



## MAP COMMENTS

| # | Map          | Source  | Comment   | Suggested Action  | Final Action Taken  |
|---|--------------|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Land Use Map | James Poulos, Robson Communities and its affiliates           | The land use designations for certain portions of Robson Ranch and EJR Ranch (which are currently within or immediately adjacent to Eloy city limits) as shown in the land use plan map appended to the October 2008 draft Comprehensive Plan are not consistent with the current approved land uses. We have obtained PAD on both Robson Ranch and EJR Ranch and certain areas of Robson Ranch have also been platted. More specifically, the PAD for Phase I of Robson Ranch (1568 acres) allows 4687 dwelling units, the PAD for Phase II of Robson Ranch (1770 acres) allows 4727 dwelling units, the PAD for Additional Triangle Portion of Robson Ranch (178 acres) allows 542 dwelling units, the PAD for Phase I of EJR Ranch (2185 acres) allows 5917 dwelling units and the PAD for Expansion Phase of EJR Ranch (160 acres) allows 560 dwelling units. Portions of this property appear to be shown on the land use plan map as Rural Residential (0-.05 du/ac). | Check land use designations for property  | Changed to Moderate Low Density Residential                                       |
| 2 | Land Use Map | Ryan Desmond, Vestar  | NWC of Gantzel and Ocotillo Roads (50 acres) as “moderate low density residential” does not recognize existing rights in current “urban” designation and we propose that the “regional commercial” designation is the most appropriate designation for this property. Property is current zoned CB-1 and would allow rezoning to CB-2. Concerned that with the current designation this would not be allowed as easily. (see letter for more detailed reasons for the recommendation)   | Modify land use designation   | No change to the map  |
| 3 | Land Use Map | Greg Loper, Planning Consultant                               | Recommend – re-designate more of the “Medium Intensity” areas as “High Intensity” Examples – I-8 (and its interchanges with Stanfield Road & SR 84), SR 347, etc.   | Recommend – re-designate more of the “Medium Intensity” areas as “High Intensity” (which does include employment uses) to take advantage of these major transportation corridors. Examples – I-8 (and its interchanges with Stanfield Road & SR 84), SR 347, etc. | No change to the map  |
| 4 | Land Use Map | Robert G. Longaker III, Senior Project Manager, The WLB Group | Mid Intensity Activity Center in the San Manual area is not quite in the correct location   | Modify exhibit – see Exhibit A attached to the December 3, 2008 letter.   | Modified the location of the Mid Intensity Activity Center in the San Manual area |
| 5 | Land Use Map | Robert G. Longaker III, Senior Project Manager, The WLB Group | Black Hills Parcel (940 acres) – open space designation is not consistent with the existing Comprehensive Plan of Rural and we request that the designation be changed to Very Low Density Residential to allow for residential development up to a maximum of one dwelling unit per acre. (see maps attached to letter 12/03/08)   | Modify open space designation   | No change to the map; open space designation allows 1 dwelling unit per acre      |



| #  | Map          | Source  | Comment   | Suggested Action  | Final Action Taken   |
|----|--------------|---|---|---|--|
| 6  | Land Use Map | Robert G. Longaker III, Senior Project Manager, The WLB Group | West State Route 77 Parcel (1.901 acres) – primary concern is that the existing RC land use designation allows for commercial services and business uses and the MLDR designation is purely a residential designation. As such, this parcel has lost the ability to accept future commercial or business uses without an amendment. It would appear that the most appropriate designation might be Mixed Use – Residential Focused. | Modify designation - We would like to discuss further. (see maps attached to letter 12/03/08)   | No change to the map; Moderate Low Density Residential does allow commercial uses; plan text includes guidelines |
| 7  | Land Use Map | Robert G. Longaker III, Senior Project Manager, The WLB Group | West State Route 77 Parcel (1.901 acres) – southern portion of this parcel contains a mix of Open Space and VLDR. It is our assumption that the final configuration of open space would be subject to more detailed study conducted during the rezoning or platting stage.  | We wish to confirm this assumption. (see maps attached to letter 12/03/08)  | No change to the map   |
| 8  | Land Use Map | Robert G. Longaker III, Senior Project Manager, The WLB Group | East State Route 77 Parcel (480 acres) – Existing Comprehensive Plan land use designations are Rural Community on the western portion and Rural on the eastern portion. It appears to show MLDR along SR 77 and VLDR and OS on the remainder.   | Primary concern is that existing designation allows for commercial services and business uses. (see maps attached to letter 12/03/08)   | No change to the map   |
| 9  | Land Use Map | John Windes, Region V Habitat Specialist, AZ Game & Fish Dept | Open Space Designation – The Department strongly supports the inclusion of the Pinal County OSTMP as a base component of the Comprehensive Plan.  | Reconcile the Land Use Plan with the OSTMP. Many open space corridors are not visible on the Land Use Plan.   | Reviewed the map to ensure that it is correct  |
| 10 | Land Use Map | John Windes, Region V Habitat Specialist, AZ Game & Fish Dept | We have identified several inconsistencies between the OSTMP and the draft Comprehensive Plan.  | Reconcile inconsistencies between Land Use Plan and Open Space and Trails Master Plan and/or update OSTMP.  | See note above   |
| 11 | Land Use Map | John Windes, Region V Habitat Specialist, AZ Game & Fish Dept | Open space and trail components may have been overlooked  | Update the open space component to include missed opportunities and new information such as recently modeled wildlife movement corridors, conservation plans and easements, and land acquisitions, as well as those areas identified by the Department. | Changes will require area specific studies   |
| 12 | Land Use Map | John Windes, Region V Habitat Specialist, AZ Game & Fish Dept | A wildlife corridor connecting the Santa Catalina Mountains to the Tortolita Mountains south of Oracle Junction and crossing Highway 77 is <b>identified in the OSTMP but the section east of 77 is missing from the Land Use Plan map</b>  | Reconcile these plans; add this corridor to the map.  | Reviewed the map to ensure that it is correct  |
| 13 | Land Use Map | John Windes, Region V Habitat Specialist, AZ Game & Fish Dept | It appears that the Moderate Low Density Residential GIS layer, which appears in yellow, covers the open space layer in many places. Does this residential overlay supersede the open space layer?  | If the residential layer is not intended to nullify the open space corridors identified in the Open Space and Trails Master Plan then the map should be reconciled. If it does nullify the OSTMP this should be made abundantly clear.                  | See note above   |



| #  | Map           | Source  | Comment  | Suggested Action   | Final Action Taken                   |
|----|---------------|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| 14 | Land Use Map  | John Windes, Region V Habitat Specialist, AZ Game & Fish Dept | Problematic for the Dept. is the wildlife corridor between Picacho Peak State Park and the Ironwood Forest National Monument. This corridor is a high priority for the Dept, especially in light of the proposed I-10 bypass through this area.  | The Dept. would like to see this corridor mapped as open space or designated as the wildlife corridor in some way.   | Comprehensive Plan amendment process |
| 15 | Land Use Map  | John Windes, Region V Habitat Specialist, AZ Game & Fish Dept | The wildlife corridor between the Ironwood Forest National Monument (IFNM) and the Picacho Mountains is missing from the Land Use Plan.  | This corridor is also within the City of Eloy's planning area. The County should add this open space corridor to the Land Use Map so that all planners are aware of it. This corridor has been modeled by Dr. Paul Beier and the report is available at <a href="http://corridordesign.org">corridordesign.org</a> . | See response 14                      |
| 16 | Land Use Map  | John Windes, Region V Habitat Specialist, AZ Game & Fish Dept | <p>There is no open space or wildlife corridor identified within the Red Rock urban growth area. The Department has modeled a corridor for wildlife movement linking the Ironwood Forest National Monument to the BLM land north of I-10 identified as a potential regional park.</p> <p>Recognize the need to preserve a wildlife corridor through the Red Rock metro area and depict this on the Land Use map. The Department sees a future where Arizona is divided by the Sun Corridor and where there is not movement of wildlife across this developed area. This area is crucial habitat for the Tucson Shovelnose Snake. Without adequate open space and corridors set aside, this and other valley floor endemic species may become major constraints to future development under the Endangered Species Act.</p> | There is no open space or wildlife corridor identified within the Red Rock urban growth area. Please consider a designation.   | See response 14                      |
| 17 | Land Use Map  | John Windes, Region V Habitat Specialist, AZ Game & Fish Dept | There is a large, shapeless area north of Mammoth identified for development. This area is not adjacent to any developed area.   | Add this area to the surrounding open space and consider reducing open space immediately adjacent to existing development around Mammoth.  | See response 14                      |
| 18 | Land Use Plan | John Windes, Region V Habitat Specialist, AZ Game & Fish Dept | Large areas stretching from Kearny to Dudleyville are designated for development. This area is currently not even accessible by paved road and almost all existing development is on the east side of the river.   | We suggest that the existing communities of Kearny and Dudleyville be buffered to show where development is preferred and that these undeveloped areas west of the rivers be set aside as open space given that they are unlikely to be developed and are far from existing infrastructure.                          | See response 14                      |
| 19 | Land Use Plan | John Windes, Region V Habitat Specialist, AZ Game & Fish Dept | An additional open space corridor should link Black Mountain with the Santa Catalina Mountains.  | Open Space is designated west of Oracle which preserves habitat connectivity with the Coronado National Forest. This corridor should extend across Highway 77 northward to connect with the open space network linking to Black Mountain.  | See response 14                      |



| #  | Map           | Source | Comment   | Suggested Action  | Final Action Taken  |
|----|---------------|--------|---|---|---|
| 20 | Land Use Plan | CMX    | Unmarked Primary Airport on Land Use Plan map.  | Williams Gateway Airport should be identified on Land Use Plan Map, even though it is outside the County. This is a significant regional airport.   | The map shows the airport already                                       |
| 21 | Land Use Plan | CMX    | Primary Airport within the Aviation Based Commerce Center not identified.   | Coolidge Airports should be identified as a Primary Airport within the Aviation Based Commerce Center.  | Map changed to show primary airports                                    |
| 22 | Land Use Plan | CMX    | Mixed Use Activity Centers on Land Use Plan Map   | May encourage leap-frog development and sprawl in smaller, rural areas. Will the plan negatively encourage sprawl in multiple locations of the county, as those areas begin to develop? See comments related to page 3.           | No change made to the map   |
| 23 | Land Use Plan | CMX    | Map: There is a tremendous amount of open space and rural residential and/or VLDR on the eastern half of the county which is mostly BLM or State land. At the same time, it is noted much of the area in the eastern half which is privately owned is MLDR. Is the State or the BLM on board with the public property being slated as fairly undevelopable? If they intend to auction property the values will not be in line with the values associated with the western half of the county. Growing Smarter Plus states, "In applying an open space element or a growth element of a general plan a municipality shall not designate private land or state trust land as open space, recreation, conservation or agriculture unless the municipality receives the written consent of the landowner or provides an alternative, economically viable designation in the general plan or zoning ordinance, allowing at least one residential dwelling per acre." | Balance the open space through out the county. BLM and especially ASLD land will not necessarily remain open space. Be sure the State and BLM are involved with the review of the Plan.   | No change made to the map   |
| 24 | Land Use Plan | CMX    | Map: The area west of I-10 is much more dense than the area east of I-10, while there are more transportation corridors depicted in the east.   | Balance the uses through out the Plan and do not assume ASLD and BLM land will remain open space or low density. The Plan should account for higher densities and implementation of transit along major transportation corridors. | No change made to the map   |
| 25 | Land Use Plan | CMX    | Map: Where is the commercial? Commercial acreage under 20 acres is not shown on the map (per the text), yet this seems to pose problems when locating commercial or other uses within areas designated moderate low density (the majority of land use not within open space categories). Based on this, amendments will be required for developing commercial nodes to serve local populations anywhere not indicated on the map.   | This map should outline locations for commercial. Plan should incorporate area plans to focus on developing areas.  | No change made to the map; there is criteria in the text for commercial |



| #  | Map           | Source   | Comment   | Suggested Action  | Final Action Taken   |
|----|---------------|--|---|---|--|
| 26 | Land Use Plan | CMX  | The Land Use Plan appears to ignore municipalities' general plans and other approved developments' (such as PADs within unincorporated areas) land use designations. Land within municipal boundaries is not subject to the County's Comprehensive Plan, but the Plan identifies land uses nonetheless. This is confusing and contradictory. The hatch marks used to identify municipal boundaries are hard to read and showing County land use designations underneath city jurisdiction is inaccurate and misleading. | Either indicate municipal planning areas and existing approved developments (e.g. PADs) on the land use plan by using a blanket color -- defined in the legend as being outside the County jurisdiction or included in a different plan -- or incorporate general plan maps and approved land use plans into the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Plan. The former option is more feasible as it will require updates less frequently. As was discussed at the developers forum, the Comprehensive Plan will be provided in a web-based format; to facilitate coordination between municipalities and the County, the County could provide direct links (embedded in the land use plan, perhaps?) to municipal general plan land use maps. Approved master plans/PADs in the county should be reflected in this Plan as well, probably best managed through the inclusion of area plans. | The Comprehensive Plan will be provided on the County's website and links to the municipalities' general plans will be provided to allow for cross referencing |
| 27 | Land Use Plan | CMX  | The Land Use Plan appears to ignore municipalities' general plans and other approved developments' (such as PADs within unincorporated areas) land use designations. Land within municipal boundaries is not subject to the County's Comprehensive Plan, but the Plan identifies land uses nonetheless. This is confusing and contradictory. The hatch marks used to identify municipal boundaries are hard to read and showing County land use designations underneath city jurisdiction is inaccurate and misleading. | Either indicate municipal planning areas and existing approved developments (e.g. PADs) on the land use plan by using a blanket color -- defined in the legend as being outside the County jurisdiction or included in a different plan -- or incorporate general plan maps and approved land use plans into the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Plan. The former option is more feasible as it will require updates less frequently. As was discussed at the developers forum, the Comprehensive Plan will be provided in a web-based format; to facilitate coordination between municipalities and the County, the County could provide direct links (embedded in the land use plan, perhaps?) to municipal general plan land use maps. Approved master plans/PADs in the county should be reflected in this Plan as well, probably best managed through the inclusion of area plans. | No change made to the maps; see response 26  |
| 28 | Land Use Plan | Tom Collazo, Associate State Director for Conservation | Page 46: Land Use Plan Map. The Open Space areas on the map should include all areas designated in the Final Master Plan Map in the October 2007 Pinal County Open Space and trails Master Plan. Of particular concern are areas along Highway 77 south of Winkelman and other areas in eastern Pinal County that the Land Use Plan Map now characterizes as Moderate Low Density Residential.  |   | See response 14  |

Pinal County Comprehensive Plan  
 Second 60 Day Review Draft (October 2008)  
 Map Comment Matrix



| #  | Map  | Source                             | Comment  | Suggested Action  | Final Action Taken   |
|----|--|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 29 | Land Use Map   | Alan Reese,<br>Synadase Farms LLC  | Change the designation of the Stanfield Road/I-8 interchange from Mid Intensity Activity Center to High Intensity Activity Center.   | Change land use designation to High Intensity Activity Center   | No change made to the map. This area has Federal land to the south and west which constrain the market area. There are also the presence of very rugged terrain immediately to the north, all of which point toward a Mid Intensity Activity Center. |
| 30 | All Land Use Plan Exhibits and Economic Plan         | El Dorado Holdings and Consultants | Need to identify street names on the exhibits  | Add street names to the land use plans.   | No change made to the map; the GIS layers will have street names; the scale of the map does not allow for more information   |
| 31 | Land Use Plan Exhibits and Economic Development Plan | Court Rich, Rose Law Group         | Modify Land Use Plan and Economic Development Plan   | Show the North-South Freeway alignment continuing south along Fast Track Road until reaching I-10.  | No change made to the map; the current North-South Freeway alignment follows current ADOT planning; as ADOT moves forward with its studies the alignment will be fine-tuned  |
| 32 | Land Use Plan  | Court Rich, Rose Law Group         | Walton Cactus Springs - 323 acres located at the southwest corner of Ralston and Pima Roads near Maricopa. Cactus Spring recently processed an approved amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and received approval for PAD zoning with the County for a master planned community but is shown as just Moderate Low Density Residential on the draft Plan map. | See the letter from the County approving the PAD application attached as Exhibit A to 12/22/08 letter. Unless the requested text changes are made to the current Moderate Low Density Residential category this land will suffer a diminished value and a severe limitation of its uses. The only other alternative is to re-designate it into a more flexible category such as Mixed Use Residential Focused under the Plan. | No change to the map; see text in the plan regarding "Relationship to Approved Zoning"   |



| #  | Map           | Source                     | Comment   | Suggested Action  | Final Action Taken                          |
|----|---------------|----------------------------|---|---|---|
| 33 | Land Use Plan | Court Rich, Rose Law Group | Walton Red Rock State Land - 6, 540 acres located generally northeast of I-10 adjacent to the east side of the Union Pacific proposed rail switch yard. The Arizona State Land Department and Walton are jointly planning the Red Rock parcel. It recently received approval from the County to be re-designated on the Comprehensive Plan to allow for a dynamic combination of uses. See the attached letter from the County confirming this change at Exhibit B.   | While many of the uses are appropriately designated on the Plan's map the presence of the Mid Intensity Activity Center is concerning. As explained above, we have concerns about the limitations and strict specification of this designation and fear that it may actually limit the creativity and options available to develop this site unless the text is substantially modified to make the category more flexible. For this reason, we ask that the "dot" be removed from this parcel and instead, allow for development under the already shown, Mixed Use Residential Focused category. It is Walton's intent to develop a fully mixed use commercial activity center as part of this community and removal of the "dot" is the best way to insure that they retain the flexibility they need and that the County approved with their Comprehensive Plan Amendment. | No change made to the map                   |
| 34 | Land Use Plan | Court Rich, Rose Law Group | McArdle Retail Site - 38 acres at the southeast corner of Table Top and Fulcar Roads. See a map depicting the location of the site attached as Exhibit C (letter 12/22/08). Over the last year this site received approval from the County for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment taking the property from Foothills to Transitional (PZ-PA-O 10-07) and from the City of Maricopa designating the site as commercial. See attached confirmation of this change from the County at Exhibit D (letter 12/22/08). | On August 20, 2008 Kevin McArdle provided the County with a letter asking that the designation of his property be changed so that the second draft of the Plan would reflect his very recently approved land use changes. See a copy of this letter attached at Exhibit E (letter 12/22/08). Unfortunately, this change was not made and the Plan still wrongly labels this site as "Rural Residential" even though it is directly adjacent to the massive Hidden Valley I, II, and III planned communities.<br><br>We repeat the request that this site be appropriately labeled on the next draft plan and ask that it be represented as either General Commercial Mixed Use Residential Focused or, if and only if our requested text changes described above are made, Moderate Low Density Residential.  | Changed to Moderate Low Density Residential |
| 35 | Land Use Plan | Court Rich, Rose Law Group | Invenergy - 160 acres located at the northwest corner of Vail and Early Roads. The City of Mesa currently owns this site and Invenergy is in escrow to purchase this location to develop a clean and alternative energy power plant. Clean and Green energy is the future of Pinal County and this use is exactly in line with the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Plan.  | We renew or request and we ask that the Land Use Map be modified to designate this site as Employment to allow for this use.  | No change made to the map                   |



| #  | Map                                   | Source  | Comment  | Suggested Action  | Final Action Taken  |
|----|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 36 | Multimodal Circulation Plans          | El Dorado Holdings and Consultants                            | Street classifications (Parkway, Arterial, etc.) shown on Land Use Plans and Roadway & Multimodal Circulation Plans are not consistent with each other and more importantly are not consistent with the RSRSR corridor map. There are Parkways shown on the Comp Plan maps that are not on the RSRSR maps. Example White and Parker Rd, Stanfield Rd, Kortsen Rd and Hwy 84 all south of the Ak-Chin Indian Community are shown as Parkways on the Comp Plan maps, but are Principal Arterials on the RSRSR Corridor map.  | Revise Comprehensive Plan Land Use Plan maps and Roadway & Multimodal Circulation Plan maps to reflect adopted RSRSR classifications. Additionally, eliminate the "Potential Future High Capacity Corridor" designation and double arrow symbol on the Comp Plan Circulation maps. These are not addressed or shown on the adopted RSRSR corridor maps and should only be added to the Comp Plan via a Major Amendment once the studies are complete. | No change made to the map; the Comprehensive Plan is a buildout plan and better circulation is needed |
| 37 | Multimodal Circulation Map            | Mike Hutchinson and Roc Arnett, Superstition Vistas           | Recommended revision to North-South Freeway corridor alignment and SR 802 corridor   | Recommended a North-South Freeway corridor alignment and SR 802 corridor alignment north of Queen Creek Wash and intersects with US 60 rather than terminating at Florence Junction.  | No change made to the map; see response 31  |
| 38 | Multimodal Circulation Plan: Roadways | Robert G. Longaker III, Senior Project Manager, The WLB Group | Recommend a commercial designation   | Recommend that a commercial designation of approximately 20 to 30 acres be placed at the southwest corner of Judd Road and Cooper Road as well as the northwest corner of Cooper Road and Magma Road.   | No change to the map  |
| 39 | Multimodal Circulation Plan: Roadways | John Windes, Region V Habitat Specialist, AZ Game & Fish Dept | Parkway designation for Willow Springs and Barkerville Roads encourage sprawl into this area which will otherwise receive little development pressure.   | Remove Parkway designation for Willow Springs and Barkerville Roads. Parkway leading to the Willow Springs development off Highway 79 is adequate for this area.  | No change to the map; the analysis of land use at buildout indicates the need                         |
| 40 | Multimodal Circulation Plan: Roadways | John Windes, Region V Habitat Specialist, AZ Game & Fish Dept | Parkways between Highway 79 and Barkerville Road serve no known need and are designed to encourage growth in this area.  | In keeping with the Focused Growth model these parkways, which serve no existing or planned communities should be removed from the plan. Florence – Kelvin Highway and Freeman Roads already serve as primary arterials into this undeveloped area.   | No change to the map; see response 39   |
| 41 | Multimodal Circulation Plan: Roadways | Tom Collazo, Associate State Director for Conservation        | Page 148: Multimodal Circulation Plan: Roadways. We reiterate our concern about proposing a new Principal Arterial with an eastern terminus at Highway 77 south of Dudleyville and heading westward to the proposed north-south Parkway from Oracle north. The inclusion of this roadway does not appear to be supported by current or projected future growth patterns and creates the risk of undercutting open space and habitat preservation goals in the San Pedro watershed. A primary concern is that such a road would require construction of a bridge across the San Pedro River in an area that is designated as Critical Habitat for several federally listed species and where substantial investments have been made to acquire lands for habitat preservation and mitigation. |   | No change to the map; see response 39   |



| #  | Map  | Source                               | Comment  | Suggested Action   | Final Action Taken   |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 42 | Multimodal Circulation Plan: Roadways                          | El Dorado Holdings and Consultants   | There is no quantifiable justification for the amount of Parkways identified in the West Pinal area. South of the Ak-Chin community, there are 3 identified parkways and Interstate-8. Parkway capacity is estimated to be 80,000 to 90,000 vpd with an additional 100,000+ capacity for I-8. Why is there a need to provide high capacity roadways for over 300,000+ vpd, in addition to the arterial and collector street systems? Additionally, two of the parkways appear to terminate at the west Pinal border, adjacent to the Sonoran Desert National Monument. Given the National Monument and the low densities planned for the adjacent areas, it seems that the number of high volume transportation corridors exceeds the potential needs. | Remove the parkway designations until further quantifiable analysis justifies the inclusion of these high volume parkways. Further analysis is warranted, given the recent adoption of the RSRM policies for Pinal County, which will have an impact on the need for high volume parkways. This is also important because the Plan notes that any removal of high-capacity roadways, parkways and enhanced parkways are considered to be a major Comprehensive Plan amendment. | No change to the map; densities being approved are very similar to Chandler and Gilbert and therefore will need improved transportation  |
| 43 | Multimodal Circulation Plan: Roadways and Economic Development | Mayor Byron K. Jackson, City of Eloy | Alignment for the North-South Freeway is inappropriately designated through the Eloy Planning Area   | The proposed future alignment of the North-South Freeway should be shown as a specific line along Fast Track Road as it passes through the Eloy Planning Area.   | No change to the map; see response 39  |
| 44 | Multimodal Circulation Plan: Rail, Transit and Aviation        | CMX                                  | Map: In the Legend, the "Native American Community" has been called out as "Indian Community".   | Revise to "Native American Community".   | On the map, the name indicates the proper name of the land area (i.e. Tohono O'odham Nation) and on the Legend we reference generically all of the sovereign nations under the category of Native American Community |
| 45 | Multimodal Circulation Plan: Rail, Transit and Aviation        | CMX                                  | Map: Roadway classification terminology and locations do not match RSRSM roadway classifications.  | Match Figure 9 of RSRSM.   | Reviewed all maps to ensure consistency with RSRSM   |