

AGENDA



**SPECIAL SESSION
MAYOR and COMMON COUNCIL
of the
TOWN OF CAMP VERDE
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
473 S. MAIN, ROOM 106**

**FRIDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2005
5:00 P.M.**

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Discussion, consideration, and possible recommendation to ADOT concerning the SR 260 Access Management Plan.**
4. **Adjournment**

Posted by: _____

Date/Time: _____

Note: Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03.A.3, the Council may vote to go into Executive Session for purposes of consultation for legal advice with the Town Attorney on any matter listed on the Agenda, or discussion of records exempt by law from public inspection associated with an agenda item.

The Town of Camp Verde Council Chambers is accessible to the handicapped. Those with special accessibility or accommodation needs, such as large typeface print, may request these at the Office of the Town Clerk.



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

Contents of this Summary

- Introduction	Page 1
- Public Involvement Process Review	Page 1
- Comment Forms	Page 4
- Letters	Page 20

Introduction

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) hosted a Presentation of Findings for the State Route (SR) 260 Access Management Plan (AMP) on Wednesday, November 16 at the Lodge at Cliff Castle. The November 16 meeting included an overview of the public involvement process, a presentation of the recommended access management strategy, and an opportunity for community comment. The preliminary findings included two alternatives - A and B - at two different locations. (The locations are between Newton Lane and Wilshire Road and between Coury Drive and Thousand Trails Road.)

Approximately 120 citizens attended the November 16 public meeting and provided comments orally or in writing. This document contains a summary of the written comments. The court reporter's transcripts are not yet finalized.

Public Involvement Process Review

The November 16 meeting was the culmination of a four-month intensive public involvement process initiated in July 2005 by ADOT, who together with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Yavapai County and in coordination with the Towns of Camp Verde, Clarkdale, and Jerome, the Cities of Cottonwood and Sedona, Camp Verde Fire District, and the Yavapai-Apache Nation are evaluating community-proposed modifications to the Environmental Assessment (EA) approved by FHWA in April 2000 and to the approved AMP for SR 260 between Wilshire Road in Camp Verde and Western Drive in Cottonwood.



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16 Presentation of Findings December 1, 2005

ADOT has hosted a total of twelve public meetings and working sessions over the past five months to provide information to the community and obtain community feedback. A brief summary of those sessions is provided below:

General Information

- Monthly sessions (August through October)
- Dates and times published in newspaper, postcards, and e-mail update to contact list
- Specific topics, with technical background provided by project staff
- Topics determined by community input in July
- Facilitated consensus building
- Each session built upon the previous

Working Session #1 Review

- August 16-18, 2005
- Approximately 150 people attended
- Presentations on Access Management 101 and SR 260 Improvement Parameters
- Q&A sessions focused on median treatments, funding, safety, and schedule
- "Homework assignment" with map and questionnaire

Working Session #1 Questionnaire Responses

Areas of *recommended consolidation* generally coincided with areas of private property along corridor

- West End (Corry area)
- Cherry Road/Old 279 Area (Cherry Rd, Out of Africa, Yavapai County Complex, A-1 Mini Storage)
- East End (Horseshoe Bend, Newton Lane, Park Verde, Doug's Park, Dickison Circle, USFS Rd #9603)
- Average travel time = 18 min
- Average legal u-turn distance = 0.5 mile
- Most responses indicated preference for open median
- Combination suggested
- References to safety, cost, mobility tradeoffs



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

Working Session #2 Review

- September 6-8, 2005
- Approximately 120 people participated in the Community Planning Exercise
- Team compiled comments from maps into tabular format and organized by milepost
- Team used written information to search for commonalities in ideas, then mapped *our interpretation of community ideas* for presentation in October

Working Session #3 Review

- October 4-6, 2005
- Approximately 120 people participated
- Team presented *our interpretation of community ideas* generated in September and requested feedback
- Community provided hundreds of comments, both in writing and drawn on maps



State Route 260 Access Management Plan



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16 Presentation of Findings December 1, 2005

Comment Forms

Participants were asked to provide written feedback on the comment form displayed below. The responses are listed on the following pages.



Presentation of Findings

State Route 260 Access Management Plan

Comment Form

November 16, 2005

What is your response to the preliminary recommendations presented for the entire corridor (please be specific)?

Pros:

Cons:

What is your response to the two options presented for Newton Lane to Wilshire Road (please be specific)?

Pros:

Cons:

What is your response to the two options presented for Thousand Trails Road to Coury Drive (please be specific)?

Pros:

Cons:

Thank You for Participating!

You may leave your comments with us tonight, mail them to Kristin Darr-Bornstein at Kristin Darr & Associates, LLC, 4545 E. Shea Blvd., Suite 108, Phoenix, AZ 85028, fax them to (602) 368-9645, or email to kristin@kdacreative.com by **November 27, 2005**.



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

Entire Corridor Pros

- Divided Highway will help
- Pleased with entire "4-lane" corridor
- It will provide a safer route to Cottonwood
- If both Alternative A proposals are used the road provides safe and speedy access to I-17 for the Upper Verde Valley and the same access to major shopping/hospital facilities in Cottonwood for Camp Verde people
- Very impressed with the thought, effort, and organization that ADOT has put into the new plan
- Glad to see the liberal use of "Access by Others" proposed roadways – as a way to keep the number of "full intersections" to a minimum
- We think that overall the proposal provides a workable solution. Old 279 to Cherry Road is a good solution.
- 4 lanes allow for more traffic. Fewer access points to small roads – increased safety
- As the plans are made out right now everything is fine; speed limits near the town limits and major intersections are good
- Divided highway sections are great
- Just the extra lanes in each direction; this will keep traffic moving at 55-60 mph
- Excellent. Consider re-naming Wilshire Road back to its original name, Wilshire Boulevard
- Overall a balanced plan that addresses SR 260 needs within the budget and time constraints. As long as no additional intersections are added.
- It has been a long, laborious process for Camp Verde to get decent access to our prime area for future economic development. The two main areas that need full access are the Coury dealership and Out of Africa. This is imperative. The latest recommendation is an improvement over what was first proposed but why should it be such a struggle when Cottonwood has numerous access points on 260?
- I think a lot of study went into it and it was a very good presentation
- I want to compliment you on the quality of material presented at the November 16 meeting
- Don't know – due to scheduling conflicts I and a number of others either could not attend tonight or had to leave early. I do not feel Camp Verde was fairly represented in this meeting. We want reasonable access to commercial properties along this corridor.
- You tried to listen well to us.



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

- Looks good
- Although Overpass/Underpass Interchanges are what is needed in place of intersections for SR260 from Wilshire Road to Prairie Lane/Ogden Ranch Road. The proposed plan addresses the needs as well as it can within budget constraints, which means without those interchanges. Anymore intersections than those on the AMP would be redundant & counterproductive to Safety, Mobility & even Access. The proposed Realigning & Consolidation of access at Cherry Road & Old Highway 279 will be a great improvement. Steve Coury & Out of Africa will have adequate access & Do Not Need Additional Intersections, they need to share the planned access with the other users for a cohesive & comprehensive Access Management Plan.
- As a resident of Cottonwood who uses SR260 infrequently, I find the preliminary access points and estimated driving time from Cottonwood to I17/Camp Verde quite acceptable.
- 4 lanes /speed limit @ 55mph
- 4 Lanes with median will increase capacity and safety. Retaining the current 260 alignment considers and protects the beautiful Verde Valley environment. 55 mile speed limit is appropriate for the new road.
- A four lane, true limited access highway could provide opportunities for safe passing, reduce driver frustration and related road rage, reduce frequency and severity of accidents, and provide law enforcement better and safer opportunities for much needed traffic enforcement.
- We are getting closer to an Access Management Plan. ADOT has worked hard, and is much appreciated, for their efforts to get the all new 260 Access Management Plan completed in a very short timeframe. The proposed realigning and consolidation at Cherry Road and Old Highway 279 will be a great improvement.
- Nice realignment of Cherry Road
- I do hope you include a walking/bike path some 30-60 feet away from the roadway.
- Let's start construction on Cottonwood end at 260.
- Keeps the access points to a minimum, promotes mobility

Entire Corridor Cons

- Original plans changed a surprise, especially Thousand Trails to Coury
- Lack of stoplights – safety



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

- Out of Africa needs direct access
- Fain Ranch intersection is unnecessary. Seems to be many right only access points.
- The October 5, 2005 presentation represents the public input
- Options presented November 16, 2005 that were not in the October 5, 2005 plans allows little time for review and comment consideration; should have frontage road along 260 from I-17 for 1 to 2 miles for commercial traffic
- There are too many intersections; mobility and safety may be compromised
- Alternative Bs are less attractive due to additional intersections which would slow traffic
- The amount of access will reduce travel time and should be limited as much as possible.
- Need to keep full intersections to a minimum. Full intersection at Fain Road is not needed.
- In the event warrants are justified for traffic lights, those will slow traffic. Motorists will want to do 65 mph in the more open areas (those that are posted for 55 mph now). Consider upping speed to 65 mph in open areas.
- Too many full intersections and exit/entry points will slow traffic and result in safety issues. As traffic increases, coordination of lights will be frustrated by traffic backup at lights.
- Why would you change the access at Dickison Circle that exists already? There is a huge wash there that would cost so much to work around! Why?!!
- You are planning way too many lighted intersections between Cottonwood and CV. 5 lighted intersections should be the max. Upper Verde Valley residents (the heart of Verde Valley) demand it
- Delete full intersection at Fain Road.
- Need 60 to 65 mph speed limit for divided highway areas. The fewer full lighted intersections the better. This must not become a giant strip mall with many lights between Cottonwood and CV like 69 through Prescott Valley.
- Too bad we can't stay within the existing easement to save money. Five lane would help economic development and put money in the state treasury.
- A key to satisfying communities other than Camp Verde, some of whom are already unhappy with eight full intersections, is to create open median, 55 mph wherever possible. The Wilshire Road – Horseshoe Bend section is bordered by USFS land and moderately priced highway frontage. The frontage process do not rise dramatically until one gets south of Wilshire Road. Please consider making the Wilshire Road – Horseshoe Bend section open median, 55 mph



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16 Presentation of Findings December 1, 2005

posted speed. Please also review the sections north of Ogden Ranch Road to see if any can be converted to open median, 55mph.

- Cherry Road needs an overpass/underpass interchange due to the traffic flow. Old 279 and Cherry Road will be an important intersection that needs an overpass/underpass interchange if possible. Concern for u-turns at OHV area and Motoplex.
- We need to limit stop light areas to a minimum using frontage roads
- Right-in, right-outs with u-turns are dangerous; they cause confusion and several opportunities for vehicle conflicts
- The plan relies on too much "access by others"; this approach has a high probability of failure and ADOT must avoid passing their problems to others without their consent and commitment. This is not only an issue of cost but also availability of ROW
- Too many access points for safety
- Cherry Road/Old Highway 279 should be an Overpass/Underpass interchange. Speed Limits from Wilshire Road should Transition to 55 mph & Thousand Trails to Prairie Lane/Ogden Ranch Road should transition to 65 mph in the Separated Divided Highway section. Concerns: Will the U-turns for the Hayfield Draw/Bryant Park OHV Area & the MotoPlex have adequate visibility for large vehicles to make the required U-turns for access are a point of concern, but should be acceptable if an adequate line of sight is provided. The USFS Road access from Wilbur/Thousand Trails Road must be retained.
- Please no intersections on the new rt. 260 and because of a divided highway 65 mph speed limit would be OK. Make this road like the highway between Cottonwood and Sedona please.
- Please consider speeds of 65 MPH on the divided highway areas of 260, as we have on 89 A. Once again, we feel that there are too many intersections. We DO NOT want another Highway 69 like the one put in in Prescott Valley.
- I am very concerned that we will not necessarily have a safer highway when it is completed. I think of emergency vehicles, cement transport trucks and other large vehicles. If they are required to slow down or stop many times on that 14 mile stretch that could be almost as dangerous as we have now. This is a fast-paced world -- everyone is in a hurry. With the proposed access points it is hard to believe that the speed limit would be set any higher than 50 or 55 mph and we know that many (most?) drivers feel they are entitled to drive 10 to 15 miles over the speed limit.
- I realize that the property owners along that roadway must have some access, however I feel that 8 access points in an 8 (or less) mile stretch is far too many.



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16 Presentation of Findings December 1, 2005

- Since the majority of highway 89A between Cornville Road and Sedona is 65 mph I would encourage that same speed limit on highway 260.
- As on 89A between Cottonwood and Sedona, it would be preferable to have 65 mph speed limits, especially on the divided highway areas, rather than the 55 to 45 mph speed limits that all of the proposed added intersections may require.
- Keep the intersections AS FEW AS POSSIBLE. Overhead or underneath passes are ABSOLUTELY more preferable to signals, roundabouts, etc. that impede traffic and safety.
- As a bicyclist, I am still concerned about the "shoulder clearance" on the existing bridges that will remain. An eight foot shoulder along SR260 is okay for experienced riders, but not as preferable as the shoulders on 89A to Sedona. There is quite a lot of construction traffic/large trucks/rvs on SR260. Those who resent sharing the roads with bicycles will stay as close to the line marking the edge of the road as they can get away with, though rumble strips should help.
- If the speed limit is raised to 65 mph the public already knows the law is not being enforced so 75 will be the norm (in 15 years I have never seen a truck, City, County or State vehicle stopped anywhere). It is my belief that if a Highway Patrol Officer ticketed a "G" licensed vehicle he would get fired.
- As someone who travels this road several times a week on my way to Phoenix and the Prescott area I would like to see the speed limit increased to 65 as it is on many other roads in rural areas (i.e. Cottonwood to Sedona, Cherry Road to Prescott). Maybe not the whole way, but the long undeveloped portion between Thousand Trails Road to Horseshoe Bend or Cherry Road. I also believe there should not be any stop lights between Western Dr. and I-17. The more stop lights, the more accidents with all the big trucks traveling at high speeds not wanting to stop.
- In general I would like all parties to consider the impact of too many intersections and to work toward lowering the number so that workers and those who use this road regularly experience safe travel at a reasonable speed. A speed limit of 65 seems appropriate.
- Concerns safety
- The current proposal provides business access, and a moderate safety increase at the expense of travel time to and from I-17. We would prefer fewer intersections and higher speed limits -similar to the Cottonwood-Sedona section of 89A.



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

- All intersections should be located where they can be converted to "freeway" type overpass intersections to further improve safety as well as access time to I 17.
- The previously proposed Cottonwood to I-17 highway west of the current 260, connecting at the General Crook exit on I 17 should be seriously considered.
- Will be difficult to enter and cross 260 safely. This is already evident in areas where 260 has been widened. Having no lights will cause significant safety issue and traffic backup.
- I was very disappointed when I saw the proposed plans for 260. At your initial meetings the audience was asked to rank 1.safety, 2.mobility and 3.access . It seems to me that this ranking most closely fulfills ADOT's mission.
- Following numerous public meetings you have developed a plan that reverses these qualities. A loud vocal minority has been mistaken for "consensus" Where is the department's responsibility to the citizens to build modern, safe highways in a consensus model?
- People have repeatedly said they don't want a Hwy 69 design on 260, yet that's exactly what could be in place in ten years as eight full intersections meet warrants. Drive times will lengthen and safety compromised when motorists speed up for yellow signals. Obviously, safety and mobility for all is being sacrificed for access for a few.
- If the department doesn't have the funds to do this project right, let's look at some other options. Could the project be completed in sections, beginning with the busiest. Could the the local municipalities front funds for a proper highway, not a Main Street for Camp Verde, to be repaid at a later time by ADOT.
- Please don't abrogate your responsibility to the citizens and proceed with Highway 69 revisited.
- The recommendations for the south end of the corridor do not meet the criteria that ADOT established as "Benefits of good access management".
- This is a highway that connects the upper Verde Valley to I-17 and connects Camp Verde and Cottonwood and serves the numerous commuters between the two towns. It should be a 65 mph highway rather than the 55 to 45 mph speed limits that all of the proposed added intersections may require.
- Seven or eight intersections are too many for safety and mobility.
- Economic needs can be served in ways other than use of a state highway as a local business street.



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

- We need to scale back and think about the needs of the state and the region, not just a few speculative property owners or a town that already has interstate access and other ways to meet their economic needs.
- Speed limits too slow for this project. This is a State Highway, not a town business district road. It should work like the State Highway between Cottonwood and Sedona, with 65 miles per hour speed limits, slowing to 55 mph. The recommendations for the south end of the corridor do not meet the criteria that ADOT established as "Benefits of good access management," specifically in improving safety. A four lane roadway increases speeds over a two way roadway; regardless of the posted speed limit. The fact that ADOT plans to decrease the posted speed limit with this AMP is a red flag that the proposal isn't safe. Highway 260 is a STATE Highway, not a city or town business district street. The full intersection at Fain Road should be deleted. These parcels can use the frontage roads to the Cherry Road intersection or the intersection to the north. Fain Ranch road could have right ins and right outs, but a full intersection will impede the safety and mobility needs of the greatest number of people in the entire Verde Valley. [The Verde Valley population center IS in the Upper Verde Valley.] Safety and mobility for the 30,000++ residents of the Upper Verde Valley (plus residents who live in Camp Verde and drive back and forth to work and vice versa) before a couple of vacant land owners' demands. This would reduce the number of intersections. This will save the lives of children, families, elderly, i.e. deleting this unnecessary intersection will literally save people's lives. Seven and eight intersections are too many for safety and mobility. We need to scale back.
- Requires a lot of parallel road construction (orange); not ADOT's responsibility

Newton Lane to Wilshire Road Pros

- Plan A has full intersection at Dickison Circle
- Alternative A is more efficient
- Alternative A would provide emerging traffic with a better line of sight at the Dickison Circle intersection
- I prefer Alternative A because, in addition to serving existing development, it will better serve future development. ADOT's willingness to build crossings over the major wash makes this a feasible alternative. Please see my comments on the attached "modified map". Also, the Schill property would be well served with Alternative A



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

- Prefer Alternative A
- We favor Alternative B
- Option B provides better spacing for major intersections
- Alt B seems to be the better choice. Provides better access to all intersections. Wilshire provides better access to the commercial points.
- Near I-17 (Newton to Wilshire) Alt B is preferable because it provides connectivity to the south on the east side.
- Alternative B appears to provide a better opportunity for traffic circulation in the long term as the secondary roads develop.
- Alternative B is the best option
- I prefer Alternative B
- With the Alternatives presented I believe that Alternative B would be the better option. It puts more space between Wilshire Rd and Doug's park, it also give more options for Alternate Access by Others.
- We would like to see Alt.B near I - 17
- Alternative B clears up redundant access points and brings the remaining access to a safer alignment
- Alternative B is the best option because it ties everything together by having backage roads on both sides of SR 260
- I prefer Alternative B because it seems to be a better design making use of frontage roads
- I like B – good access to all areas in circle for emergencies; able to get around on side roads
- Alternative B clears up the redundant access points & provides safer access at the remaining intersections.
- I've reviewed some of the preliminary drawings and would especially wish to encourage ADOT to select ALTERNATE "B" at Newton Road
- Near I-17 (Newton to Wilshire) Alt B is preferable because it provides connectivity to the south on the east side.
- Newton-Wilshire section should use ADOT Alt "B" plan.
- Alternative B for the area near I17 is preferred since it gives access both north and south of SR260.
- The proposed access road (north side of Hwy 260) provides property owners easier access without adding highway intersections.
- Consolidation of Park Verde, Doug's Park, and Dickison Circle a great idea in both options



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

- Four lanes, with right-in, right-outs; 45 mph good idea; may need light at Horseshoe Bend

Newton Lane to Wilshire Road Cons

- Sav-Mart—Our 30 acres on 260, commercial/residential is not allowed access to Hwy 260 or full intersection. We have a dedicated road access to 260 now and will get nothing. Plan B was never shown before November 16, 2005 to the public. October 5, 2005 plans, public session, showed Doug's Park Road as right-in, right-out
- Need right-in, right-out at Park Verde Road
- There is a huge gulch north of Dickison Circle that is not passable with high runoff
- Alternative B. The intersection at Doug's Park Road will encourage more traffic through a residential area.
- Who is going to pay for access by others if you close off these three streets? The maps do not show current streets.
- The cost to the property owners is too expensive!!
- Need to improve sight distances at Horseshoe Bend; it would be nice to consolidate streets/roads in this area if possible
- The primary problems with Alternative A are the creation of an effective link with properties to the south, including Eng, and the costs associated with crossing the major wash on both the east and west side of the highway, plus the additional driving distance to Hwy 260 for the residents of Park Verde. If Alternative B is selected, would it be feasible to shift the centerline of the new east-west roadway north to the property line itself? Although the property to the north has a north-south depth of only 200 feet, the property, with grading, is primarily usable, while the Reed parcel loses land to the north and east roadways, to the realigned wash channel and to the controlled access area for the large wash to the south. Even a small amount of land saved will contribute to the creation of a sensible economic development project.
- Speed limit should be transitioned to 55 mph sooner (at Wilshire Road); it should be transitioned to 65 mph from Thousand Trails to Prairie Lane that was not addressed because of no conflict.
- Doesn't connect as well to Dickison Circle and Doug's Park Road
- Expense for access roads; A does not provide an alternate way around



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

- The Speed Limit should transition to 55 mph sooner & the highway should be a 4-lane divided highway with open median from Newton Lane to Wilshire Road.
- Speed limits too slow. Interchanges, as originally planned in the Access Management Plan taxpayers already paid \$250,000 for, would be preferable to the mobility and safety of this highway to keep the traffic moving and the air cleaner, and to prevent accidents, deaths and maimings.
- Alt A seems limited to many parcels. Limits many parcels' highway access.
- Option A doesn't seem to increase mobility.

Thousand Trails Road to Coury Drive Pros

- Alternative A would be my choice of the 2 options
- At the Coury area, Alt A is preferable because it's one less full access (signal) location and the majority of property owners prefer this location. (Including a large business right behind Coury's, Griffith Enterprises. Tom Griffith prefers Alt. A—). It is a better location considering the highway grade is flat, in the bottom of a sag. The other alternate at the Coury location creates 2 intersections, both on an upgrade/downgrade on the highway. The City of Cottonwood met with property owners, and the hands down choice is Alternate A in the Gateway/Coury area. The Steve Coury business needs to share access at the new full intersection with the other property owners and users for a cohesive and comprehensive Access Management Plan.
- Alternative A seems more logical, requires only a single intersection, and simplifies the service road requirement
- Alternative A is best. One intersection at the base of the grade would be safer for traffic leaving Coury complex and heading to Cottonwood. Coury still has right in/out at Coury Drive. Back businesses would be safer to reach.
- To keep the number of full intersections to a minimum, I would prefer Alternative A. Coury can live with right-in, right-out.
- Alternative A provides a better balance and will facilitate the development of more commercial sites.
- Alternative A is the best option. All property owners have access and there is only one full intersection.
- I prefer Alternative A. One less signal location.
- I like A – only 1 major intersection. Will soon need light for trucks and motorhomes to have good access for slow startups.



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16 Presentation of Findings December 1, 2005

- I prefer Alternative A because there will be one less major intersection and it seems to take care of Coury and Thousand Trails pretty well. B adds one more 4-way intersection that really isn't needed.
- We would like to see Alt. A at the Coury area
- Alternative A provides for growth & access while having only one intersection. The New Full Intersection should provide a safe & visible intersection with good access for everyone. Steve Coury needs to share access at the New Full Intersection with the other property owners & users.
- While both alternatives have excellent features, I prefer Alternative A due to the central four-way location. It serves all surrounding properties well from that location and has excellent highway visibility from north and south.
- Alternative A provides for growth and access while giving a visible intersection for safety with the new full intersection.
- I've reviewed some of the preliminary drawings and would especially wish to encourage ADOT to select ALTERNATE "A" at the Coury dealership
- At the Coury area, Alt A is preferable because it's one less full access (signal) location. It is a better location considering the highway grade is flat, in the bottom of a sag. The other alternate at the Coury location creates 2 intersections, both on an upgrade/downgrade on the highway.
- Coury Area should use ADOT Alt "A" plan.
- I prefer Alternative A because it contains only one consolidated access point and because of the location of it. There have been many bad accidents on this stretch of road. If the accident rate goes up per intersection, it makes sense to me to keep things as uncomplicated as possible. I also think a good point was made about starting and stopping the big trucks on a hill. Alternative B does seem to give them less "running room" with more stops. Bicyclists also appreciate not having to stop on hills.
- The Alternative I prefer here is Alternative A. Allowing one full Intersection for the area and providing Alternate Access by Others. On Alternative B The intersections are placed in bad spots the one south of Coury Dr is right on a hill which would not be good for visibility.
- In the Coury area Alt A is preferable because it provides a connection to existing business and to the old highway already in existence. Near I-17 alt B is best for connectivity to the south and east side. I am not in favor of the taxpayers footing the bill for billionaire landowners for access to SR 260 from any other intersection other than the county facilities or from the Coury entrance, make them pay for the frontage road between the Coury entrance and the County jail Two Signals between Pioneer and the freeway is too many as long as



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

we have CTI trucks breathing down our neck with their headlights in the back window.

- Alt A is preferable because it is one less full access (signal) location and the majority of property owners prefer this location. The highway grade is better at this location and one access is preferable to two.
- I choose Alt. A for the area near the Coury car dealership. This seems to have the least amount of impact on traffic flow from the Upper Verde.
- Alt A maintains Thousand Trails as a pristine access to federal and State lands while providing a needed secondary connector to Thousand Trails to the new intersection (needs a light) for the large mobile home rigs and commercial trucks entering and exiting the RV park and Industrial area. This also provides a realistic loop at Wilbur road and an access point at Wilbur.
- Alt A is the best plan in regards to safety and traffic flow, as long as TT stays a full intersection as indicated on the map @ the presentation
- We prefer Alternative A in the Steve Coury area because it eliminates an intersection.
- Alt A is best with one full access intersection. Coury Drive should only be a right in point.

- We favor Alternative B
- I like Option B because of future growth and that Coury must expand on his property north of his GM plant.
- Like Option B. Coury should have full access. However, Thousand Trails should also have a full intersection.
- Prefer Alternative B

- Divided 4 lanes with right turn accel/decel lanes
- It is a very good plan using the frontage and backage roads (279); also I think we definitely need a light at Cherry

Thousand Trails Road to Coury Drive Cons

- Original design changed from full intersection to nothing or right-in right-out, safety concerns w/ big RVs pulling out into high-speed traffic and compound that with low visibility
- Between Thousand Trails and Coury is 9/10 to one mile apart. Why only one intersection?



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

- Don't like A – isolates Coury. Slow down w/ heavy trucks could defeat mobility.
- Need right-in, right-out at existing Thousand Trails
- We do not think that there should be a different access for Coury Drive
- Alternative B. The extra intersection to serve Wilbur Road/Thousand Trails would be at the crest of a grade and would have poor line of sight. The proposed intersection south of Coury's would also be hampered by the hill going south. The existing Coury exit for people going to Cottonwood is dangerous enough right now.
- Alt B two full intersections limits mobility and Thousand Trails does not need a separate intersection.
- Alternative B. The new full intersection serves present users to the detriment of future development.
- Alt B is unacceptable, adding two intersections instead of one. As on 89A between Cottonwood and Sedona, it would be preferable to have 65 mph speed limits, especially on the divided highway areas, rather than the 55 to 45 mph speed limits that all of the proposed added intersections may require. Seven and eight intersections are too many for safety and mobility. We need to scale back.
- Option B seems unsafe by putting relocated Thousand Trails at the top of the hill with limited visibility to the west. This also forces RV's through the industrial park and intermingles traffic. Option B ignores current access points to Thousand Trails, Alcantara Vineyard and Winery, Bignotti Beach and Wilbur.
- Could slow traffic if warrants are met for full intersections and traffic lights installed.
- Need TI at Coury Lane; this will benefit three businesses: GMC, Ford, and Griffith's business
- There are political issues with respect to Coury, who has repeatedly threatened to de-annex from Camp Verde if he does not get to keep his four-way intersection. Such a move could cost Camp Verde dearly when it comes to sales tax revenue. Clearly, this is not ADOT's problem, but would it be worth reversing the main intersection with Coury Drive?
- Concern for Motoplex access to new full intersection. Concern for USFS road access to Wilbur Road intersection. Will they be provided?
- Coury Drive should have a full intersection because it is an established business and has the most traffic of anything along that segment of the roadway. If SR 260 needs to have a jog in it to allow for 600 feet in front of Coury then that is what is needed.
- Out of Africa probably won't be happy because they won't have straight in access; however, they built there anyway!



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

- Cost of access roads.
- Concern for Motoplex Access to the New Full Intersection from the property corner. Visibility for necessary U-turns at Thousand Trails/Wilbur Road when leaving the right in/right out at the Motoplex to return to Highway I-17. USFS Road Access from the Thousand Trails/Wilbur Road intersection needs to remain or be provided.
- We really do not need the full intersection at Fain Rd. It would impede those who are traveling to and from jobs in the Cottonwood area.
- The full intersection at Fain Road should be deleted. It will impede the safety and mobility needs of the greatest number of people in the entire Verde Valley. [The Verde Valley population center IS in the Upper Verde Valley.] Safety and mobility for the 30,000++ residents of the Upper Verde Valley (plus residents who live in Camp Verde and drive back and forth to work and vice versa) must be considered before the demands of two vacant land speculators.
- Delete altogether the access at Fain Road.
- Eliminate the full intersection at Fain Rd. The purpose of the improvements on Highway 260 should be to facilitate the uninterrupted flow of traffic from I17 to Cottonwood.
- There seemed to be some concern that limiting access to Coury Drive would affect the area financially, but I really don't see the reasoning behind this. It seems to me that anyone with the money and time to purchase a vehicle out there in the first place, would not be put off by having full access moved a few blocks down the road. As an owner of a Pontiac, I have been a customer of Steve Courys and will probably be so in the future. I don't care about immediate access on Coury Drive. I want to be able to drive there without the extreme stress of having to drive at whatever speed is needed to prevent a head-on crash.
- I request that the intersection at Fain Rd. be deleted from the plan. This full intersection impedes mobility and its usefulness is limited.
- The major intersection should be keep @ Coury Drive and this intersection should have signals. With all the truck traffic coming in and out of the planned industrial park, and all the 20' + trailers and 5th wheels accessing TT, the flow of traffic needs to be slowed down to allow the longer vehicles to cross the media and proceed into the flow of traffic. The original study for Coury Drive looked at this with placing the intersection on a long flat place in the highway to permit traffic enough time to view the lights and/or the intersection. I feel the same on the placement of the full intersection @ TT, allowing a light @ Coury the longer



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

5th wheels, mobile homes, and trucks (commercial) with trailers will have a protected turn both going to the right or left.

- I have a personal interest as the my vineyard, winery, and B&B Inn are at the end of Thousand Trails, the property has been zoned by the county Commercial, and when completed (expected 12/06), I will be expecting traffic of over 500 persons per week. I like seeing the full intersection at Thousand Trails as putting traffic thru a Industrial Park would not be an added experience for those going to the Vineyard for the ambience. This 'destination' will be open to the public and will have public access to the 'beaches' and fishing
- The Fain Ranch intersection should be eliminated, since these areas can be easily accessed from Cherry Rd or the new 279 intersection.
- The full intersection at Fain Road would impede the safety and mobility needs of the greatest number of people in the Verde Valley - - - all of the residents of the upper Verde Valley (where the population center is) AND the residents of Camp Verde who drive to Cottonwood for employment and/or services. Their needs should not be ignored because of the demands of two vacant land speculators.



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

Letters

- Yavapai Fence** Letter dated November 23, 2005 requesting that right-in, right-out be moved north to the common boundary between Mike Mulcaire Excavating, Inc. and Yavapai Fence. Letter also from Mike Mulcaire in agreement. Other wide parties in agreement with plan as presented November 16.
- Sav-Mart** Letter dated 11/22 - hand delivered and faxed by Robbins & Green, attorneys for property owner (s); parties were in agreement with October 5 depiction of full intersection at Dickison Circle, now object to removing said element. Alternative A would be acceptable if the Access Control were redefined to allow access to the Dickison Circle/SR 260 intersection from the Sav-Mart property. Property owner representative Edwin Eng (comment form filled out by him included in comments on preceding pages).
- Ewin** Submitted comment forms and maps requesting full intersection at Dickison Circle to accommodate "approved site plan" that shows restaurant, retail village, health club, and 20 residential condos.
- Groseta Ranches** Fax dated 11/23 – requesting one more full-access intersection on the Aultman Land & Cattle II, LLC property and to move the Fain Ranch Road intersection back to the location where it exists presently (associated justification included in letter along with maps). Also requesting full at Hayfield Draw/Old 279. Also requesting that Coury and Thousand Trails be maintained as full-access intersections.
- Clarkdale** Comment form submitted - Prefer Alternative B for Newton to Wilshire and Alternative A for Thousand Trails to Coury; concerned by "way to many full access points". Complimentary of 4-lane plans, public involvement process.



Summary of Public Comment on the November 16
Presentation of Findings
December 1, 2005

Yavapai County
Public Works

Comment form submitted - Prefer Alternative B for Newton to Wilshire and Alternative A for Thousand Trails to Coury; concern for increased number of full intersections and also for mitigation costs. Complimentary of process and balanced proposal.

Bicycles

Correspondence regarding rumble strips, shoulder width over bridges; requesting 10-foot shoulders for bicycle use due to 55 mph posted speed (they say 8-ft is ok w/ 45 mph but 10-ft needed for safety with higher speeds); "Share the Road" with bicyclists signage. Requesting meeting with project team prior to his ADOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Steering Committee meeting on December 1.

Camp Verde

Letters received from Town Manager and Council Members expressed concern over scheduling conflict on November 16, as well as concern about access shown for Coury, Out of Africa, and the planned U of A extension. Correspondence expressed the importance of those businesses to the Town and region.

Cottonwood

Letter dated November 21, 2005 and addressed to Bob Miller, multiple signatories; Favor Alternative A for Thousand Trails to Coury; requesting that the state consider extending the construction of Phase 1A east through the full access intersection presented in Alternative A, stating that the segment through national forest has no controversy and would extend initial construction to the Cottonwood town limit.