em>Gila intermedia</em></td>
<td>Fishes</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>&lt;5,500</td>
<td>Streams, ciénegas, artificial ponds, use vegetation for cover, slow and fast waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila Topminnow</td>
<td><em>Poeciliopsis occidentalis</em></td>
<td>Fishes</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>&lt;4,000</td>
<td>Shallow, warm, ponds, ciénegas, tanks, pools, springs, dense algae and debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huachuca Water-Umbel</td>
<td><em>Lilaeopsis schaffneriana var. recurva</em></td>
<td>Flowering Plants</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>&lt;6,500</td>
<td>Backwaters, ciénegas, springs, gentle waters, minimal vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaguar</td>
<td><em>Panthera onca</em></td>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Near warm water, tropical savannas, forests, thornscrub, desertschrub, grasslands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearney's Blue-Star</td>
<td><em>Amsonia kearneyana</em></td>
<td>Flowering Plants</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Long-Nosed Bat</td>
<td>Leptonycteris curasoe yerbabuena e</td>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masked Bobwhite Quail</td>
<td>Colinus virginianus ridgwayi</td>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Desert grasslands, high vegetation density</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Spotted Owl</td>
<td>Strix occidentalis lucida</td>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High tree density, canyons, woodlands, riparian, vertical cliffs, caves, near water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichol's Turk's Head Cactus</td>
<td>Echinocactus horizonthalonius var. nicholii</td>
<td>Flowering Plants</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Limestone substrate, terraces, saddles, bajadas, debris flows, partially shaded areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mexican Gartersnake</td>
<td>Thamnophis eques megalops</td>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Riparian, wetlands, stock tanks, woodlands, dense grass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocelot</td>
<td>Leopardus (=Felis) pardalis</td>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima Pineapple Cactus</td>
<td>Coryphantha scheeri var. robustispina</td>
<td>Flowering Plants</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Basins, hillsides, semi-desert grasslands, desert scrub transition areas, open areas, flat ridge tops, ridge-slopes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemont Talusnail</td>
<td>Sonorella rosemontensis</td>
<td>Snails</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Santa Rita Mts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoran Pronghorn</td>
<td>Antilocapra americana sonoriensis</td>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mountain valleys, medium vegetation cover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoyta Mud Turtle</td>
<td>Kinosternon sonoriense longifemorae</td>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ponds, pools, streams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Willow Flycatcher</td>
<td>Empidonax traillii extimus</td>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Dense riparian, saturated soils, standing water, dense vegetation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson Shovel-Nosed Snake</td>
<td><em>Chionactis occipitalis klauberi</em></td>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Dry desert, sandy flats, valley floors, sand dunes, washes, rocky hillsides,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-Billed Cuckoo</td>
<td><em>Coccyzus americanus</em></td>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Forests, close to rivers, riparian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Project location
Figure 2. Project segments

PCDOT No. 4RTSUN
Sunset Road: Silverbell Road to I-10 Eastbound Frontage Rd. – Segment 1