Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 generally:

...prohibits the use of land from a park and recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site unless it can be shown that there is no prudent and feasible alternative to that use and that the project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the resource.

Section 4(f) applies to projects that receive funding from or approval by an agency of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

What are Section 4(f) properties?

Within or near the Study Area, the following are subject to protection under Section 4(f):

- Recreational trails
- Historic properties
- Recreational facilities associated with public schools
- Public parks

Highway planners and designers must demonstrate there is no prudent and feasible alternative before allowing a highway project to impact a Section 4(f) resource.

Implementing measures early in the EIS process helps to protect and avoid the use of Section 4(f) resources.
Section 4(f) – South Mountains

Public Parkland Resources (Phoenix South Mountain Park/Preserve)

The South Mountains are a highly valued resource and are afforded protection under Section 4(f) as a:

Publicly-Owned Park
- Phoenix South Mountain Park/Preserve is 16,600 acres, and is operated and maintained by the City of Phoenix as a centerpiece of the Phoenix Sonoran Preserve System.
- Over 3 million people per year hike, bike, horseback ride, and visit the park.

Historic Resource – Property Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places
- The park’s origins began in 1924 and has a rich history.
- From 1933 to 1942, projects in the park were completed by the Civilian Conservation Corps to provide relief from the Great Depression.

Traditional Cultural Property
- The South Mountains are eligible as a traditional cultural property because they are considered sacred, playing a role in certain Native American cultures, identities, histories, and oral traditions.

What are traditional cultural properties?
Traditional cultural properties (TCPs) are places considered important for their association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that are rooted in that community’s history and are important in maintaining the cultural identity of a community. TCPs are not always man made; they can be locations where a particular community has historically gone—and is known to go today—to perform traditional cultural practices.
Section 4(f) Outcomes

Representative Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Section</th>
<th>Eastern Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W101 W71 W59</td>
<td>E1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would not use any Section 4(f) resources.

Would result in the use of Section 4(f) resources in the South Mountains, including 31 acres (or less than .2 percent) of public parkland and historically-eligible land, and as a traditional cultural property.

No-Build Alternative

No immediate impacts would occur, but transportation-related planned development (nonfederally funded) could contribute to future impacts.

Representative Measures to Minimize Harm

Representative measures to minimize harm to historic properties and trails would include, but would not be limited to:

- Spanning eligible properties and trail segments to avoid impacts.
- Providing access during construction.

What are measures to minimize harm?

After determining there are no prudent and feasible alternatives to avoid the use of Section 4(f) resources, the study process requires all possible planning to minimize harm or mitigate for adverse impacts and effects. Possible measures to minimize harm may include:

- Alignment/design modifications or adjustments.
- Mitigation and enhancement measures.
- Replacement of land or facilities of comparable value and function.

Mitigation for South Mountain Park/Preserve and South Mountains Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) would include:

- Minimizing land needed and impacts of the proposed freeway during final design.
- Establishing a slope treatment plan for cuts through the ridgelines to blend the cuts into the South Mountains’ natural setting.
- Using vegetation as screening.
- Constructing aesthetically pleasing noise barriers and other structures.
- Consulting with the Gila River Indian Community and other agencies regarding design and locations of multifuse crossings.
- Contracting with the Gila River Indian Community to perform a full TCP evaluation.
- Identifying potential replacement land through coordination with appropriate stakeholders (i.e., City of Phoenix) adjacent to the park.

CONCLUSION:

After extensive consideration of a multitude of design options (i.e., tunneling, bridging), the study team determined avoidance of the mountains WOULD NOT be prudent and feasible as defined under Section 4(f).