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2-1.1 Introduction

This volume of the Boulder City/United States Highway 93 (U.S. 93) Corridor Study Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) contains a discussion of the circulation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and public hearing process, and it provides copies of the comments received on the DEIS along with responses to those comments. The comments are reproduced with an identifying document number at the top of the first page of each letter. The comments were submitted as letters, electronic mail (e-mail), public hearing transcripts, and public hearing comment sheets. Each letter, e-mail, or commenter at the public hearing has been assigned a letter and number designation at the top of the comment letter. The letter portions of the designation, corresponding to one of the five comment categories, are listed below to assist in finding individual comments:

- A Government Agencies
- B Organizations
- C General Public
- D Public Hearing Comment Sheets
- E Public Hearing Transcripts
- F Comments Received Before DEIS Release

Appendixes A through F contain the responses to these comments coded in the same letter-number designation as listed above.

2-1.2 Notice of Availability in Federal Register

The comment period on the DEIS began on March 15, 2002, when the Notice of Availability was published in the Federal Register. A copy of the notice is included as Figure 2-1. The normal 45-day public comment period was extended by 12 days by FHWA, and the public comment period closed on May 10, 2002.

2-1.3 Distribution of DEIS

Approximately 146 complete DEISs were mailed out during and after the comment period. The list of agencies, organizations, and persons who received copies of the DEIS is in Chapter 10 of the EIS.

The complete DEIS document was made available for review at the following locations:

- Boulder City Hall, Boulder City, Nevada
- Boulder City Public Library, Boulder City, Nevada
- Community College of Southern Nevada, Boulder City Campus
- Henderson City Hall, Henderson, Nevada
- Clark County Public Library, Las Vegas, Nevada
• Green Valley Public Library, Henderson, Nevada
• Henderson Public Library, Henderson, Nevada
• FHWA Division Office, Carson City, Nevada
• Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) Headquarters, Carson City, Nevada
• NDOT District 1 Office, Las Vegas, Nevada

2-1.4 Website

The entire DEIS was activated on the project website on March 15, 2002. The document could be accessed at the following website address:

http://bouldercitystudy.com

The online DEIS included all figures, tables, chapters, and text as the paper document. It included an e-mail comment feature, which enabled the reviewer to click on an e-mail link, type in comments, and submit them electronically.

2-1.5 Public Hearing

On April 4, 2002, the Project Management Team (PMT) hosted a Public Hearing to provide the interested parties with an opportunity to provide comments on the project and the DEIS. The PMT and technical staff were available to discuss the project purpose and need; major issues; alternatives and design features; and the potential social, economic, and environmental effects related to each alternative.

The public hearing was held at the following location:

• Thursday, April 4, 2002
  Boulder City Parks & Recreation Center – New Gym
  900 Arizona Street
  Boulder City, Nevada

An open house format was used, allowing members of the public to discuss the project alternatives and the DEIS with members of the PMT. Attendees were encouraged to submit comments on the DEIS using one of the following methods: completing a comment sheet, providing oral comments to a court reporter, mailing written comments, or using the project website to e-mail comments. Approximately 278 people were in attendance. The transcript from the court reporter is included in Appendix E.

The following items were on display at the meeting:

• Project schedule and an overview of the study process.
• Federal environmental review process.
• Purpose of and need for the project.
• Summary of the environmental considerations to existing U.S. 93 through Boulder City for each of the environmental categories.
• Summary of the traffic analysis for existing and future traffic.
CHAPTER 2.1 COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT EIS

STACEY E. KATZEN, Secretary
3501 Main Street, Suite 300
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866
September 12, 2002

RE: NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY FOR THE "Lindsey Energy Project: Long Range Site Development Plan, New York State, NY" Draft EIS

Dear Ms. Katz: 

I am writing to express my comments on the Draft EIS for the Lindsey Energy Project. The proposed project, located in the town of Middleburgh, New York, includes the development of a lignite mine, a lignite processing facility, and a 2000 MW lignite-fired power plant. The project is intended to be the first lignite-fired power plant in the United States and is expected to generate 2000 MW of electricity.

I am concerned about the potential environmental impacts of the project, particularly the impact on air quality and water resources. The proposed project is expected to emit significant amounts of greenhouse gases, which could contribute to climate change. Additionally, the project is expected to use large amounts of water, which could strain local water resources.

I recommend that the draft EIS include a more detailed analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the project, including the impact on air quality and water resources. I also suggest that the draft EIS include recommendations for mitigating these impacts, such as the implementation of water-efficient technologies and the use of carbon capture and storage technologies.

Thank you for considering my comments. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Position]

[Organization]
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• Summary of the noise study.
• Map of the waterways and parks/open space affected by each build alignment.
• Map of the areas for wildlife habitat.
• Summary of impacts to bicycle and pedestrian trails/pathways.
• Large-size posters of each of the build alignments. These plots indicate new roadway footprint, geometry, and the right-of-way needs with an aerial map as the base.
• Computer datashow station to show engineering files of the alignments.
• Computer datashow station displaying video animation of several alignment drive-throughs.
• Document station providing copies for review of the DEIS and all of the technical studies and appendixes.

This material was arranged in a manner that allowed attendees ample time to study the boards and interact with project team members.

The following handouts were available to all meeting attendees:

• Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study website advertisement
• Summary of the environmental considerations to existing U.S. 93 through Boulder City
• Comment sheet

The handouts were created to provide meeting attendees information about the project to take with them. To date, 331 comment sheets have been submitted. The comments received covered a wide variety of issues related to the project.

### 2-1.6 Comments on the DEIS

Approximately 326 commenters from government agencies, organizations, and members of the general public provided input on the DEIS before the close of the comment period on May 10, 2002. Another 5 commenters from organizations and members of the public provided written statements after the close of the comment period, making a total of 331 commenters on the DEIS. Of the correspondence received, 5 letters were from government agencies; 3 were from organizations; and 108 letters and e-mails were from the general public. Some of the comments from the general public were submitted via e-mail directly to the lead agency or through the project website. In addition, 30 people provided oral comments to the court reporter, and an additional 177 people submitted comment sheets during or after the public hearings. Table 2-1-1 provides an index of the agencies, organizations, and individuals that submitted written or oral comments on the DEIS. Appendix G provides a detailed summary of all substantive comments on accessibility, operations, and safety; environmental; implementation and construction; and socio-economics issues on the DEIS, both from the public hearings and those received through direct mail and e-mail. Appendixes A through F contain the responses to comments, discusses the consideration given to any substantive issues raised, and provides supporting information.
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<td>D-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D31</td>
<td>Clark, Beatrice</td>
<td>D-38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2-1-1
Index of Comment Letters for the DEIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D32</td>
<td>Clark, Robert C.</td>
<td>D-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D33</td>
<td>Compton, Gary</td>
<td>D-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D34</td>
<td>Conrad, Diane</td>
<td>D-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D35</td>
<td>Cook, Joyce D.</td>
<td>D-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D36</td>
<td>Cooper, Donald K.</td>
<td>D-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D37</td>
<td>Cornelius, Curtis</td>
<td>D-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D38</td>
<td>Crooks, Ray</td>
<td>D-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D39</td>
<td>Crowley, Ihla J.</td>
<td>D-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D40</td>
<td>Davie, Art</td>
<td>D-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D41</td>
<td>Davis, William S.</td>
<td>D-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D42</td>
<td>Davlin, Andrew Jr.</td>
<td>D-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D43</td>
<td>Denton, Ralph and Sara</td>
<td>D-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D44</td>
<td>Dey, Roxanne</td>
<td>D-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D45</td>
<td>Di Teresa, Matt</td>
<td>D-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D46</td>
<td>Dike, Aileen</td>
<td>D-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D47</td>
<td>DiManno, Fred and Joyce</td>
<td>D-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D48</td>
<td>Dismuke, Ferne</td>
<td>D-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D49</td>
<td>Doyle, Angela</td>
<td>D-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D50</td>
<td>Doyle, Leo</td>
<td>D-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D51</td>
<td>Draney, Robert</td>
<td>D-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D52</td>
<td>Dunn, Leigh</td>
<td>D-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D53</td>
<td>Eltrich, Johanna</td>
<td>D-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D54</td>
<td>Ensign, Frank E.</td>
<td>D-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D55</td>
<td>Estes, Don and LaVonne</td>
<td>D-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D56</td>
<td>Fagan, D. V.</td>
<td>D-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D57</td>
<td>Fair, Meg</td>
<td>D-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D58</td>
<td>Fair, Rod</td>
<td>D-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D59</td>
<td>Faiss, Bob</td>
<td>D-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D60</td>
<td>Ferraro, Bob</td>
<td>D-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D61</td>
<td>Froseth, James</td>
<td>D-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D62</td>
<td>Gabay, Dolores</td>
<td>D-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D63</td>
<td>Ganz, Hans A.</td>
<td>D-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Page Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D64</td>
<td>Garrity, Mark</td>
<td>D-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D65</td>
<td>Gifford, Caryn</td>
<td>D-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D66</td>
<td>Gifford, Jeff</td>
<td>D-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D67</td>
<td>Goodman, Linda</td>
<td>D-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D68</td>
<td>Grant, William L.</td>
<td>D-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D69</td>
<td>Guenther, Manfred and Margot</td>
<td>D-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D70</td>
<td>Halfauson, Lareltia O.</td>
<td>D-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D71</td>
<td>Hamel, Albert K.</td>
<td>D-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D72</td>
<td>Hansen, Jan</td>
<td>D-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D73</td>
<td>Hanson, Dennis</td>
<td>D-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D74</td>
<td>Hearn, Daniel</td>
<td>D-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D75</td>
<td>Helfrich, Harry W.</td>
<td>D-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D76</td>
<td>Hughes, Barbara</td>
<td>D-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D77</td>
<td>Hughes, James</td>
<td>D-103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D78</td>
<td>Isaacson, Ken</td>
<td>D-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D79</td>
<td>Jayne, C.</td>
<td>D-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D80</td>
<td>Jayne, Cameron</td>
<td>D-107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D81</td>
<td>Jensen, Edward H.</td>
<td>D-108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D82</td>
<td>Jensen, Teresa M.</td>
<td>D-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D83</td>
<td>Kaboli, Louis</td>
<td>D-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D84</td>
<td>Karr, Curtis D.</td>
<td>D-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D85</td>
<td>Kay, M.</td>
<td>D-113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D86</td>
<td>Kay, Stephen</td>
<td>D-114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D87</td>
<td>Kevorkian, L.</td>
<td>D-116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D88</td>
<td>Kevorkian, Len</td>
<td>D-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D89</td>
<td>Kittleson, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph</td>
<td>D-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D90</td>
<td>Lampus, Karen W.</td>
<td>D-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D91</td>
<td>Langer, Marie</td>
<td>D-123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D92</td>
<td>Lasiewicki, Jane</td>
<td>D-124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D93</td>
<td>Lasiewicki, John D.</td>
<td>D-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D94</td>
<td>Lemon, James H.</td>
<td>D-128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D95</td>
<td>Linzmaier, Peter</td>
<td>D-129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Page Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D96</td>
<td>Luisi, Antoinette</td>
<td>D-131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D97</td>
<td>Luisi, Paul</td>
<td>D-132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D98</td>
<td>Lytal, Jacqueline</td>
<td>D-133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D99</td>
<td>Lytal, Norman</td>
<td>D-135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D100</td>
<td>Markham, James R.</td>
<td>D-137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D101</td>
<td>Martin, Darryl</td>
<td>D-138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D102</td>
<td>McDonald, Nina and John</td>
<td>D-139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D103</td>
<td>McGarvey, Darrell</td>
<td>D-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D104</td>
<td>McMakim, Diane and Roger Legare</td>
<td>D-141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D105</td>
<td>Merino, R. F.</td>
<td>D-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D106</td>
<td>Merrell, Lori</td>
<td>D-143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D107</td>
<td>Merrell, Robert</td>
<td>D-145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D108</td>
<td>Meyer, Scott</td>
<td>D-147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D109</td>
<td>Miller, Billie</td>
<td>D-149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D110</td>
<td>Miller, Byron L.</td>
<td>D-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D111</td>
<td>Mlarar, Milan R.</td>
<td>D-151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D112</td>
<td>Mooney, Linda</td>
<td>D-152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D113</td>
<td>Morris, Barbara J.</td>
<td>D-153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D114</td>
<td>Morris, Ken</td>
<td>D-155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D115</td>
<td>Morwick, Marlene</td>
<td>D-156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D116</td>
<td>Morwiek, Robert</td>
<td>D-157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D117</td>
<td>Murphy, Jim</td>
<td>D-158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D118</td>
<td>Musick, Robert</td>
<td>D-159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D119</td>
<td>Nelson, Gloria (Wootten)</td>
<td>D-160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D120</td>
<td>Nickell, Bill and Betty</td>
<td>D-161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D121</td>
<td>Ohlerking, Damon</td>
<td>D-162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D122</td>
<td>Oligschlaeger, Charles</td>
<td>D-163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D123</td>
<td>Oliver, Donald and DeOnne</td>
<td>D-165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D124</td>
<td>Paxinos, Jim</td>
<td>D-167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D125</td>
<td>Perkins, Virginia and Jeff Dalby</td>
<td>D-168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D126</td>
<td>Perry, Barbara</td>
<td>D-170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D127</td>
<td>Perry, Ronald</td>
<td>D-171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Page Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D128</td>
<td>Petersen, Mildred</td>
<td>D-172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D129</td>
<td>Peterson, Chuck E.</td>
<td>D-173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D130</td>
<td>Peterson, Jack and Vanessa</td>
<td>D-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D131</td>
<td>Peterson, Linda Lee</td>
<td>D-176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D132</td>
<td>Pontillo, Ricardo</td>
<td>D-177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D133</td>
<td>Powell, Beverli G. and Jack F.</td>
<td>D-179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D134</td>
<td>Powell, Jack F.</td>
<td>D-180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D135</td>
<td>Radosta, Alfred A.</td>
<td>D-181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D136</td>
<td>Raulston, Barbara</td>
<td>D-183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D137</td>
<td>Reuther, Vaughn</td>
<td>D-185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D138</td>
<td>Rihel, Martin S.</td>
<td>D-186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D139</td>
<td>Riley, Steven</td>
<td>D-188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D140</td>
<td>Schrick, Linda</td>
<td>D-190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D141</td>
<td>Schuster, Barbara and Ron</td>
<td>D-191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D142</td>
<td>Segerblom, Gene</td>
<td>D-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D143</td>
<td>Selson, Dolores</td>
<td>D-193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D144</td>
<td>Selson, Harold</td>
<td>D-194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D145</td>
<td>Sigundson, Georgia</td>
<td>D-195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D146</td>
<td>Strickland, Tracy</td>
<td>D-196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D147</td>
<td>Struve, Ann</td>
<td>D-198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D148</td>
<td>Struve, David S.</td>
<td>D-199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D149</td>
<td>Swanson, M.</td>
<td>D-201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D150</td>
<td>Terra Vista, LP</td>
<td>D-202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D151</td>
<td>Therrien, Mary Jane</td>
<td>D-203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D152</td>
<td>Thompson, Russ</td>
<td>D-205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D153</td>
<td>Thompson, Sue</td>
<td>D-206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D154</td>
<td>Towles, Gladys C.</td>
<td>D-207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D155</td>
<td>Towles, Robert</td>
<td>D-208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D156</td>
<td>Triolo, Bob</td>
<td>D-209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D157</td>
<td>Triolo, Pamela</td>
<td>D-211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D158</td>
<td>Troiola, Julia</td>
<td>D-213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D159</td>
<td>Troup, Arlene</td>
<td>D-214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-1-1
Index of Comment Letters for the DEIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D160</td>
<td>Trygstad, Carl</td>
<td>D-215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D161</td>
<td>Tuggle, Steve</td>
<td>D-217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D162</td>
<td>Wagner, Joseph P.</td>
<td>D-219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D163</td>
<td>Waymire, Edward L.</td>
<td>D-221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D164</td>
<td>Waymire, Mrs. Billie</td>
<td>D-222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D165</td>
<td>Weaver, Molly A.</td>
<td>D-224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D166</td>
<td>Wilson, Vennita J.</td>
<td>D-225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D167</td>
<td>Wines, Virginia</td>
<td>D-227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D168</td>
<td>Wohlbrandt, Maudie</td>
<td>D-228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D169</td>
<td>Zerfoss, John</td>
<td>D-229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D170</td>
<td>Zerfoss, John</td>
<td>D-230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D171</td>
<td>Zimmerman, Lettie</td>
<td>D-232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D172</td>
<td>Zuniga, Jerome and Karen</td>
<td>D-233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D173</td>
<td>Bayer, John D.</td>
<td>D-234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D174</td>
<td>Hinson, Mary</td>
<td>D-236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D175</td>
<td>Mahaney, Rebecca L.</td>
<td>D-238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D176</td>
<td>Mahaney, Michael L.</td>
<td>D-240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D177</td>
<td>Paige, Leslie</td>
<td>D-242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPTS

<p>| E1             | Gifford, Caryn                          | E-2         |
| E2             | Hartman, Robert                         | E-3         |
| E3             | Ettrich, Joanna                         | E-8         |
| E4             | Powell, Beverli                         | E-9         |
| E5             | Strickland, Tracy                       | E-10        |
| E6             | Perkins, Virginia                       | E-16        |
| E7             | Strickland, Linda                       | E-19        |
| E8             | Hatcher, David                          | E-23        |
| E9             | Cascioppo, Chuck                        | E-24        |
| E10            | Buck, Shirley                           | E-26        |
| E11            | Doyle, Leo                              | E-28        |
| E12            | Halldarson, Loretta                     | E-29        |
| E13            | Isaacson, Ken                           | E-30        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>Therrien, Mary Jane</td>
<td>E-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>Prisem, Steve</td>
<td>E-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16</td>
<td>Steenson, Rob and Gretchen</td>
<td>E-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>Byler, Ken</td>
<td>E-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18</td>
<td>Morris, Barbara</td>
<td>E-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19</td>
<td>Tuggle, Steve</td>
<td>E-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20</td>
<td>Morneau, Emil</td>
<td>E-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21</td>
<td>Lazar, Sharon</td>
<td>E-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22</td>
<td>Reuther, Sandra</td>
<td>E-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23</td>
<td>Murray, Beth</td>
<td>E-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24</td>
<td>Cox, George</td>
<td>E-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25</td>
<td>Compton, Gary</td>
<td>E-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E26</td>
<td>Blackwell, James</td>
<td>E-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E27</td>
<td>Blackwell, Charlene</td>
<td>E-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E28</td>
<td>Broadbent, Bob</td>
<td>E-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E29</td>
<td>Adams, Pam</td>
<td>E-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E30</td>
<td>Strue, Dave and Ann</td>
<td>E-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E31</td>
<td>Strickland, Tracy and Linda (Exhibit A)</td>
<td>E-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E32</td>
<td>Strickland, Tracy (Exhibits B and C)</td>
<td>E-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E33</td>
<td>Strickland, Tracy and Linda (Exhibit D)</td>
<td>E-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E34</td>
<td>Strickland, Tracy (Exhibit E)</td>
<td>E-66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-1-1

Index of Comment Letters for the DEIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Bensinger, Jonathan E.</td>
<td>F-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brueske, Michael W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawks, Tom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McNamara, Dolores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michel, David R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sorensen, William D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spearman, Steven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watson, George Ann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wierdsman, Marge and John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, Clifton A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willis, Stanley R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Douglass, James C.</td>
<td>F-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Helfrich, Harry W.</td>
<td>F-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Jones, Robert</td>
<td>F-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Phegley, Richard and Marge</td>
<td>F-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>Radosta, Alfred A.</td>
<td>F-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Norma R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2-1.7 Responses to Comments

This FEIS for the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study includes copies of all substantive comments received from government agencies, organizations, and the general public on the DEIS. A response is provided to each substantive comment. Where the FEIS text is revised as a result of the comments received, the response indicates where revisions were made, and the FEIS changes are highlighted in the margins of the document. The response attempts to adequately address the issue or concern raised by the commenter or where substantive comments do not warrant further response, explain why they do not, and provide sufficient information to support that position.

The FEIS incorporates the DEIS in its entirety with changes made as appropriate throughout the document to reflect the identification of a preferred alternative, updated information on the affected environment, changes in the assessment of impacts, the results of coordination, comments received on the DEIS, and responses to these comments.
Response to Comment A1-1.1

FEIS Section 4.11, Economic Impacts, states that according to current engineering development, Alternative B would displace five businesses and could partially displace seven businesses along existing U.S. 93. Alternative C would not displace any businesses but would impact the planned Boulder Ridge Golf Course. Alternative D would have the least amount of direct impacts to existing homes and businesses in Boulder City.

The Preliminary Engineering Report indicates that traffic modeling predicts an LOS of B at the Railroad Pass interchange, an improvement from a predicted LOS F for Alternative A (No Build).

The Purpose and Need (FEIS Chapter 1) for the project states as a purpose to “extend freeway status to the U.S. 93/95 interchange,” which would require a grade separation of the railroad tracks.

Response to Comment A1-3.1

All build alternatives, including Alternative D (the preferred alternative), propose a railroad bridge (EX01) at the proposed U.S. 93/95 crossing of the Nevada State Division of Museums and Historic Railroad. Improvements and safety measures on the existing highway will require further consideration by NDOT and during final design.
Response to Comment A1-6.1
Comment noted. The preliminary geometry required for the bridge as part of the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor project does not accommodate the geometry required for the UPRR bridge near Russell Road.
A2

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 12
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

May 16, 2002

Daryl James, Chief, Environmental Services Division
Nevada Department of Transportation
1263 South Stewart Street
Carson City, NV 89712

Dear Mr. James:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study, Clark County, Nevada (CEQ Number: 020093, ERP Number: TIU-I40250-0V). Our review is pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and section 210 of the Clean Air Act. This letter provides a summary of EPA’s concerns. Our detailed comments are enclosed.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) propose a highway project to reduce traffic congestion, improve safety, and enhance regional mobility along U.S. 93 and improve or maintain local circulation and access within Boulder City. The western boundary of the project is in the City of Henderson, and the eastern boundary of the project is coincident with the planned western end of the U.S. 93 Hoover Dam Bypass project. The DEIS analyzes four alternatives: (A) No Action Alternative, (B) Improvements to the existing U.S. 93 Alignment, (C) Through-Town Alignment, south of existing U.S. 93, and (D) Southern Alignment, south of existing U.S. 93. A Preferred Alternative has not been identified.

In 2001, EPA reviewed and provided comments on several of the draft technical reports developed in support of this DEIS. We note that the majority of the issues we raised in our early review have been addressed in the DEIS. Overall, the DEIS is a well-prepared document that clearly identifies the proposed impacts of the proposed project. We have, however, identified environmental impacts of concern that should be more thoroughly described and mitigated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Specifically, EPA is concerned about direct project impacts to water resources, as well as indirect impacts associated with Alternative D. Because of the location of this alignment, Alternative D has the potential to influence both the timing and location of development in south Boulder City, resulting in indirect project impacts. Based on our review, we have raised this document EC-2, Environmental Concern Insufficient Info. Please refer to the attached “Summary of Rating Definitions” for further details on EPA’s rating system.

Faxed on Inserted Paper
While each of the alternatives has environmental impacts, EPA notes that Alternative D, cumulatively, has the greatest environmental impacts of all of the alternatives considered. When compared to Alternatives B and C, Alternative D has the greatest potential to impact threatened and endangered species through native habitat disturbance and fragmentations; has the most extensive roadway cuts and fill and, therefore, the highest potential for erosion; has the largest average impact to the Lake Mead National Recreation Area and to Waters of the U.S.; and Alternative D has the greatest potential to effect long-term water quality and the timing and location of future development. For these reasons, it is EPA's position that Alternative D is not the environmentally preferred alternative. If Alternative D is selected as the Preferred Alternative, the Record of Decision (ROD) will need to state that the environmentally preferred alternative was not chosen as the Preferred Alternative (40 CFR 1505.7).

EPA appreciates the opportunity to comment on the DEIS. Please send two copies of the Final Environmental Impact Statement to the address above (Mail Code: CMD-2) when it is filed with EPA's Washington, D.C. office. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Mr. or Ms. Blazej, the point of contact for this project. Nova Blazej can be reached at 415-972-3846 or Blazej.nova@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Lisa B. Hanf, Manager
Federal Activities Office

Attached: Summary of EPA Rating Definitions
Detailed Comments

cc: Ted Bendure, Federal Highway Administration-Nevada Division
Shelly Carter, Army Corps of Engineers Reno
Grady McNair, Army Corps of Engineers-St. George
SUMMARY OF EPA RATING DEFINITIONS

This rating system was developed as a means to summarize EPA's level of concern with a proposed action. The ratings are a combination of alphabetical categories for evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposal and numerical categories for evaluation of the adequacy of the EIS.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE ACTION

"LO" (Lack of Objections)
The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

"EC" (Environmental Concern)
The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EO" (Environmental Objections)
The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of new viable project alternatives. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EU" (Environmental Unsatisfactory)
The EPA review has identified advanced environmental impacts of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

ADEQUACY OF THE IMPACT STATEMENT

Category 1" (Adequate)
EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

"Category 2" (Insufficient Information)
The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives assessed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

"Category 3" (Inadequate)
EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives assessed in the draft EIS, which should be assessed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 339 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

Response to Comment A2-2.1

Section 4.6 of the FEIS (Volume I) has been updated to reflect the results of consultations with the USACE and the EPA. It also provides a description of the evaluations that contributed to the identification of Alternative D as the LEDPA. Continuing consultation with the USFWS will take place as part of the development of the Biological Assessment for implementation of the preferred Alternative D. It is anticipated that the USFWS’ Biological Opinion will include additional mitigation measures to minimize impacts to sensitive resources (see Section 4.4.3) that will be incorporated into this project. Consultations with the EPA on the development of the Conceptual Mitigation Plan also continue.

Request and recommendation for EPA and Resource Agencies’ direct involvement in project noted.

In response to EPA comments, FHWA and NDOT conducted a project site reconnaissance with USACE, as well as working sessions with EPA and USACE on the following dates:

- May 23, 2002 (meeting with USACE)
- June 11, 2002 (site visit involving USACE)
- June 12, 2002 (teleconference involving EPA, USACE, FHWA, and NDOT)

Based on the field review, a review of the information provided in the DEIS, and pursuant to the above-noted meetings, USACE provided comments and recommendations in a letter dated June 26, 2002, and included in the volume (see page A-18). USACE concurred with the delineation of waters of the U.S. presented in this FEIS. It also recommended examination of the conditions of nationwide general permit number 14. Subsequent to the completion of detailed engineering design, and in order to continue to comply with provisions of the Clean Water Act, as well as other applicable regulations, the appropriate permit application will be submitted to USACE prior to the initiation of construction.

Response to Comment A2-2.2

FEIS Sections 4.5 and 4.6 describe the measures to be taken that would avoid and minimize impacts to water resources. Recommendation for EPA and USACE involvement and coordination has been actioned. Refer to response to Comment A2-2.1.
Response to Comment A2-2.3
As noted in FEIS Section 4.5.2, the State of Nevada’s Handbook of BMPs will be utilized as guidance in implementing BMPs and monitoring. The South Valley Area 208 Water Quality Management Plan will also be consulted. FEIS Section 4.5.2 briefly describes pertinent guidance from these reference documents, and mitigation measures. The detailed BMP monitoring program will be developed as part of the project design efforts and would be completed prior to construction.

Response to Comment A2-2.4
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Sections 2.4 through 2.6 of the FEIS discusses the screening and evaluation processes that led to this decision.

Alternative D would only provide interchanges at the eastern and western project limits. Only emergency vehicular access at Buchanan Boulevard is planned as part of Alternative D. See letter from City of Boulder City dated May 23, 2002, on page A-15 of this document (Volume II of the FEIS).

Alternative D would traverse predominantly undeveloped open space owned by Boulder City since its incorporation in 1958. The sale of City-owned open space lands greater than 1 acre in size requires approval by the City electorate. Since 1979, the City’s growth-control ordinance (adopted by referendum) has limited development, resulting in annual growth of about three percent. The 1995 adopted land use plan limits future development of open space to areas west of Buchanan Boulevard, north of the airport, and south of existing development near Adams Boulevard. Based on the City's statutory controls on disposal of public lands and land development, it is reasonable to conclude the project alternatives would not have growth-inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in land use, population density, and the rate of population growth, and the associated effects on natural resources.

The updated Boulder City Master Plan was adopted in December 2003. Of the build alternatives, only Alternative D would avoid substantive conflicts with planned land use presented in the Master Plan.
Response to Comment A2-2.5
FEIS Section 6.6 describes the relevant, reasonable mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts, and identifies the responsibilities of the lead agency and other entities.

Response to Comment A2-2.6
Recommendation for additional air quality mitigation measures noted. Mitigation during construction activity is detailed in the FEIS, Section 4.2, and will conform to the purposes of the Federal Clean Air Act and follow the Clark County Department of Air Quality Management Best Management Practice manual for construction activities.
Response to Comment A2-2.7
Recommendation for materials reuse noted. As part of the preliminary and final design phases of this project, specifications for materials use will be developed and included in the specifications to the contractor.

Response to Comment A2-2.8
As noted in FEIS Section 4.10.3, NDOT has developed and circulated, in June 2002, a landscape policy that will outline a treatment methodology. The policy will describe a landscaping minimum. Compliance with EO 13112 provisions will be included as part of this policy.
Response to Comment A3-2.9
Comments noted, with particular attention to NDOW's concerns regarding the wildlife resources within the project area and the anticipated impacts associated with the build alternatives. The FEIS has been updated to include additional data pertaining to wildlife impacts that would result from the build alternatives, and to address cumulative impacts including the effect of the current roadway on bighorn movement between local mountain ranges.

Response to Comment A3-2.10
Comments noted. Mitigation measures identified in this document are preliminary and subject to refinement as additional engineering is completed for the selected alternative. Consultation with state and federal wildlife agencies during the development of the Biological Assessment (BA) will result in the refinement of mitigation measures that will be included in the Biological Opinion, and implemented as part of this project (see Section 4.4.3).
Response to Comment A3-2.11

FEIS Section 4.4 has been updated to address the bighorn-vehicle collisions that would occur from any of the alternatives, including the no-action alternative (continued use of the current roadway). FEIS Chapter 6 has been updated to address the cumulative impacts of continued development in the region on bighorn populations. Also, mitigation measures presented in FEIS Section 4.4.3 have been clarified. These specific mitigation measures, such as fencing and wildlife crossings, will be brought forward in the final design process in consultation with NDOE and federal resource agencies, to minimize the probability of direct mortalities. The mitigation in the FEIS has been developed to establish potential locations for bighorn sheep crossings.
Response to Comment A3-2.12

FEIS Section 3.4.2 has been modified to acknowledge the state-protected status of the desert tortoise pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 501.110 and Nevada Administrative Codes (NACs) 503.080, 503.090, and 503.093; and revisions to Section 4.4.4 note that state authorizations will be required should desert tortoise collection, removal, translocation, or similar activity be consequential to Alternative D.

Response to Comment A3-2.13

Comments noted.

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. Section 4.4.4 identifies NDOW as a reviewing and permitting agency for the project and, as a result, would have the opportunity to request specific mitigation measures to address any impacts of concern during the development of the Biological Opinion by USFWS.
Response to Comment A3-2.14
Comments noted. Refer to response to Comment A3-2.13.

Response to Comment A3-2.15
FEIS Section 3.4.2 has been modified to include a description of the Clark County MSHCP and a list of covered species that occur within the project area. FEIS Section 4.4.4 identifies NDOW as a reviewing and permitting agency for the project and, accordingly, will be consulted during final design regarding specific mitigation for species not covered under the MSHCP (i.e., desert bighorn sheep and banded Gila monster).

Response to Comment A3-2.16
Prior to project implementation a BA will be prepared in consultation with NDOW, USFWS, and other responsible agencies. During this process engineering design will include the development of crossings and other forms of mitigation; both bridges and oversize culverts will be considered for use. Please refer also to response to Comments A3-2.10 and A3-2.11.

Response to Comment A3-2.17
Sections 3.4 and 4.4 of the FEIS have been updated to include more detailed data provided by NDOW on bighorn occurrences in the project area, including in the vicinity of the Alternative A, B, and C corridors. Mitigation measures for the Alternatives are presented as well.
Response to Comment A3-2.18

As noted in FEIS Section 3.5.1, the desert washes within the project area convey runoff from winter and summer storms. These stormwater flows are of a temporary nature. Bridges, culverts, and other engineered features will be designed to minimize impacts to ephemeral flows (Sections 4.5, 4.6).
Response to Comment A4-3.2

The action taken by the Boulder City Council on May 14, 2002, is noted. An interchange at Buchanan Boulevard as a point of vehicle access is not proposed as an aspect of Alternative D, the preferred alternative. The FEIS notes that emergency access to the Alternative D alignment at the Buchanan Boulevard extension crossing has been incorporated into the preferred alternative development.
Response to Comment A5-2.19
The consultation process had progressed as far as appropriate through May 23, 2002 (the date of this comment letter). The process was reinitiated upon the identification of Alternative D as the preferred alternative and is addressed as part of this FEIS and will continue through preliminary and final design of the approved alternative.

Response to Comment A5-2.20
On May 14, 2002, USDI NPS LNMRA was provided with a diskette by CH2M HILL containing an electronic file copy of preliminary information assembled to facilitate NPS preparation of that agency’s impairment analysis. NPS’s impairment analysis was received at CH2M HILL on July 29, 2002. The impairment analysis is presented in Appendix D of Volume I of this FEIS.

With the inclusion of Appendix D, the particular opinions and findings of NPS have been included.
Until more activities are completed, we cannot conclude our determination as to which alternative may be preferred, nor that all prudent and reasonable measures to minimize harm to Section 4(f) resources have been employed. Should you require additional information, please contact Superintendent Bill Dickinson, Lake Mead N.R.A. on (702) 293-8920.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments.

Sincerely,

Willa R. Taylor  
Director, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance

cc:  
Mr. Bill Dickinson  
Lake Mead National Recreation Area  
National Park Service  
601 Nevada Highway  
Boulder City, Nevada 89005

Mr. Daryl James  
Chief, Environmental Services Division  
Nevada Department of Transportation  
1260 South Stewart Street  
Carson City, Nevada 89712
Response to Comment A6-2.21

Impacts to drainages within the Eldorado Valley watershed will not be considered in subsequent application to USACE for a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. They will be mitigated through conformance with appropriate design and construction criteria provided by guidelines of the Clark County Regional Flood Control District and NDOT.
Response to Comment A6-2.22
Impacts to drainages within the Lake Mead/Colorado River watershed will be quantified subsequent to the completion of initial engineering design work pursuant to implementation of Alternative D and addressed in the project-specific application to USACE for permit in compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Response to Comment A6-2.23
Prior to submittal of a project-specific application to USACE for permit in compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, determination will be made regarding whether a nationwide general permit No. 14 would be appropriate for this project.
Response to Comment A7-2.24
The NPS impairment analysis is included in this FEIS as Appendix D, Volume I. The results of this analysis, as well as those from resourcespecific analyses (e.g., the Biological Assessment, the assessment of effects to historic properties) along with agency consultations, will be used to refine and to develop additional mitigation measures appropriate to reduce impacts resulting from implementation of the preferred alternative. These measures would then be implemented prior to the beginning of construction, during the construction phase, and/or those meant to reduce operational impacts.

Response to Comment A7-2.25
Collaboration and consultation with NPS will continue to be integral components of the environmental and engineering planning efforts by NDOT and FHWA pursuant to the implementation of Alternative D.
we appreciate the opportunity for Lake Mead NRA to be represented on the PMT. Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact me at (702) 293-8920.

Sincerely,

William K. Dickinson
Superintendent

Encl:es (1)
Boulder City/US 93 Corridor Study Impairment Analysis

cc: John Price, Administrator, Federal Highways Administration
This page intentionally left blank.
Response to Comment B2.1

The Ahamak Cultural Society, which is the Historic and Cultural Resources Manager for the Carson City area, has provided an outline of the comments and responses to the Alternative D. The comments are organized into categories, and each category includes a brief summary of the comments and responses. The summary mentions that the project team has reviewed and responded to the comments, and the responses are included in the final report. The summary also notes that the project team has provided additional information to address the concerns raised in the comments. The summary concludes with a statement that the project team has taken the comments into account in the final report.
Response to Comment B2-4.1
Alternative D, the Southern Alignment, has been identified as the preferred alternative, in part due to the lesser impact on the environment of Boulder City relative to the other alternatives.
Boulder City
Chamber of Commerce

1309 Arizona Street • Boulder City, Nevada 89005-2612 • (702) 293-2034 • Fax: (702) 293-0574

Dear Valued Chamber Member:

The Board of Directors of the Boulder City Chamber of Commerce feel it is time for us to poll our business community to better identify and evaluate your knowledge and concern on the US 93/Boulder City Corridor.

How well informed do you feel about the US 93 Corridor? (circle one)
Very Well  Somewhat  Not Very  Not Concerned

How many meetings have you attended concerning this issue?
City or Council  Chamber  NDOT  Other

Do you feel you have received valid information/education from (circle one): The City? The Chamber? Other? Need more?
Yes  No  Yes  No  Yes  No  Yes  No

If a selection for the US 93 Corridor route was put to a vote of the people in a year, which route would you like to see chosen? Circle one and make a brief comment as to why or how you think it would affect your family or business.

A. No Change-keep the existing route.

B. Improved route traveling along the existing road through town and down the Hemenway Valley.

C. Northern route traveling just north of Industrial Road and continuing just below Boulder Oats RV Resort and just above Lake View housing community and down Hemenway Valley.

D. Southern route traveling south of town below the industrial plant.

All information is confidential and will be assessed by the 10 member Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce. If you want to sign your business name and address you may. The results of this survey will be used to give us a better understanding of your needs and to assist us in making a decision and to make our position known to the city council.

Our voice does make a difference and we need to make a united front. Please respond at your earliest convenience before September 15 by fax, mail or drop off at the office.

Thank you for your time in giving us this valuable information.

Visit our website: www.bouldercitychamber.com  •  E-Mail: info@bouldercitychamber.com
Dear Valued Business Owner:

The Board of Directors of the Boulder City Chamber of Commerce feel it is time for us to
poll our business community to better identify and evaluate your knowledge and concerns
on the US 93/Boulder City Corridor.

How well informed do you feel about the US 93 Corridor? (circle one)

Very Well          Somewhat          Not Very          Not Concerned
21%                14%              17%            48%

How many meetings have you attended concerning this issue?

City or Council     Chamber    Other
15%               49%            36%

Do you feel you have received valid information/education from (circle one)
The City             The Chamber     Other     Need more
Yes  24%               Yes  21%          Yes  21%     Need more  34%
No   32%                No   28%         No   28%      No need  38%

A roadway for the US 93 Corridor route was put to a vote of the people TODAY which
route would you like to see chosen? Circle one and make a brief comment as to why or how
you think it would affect your family or business.

A. No Change-keep the existing route. 59%
B. Improved route traveling along the existing road through town and down the
   Hemenway Valley. 12%
C. Northern route traveling just north of Industrial Road and continuing just below
   Boulder Oaks RV Resort and just above Lake View housing community and down
   Hemenway Valley. 5%
D. Southern route traveling south of town below the sub station and treatment
   plant. 19%

Other: 2%

All information is confidential and will be assessed by the 10 member Board of Directors of
the Chamber of Commerce. If you want to sign your business name and address you may.
Due results of this survey will be used to give us a better understanding of your needs and
1

1In case of a tie, please respond to your earliest convenience before September 15 by fax, mail or drop off at the office.
2

Thank you for your time in giving us this valuable information.

Boulder City Chamber of Commerce
1305 Arizona Street, Boulder City, NV 89005-2010 • Tel: (702) 293-2004 • Fax: (702) 293-2074

Visit our website: www.bouldercitychamber.com • E-Mail info@bouldercitychamber.com
Response to Comment B3-1.1

Comments noted. FEIS Sections 1.2 and 1.3 describe the purpose and need for the project, respectively. The purpose of the project includes improving operations at the junction of the U.S. 93/95 interchange and creating a safer transportation corridor. All three build alternatives would meet this purpose. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
We strongly support the collective position of Boulder City Mayor Bob Ferraro and all the members of the Boulder City Council, as expressed publicly at their April 23, 2002, City Council meeting, that Route D merits selection as the preferred route in the Boulder City U.S. 93 Corridor Study.

Sincerely,

Ken Sinatra

cc: Governor Kenny C. Guinn, Chairman, NDOT Board of Directors
Lt. Governor Lorraine Hunt, NDOT Board of Directors
Attorney General Frankie Sue Del Papa, NDOT Board of Directors
State Controller Kathy Augustine, NDOT Board of Directors
Thomas E. Stephens, P.E., NDOT Director
Scott Rawlins, NDOT Project Manager
Mayor Bob Ferraro, Boulder City
Andrea Anderson, Boulder City Council
Dr. Joe Hardy, Boulder City Council
Bryan Mox, Boulder City Council
Mike Pacini, Boulder City Council
Bob Faiss, Esq.
March 28, 2002

Daryl James
ND DOT Environmental Division
1263 South Stewart
Carson, Nevada 89712

Dear Mr. James:

This correspondence is in reference to the draft of the Environmental Impact Statement regarding the Boulder City/US Highway 93 Corridor Study.

Of the four alternatives listed, Alternative D is really the only salient choice for Boulder City. This is so, in that it would keep the traffic noise out of the residential parts of Boulder City and diminish noise pollution for the residents. This choice also does not result in the loss of businesses or residences which may occur with other alternatives. It is also the safest route around the city with the least chance of automobile accidents and the safest route to transport hazardous materials.

I appreciate your considering my comments and hope that you will choose Alternative D as the preferred route.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Scott L. Baranoff, M.D., F.A.C.S.
SLBmj

Response to Comment C1-2.1

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative D would bypass to the south of town. The nearest residential receptors are approximately 1.4 kilometers (km) (.85 miles) from the alignment. Therefore, residential receptors would experience less noise, dust, and traffic under Alternative D than with the other build alternatives.

All of the build alternatives (B, C, and D) were developed to satisfy the need for reducing the frequency of vehicle crashes in comparison to No Build (Alternative A). Spills would not occur less frequently for Alternative D than any of the build alternatives; however, with Alternative D, traffic would be farther from town.

Comment concerning transport of hazardous waste is noted.
Response to Comment C2-1.1

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment C3-2.2
Support for Alternative D and comment noted.

Response to Comment C3-1.2
The traffic problems at Hoover Dam were addressed in the Hoover Dam Bypass FEIS. Construction of the bypass project, located 1,500 feet south of the dam is currently underway.

Response to Comment C3-2.3
As discussed in Section 4.8 of the FEIS, Alternative D would impact three recorded eligible archaeological sites. NDOT and FHWA, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and any appropriate Native American tribes, will develop specific mitigation measures pursuant to the PA for this project (Appendix E, Volume I). In addition, a Native American consultation plan (Blair and Lawrence, 2000) has been written and consultation will be reinitiated between FHWA and the appropriate Native American representatives during the preliminary and final design phases of the project.
Koepp, Elizabeth

Subject: FW: Boulder City Bypass

> From: Hal Bergheil <halbergeil @ hotmail.com>
> Date: Thu, 05 May 2002 11:51:33 -0700
> 
> Hi,
> 
> This is the message that you appear to have received in error. My position hasn't changed. The
> purpose of the Southern Bypass is to relieve the absent from the primary route. The
> problem is to approach this from the point of the community's best
> interests, not individual gain.
> 
> There are many of us who feel strongly on this issue but who haven't
> invested a primary fortune in hiring political lobbyists to drive up our
> property values to the great expense of public spirit. We should not be
> apocalyptic because we have neither the time, desire, nor economic might to
> impose our will on our neighbors.
> 
> With all best regards,
> 
> Hal Bergheil
> 
> BC resident
> 
> (copy of email to Tom Greco, September 22, 2001)
> 
> I would like to express another view to HNTV as it undertakes its planning.
> 
> 1) Those who moved along U.S. 36 did so knowing full well that they were
> moving alongside a heavily used highway. Those of us who moved on the
> south side of Boulder City did so because we thought they were moving to
> the quiet desert northwest. The "ecological" effort provides me of the people
> who built homes in plays de Rey under the takeoff path of LAX, and then
> altering their lives over the noise pollution. It caused lots of short-term LAX
> was there before the homes. The same applies for the homes along U.S.
> 2) The fact that this "ecological" effort is throwing a lot of money at this
> effort makes me even more suspicious of the motive.
> 
> (2) At this moment, Hoover Dam is closed to much traffic. Non-auto
> traffic is diverted through Laughlin. This seems to be an effective
> solution to a problem. We have a major issue that we are unaware of: the
> routing through Laughlin seems to be viable. Let's re-consider it as a
> permanent solution. It is a fundamental mistake to do something
> ill-conceived in the interest of "political realities."
> 
> (3) Given the events of the past week, one really has to examine how
> reasonable it is to place a bridge even within a few miles of the
> Dam. Wouldn't it be safer in the long run to get the traffic off it as
> far away from Hoover Dam as practical? I'm no expert, but as a frequent
> flyer over this area, crossing truck traffic through Laughlin or over the
> Henderson cut seems to make a lot more geographical sense.

Response to Comment C4-2.4
Comment noted.

Response to Comment C4-6.1
Comment noted.
Response to Comment C4-2.5

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. Visual, noise, and air impacts are discussed in FEIS Sections 4.10, 4.3, and 4.2, respectively.
Response to Comment C5-4.1
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. Small business and casino economic impacts are discussed in Sections 3.11.2 and 4.11 of the FEIS.

Response to Comment C5-2.6
A description of Alternative D can be found in Section 2.7.4 of the FEIS.

As described in FEIS Section 4.10 (Visual Impacts), Alternative D would result in the greatest landscape modification.

Response to Comment C5-4.2
Comment noted.

Response to Comment C5-2.7
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

The nearest residential area is approximately 1.34 km (0.83 miles) from the Alternative D alignment.

Comment concerning transport of nuclear waste is noted. Of the build alternatives, Alternative D maintains traffic the greatest distance from residences.

Sincerely,

Colin Booth
266 Lake Huron
Boulder City
Home Owner
Rancher
Small Business Owner (Lee's Marine Repair & Storage)
The commenter is referred to FEIS Table ES-1, which indicates the following impact summaries for Alternative D:

- **Air Quality (4.2)** - equivalent to Alternative B.
- **Noise (4.3)** - decreased noise in some residential areas; increased noise in portions of LMNRA.
- **Biology/Threatened Species (4.4)** - equivalent to Alternative B.
- **Water Resources (4.5)** - greater long-term impacts than Alternative B or C.
- **Wetlands/Waters of the U.S. (4.6)** - greater impacts than other build alternatives.
- **Floodplains (4.7)** - smaller area requiring least mitigation of all build alternatives.
- **Land Use/Section 4(f) (4.9)** - greater impact on LMNRA land; highest level of support for bicycle routes; benefits to residential development; greater utility tower/line impacts. Mitigation measures equivalent to Alternative C.
- **Visual (4.10)** - lowest visual resource impacts of build alternatives. Mitigation equivalent to Alternatives B and C.
- **Economic (4.11)** - short-term negative impact.
- **Energy Use (4.16)** - most energy consumed during construction and operation.

Response to Comment C6-3.1
Opposition to Alternative D noted. Refer to FEIS Table ES-1 for a summary and compilation of potential impacts and mitigation measures for the alternatives.
Response to Comment C6-3.2
Standard NDOT cut-and-fill criteria were used to determine the depths of cuts and fills for all build alternatives. All excavated material may be used in fills, thus reducing the need for fill importation. Sources of imported fill material will be identified during the final design phase of the project.

On the basis of information developed for the Preliminary Engineering Report (NDOT, November 2001), total estimated fill importation required for Alternative D is approximately 10 times less than for Alternative B and 7 times less than Alternative C.

Response to Comment C6-6.2
Comment noted.

Response to Comment C6-4.3
Potential future land use sales on the part of BLM are beyond the scope of the DEIS and FEIS for the project.

Response to Comment C6-2.9
As discussed in FEIS Section 3.3, project-related traffic noise impacts were evaluated by conducting existing traffic and background noise level measurements in the project area and predicting future traffic noise levels from each project alternative using projected peak-hour traffic data, the proposed roadway alignment(s), and the FHWA Traffic Noise Model (TNM) Version 1.1. Project-related traffic noise impacts were evaluated against traffic noise level criterion for Activity Category B sites. Results from this analysis were compared to existing conditions for each alternative.

Response to Comment C6-5.1
Preference for Alternative C noted.
Response to Comment C6-2.10
Comment noted. Air quality-related impacts are addressed in FEIS Section 4.2. Wind speed and direction were considered in the dispersion modeling prepared for this analysis.

Response to Comment C6-2.11
As discussed in FEIS Section 3.3, project-related traffic noise impacts were evaluated by conducting existing traffic and background noise level measurements in the project area and predicting future traffic noise levels from each project alternative using projected peak-hour traffic data, the proposed roadway alignment(s), and the FHWA TNM Version 1.1. Project-related traffic noise impacts were evaluated against traffic noise level criteria for Activity Category B sites (e.g., residences, churches, schools, recreation areas, and similar uses). Results from this analysis were compared to existing conditions for each alternative.

The potential impacts at Hoover Dam were addressed in the Hoover Dam Bypass FEIS, which has received a Record of Decision (ROD). Design of the bypass project, located 1,500 feet south of the dam is currently underway. This FEIS focuses on the portion of U.S. 93 between I-515 and the planned western end of the U.S. 93 Hoover Dam Bypass project.
### Response to Comment C6-2.12
Opposition to Alternative D noted. Potential impacts to biological resources and threatened/endangered species are discussed in FEIS Section 4.4. FEIS Sections 4.4.3 and 4.4.4 describe measures that would be undertaken to protect bighorn sheep during construction and operation of Alternative D.

### Response to Comment C6-2.13
Comment noted.

### Response to Comment C6-2.14
As noted in FEIS Section 4.6, construction and long-term operational impacts would be greater for Alternative D, relative to Alternatives B and C.

Boulder City code requirements for subdivision grading, drainage, and topography are not applicable to an interstate highway project.

As noted in FEIS Section 4.10.3, NDOT has developed and circulated, in June 2002, a landscape policy that will outline a treatment methodology.

### Response to Comment C6-2.15
Opposition to Alternative D noted.

### Response to Comment C6-2.16
Opposition to Alternative D noted.

### Response to Comment C6-2.17
As noted in FEIS Section 4.5, construction and long-term operational impacts would be greater for Alternative D, relative to Alternatives B and C.

Construction and operational mitigation to avoid or minimize potential adverse impacts associated with implementation of all the build alternatives are discussed in FEIS Section 4.6.3.

Opposition to Alternative D noted.
Response to Comment C6.2.20

As noted in FES Section 4.14.1, Alternative B would change traffic patterns within Boulder, resulting in impacts to pedestrians and bicycle facilities. While Alternative C would have less of an impact to its alignment outside of the City, it would result in larger impacts within the City.

Response to Comment C6.2.19

Alternative D would result in a slower rate of traffic volume increase within the City, while affecting recreational trails and NPS backcountry roads in the eastern portion of the alignment.
Response to Comment C6-2.21
The FEIS evaluated a representative collection of potentially sensitive viewpoints for each alternative based on an onsite field survey.

Suggestion for additional viewshed analysis noted.

Response to Comment C6-2.22
As noted in FEIS Section 4.11.1, Alternative D is expected to result in an initial noticeable negative effect on through-traffic businesses. In the long run, it is anticipated removal of most of the through-traffic would present a much more attractive environment for many businesses not dependent on significant through-traffic customers. Thus, Boulder City's economy might transition into one dependent more on services, destination tourism, or possibly even small-scale manufacturing.

Response to Comment C6-2.23
Comment noted. See response to Comment C6-2.22.
Response to Comment C-6-24A

Response to Comment C-6-3.3
Comment noted. Refer to DEIS and FEIS Table 4.3-2.

Response to Comment C-6.13
As noted in FEIS Section 4.16.2, Alternative D would result in the highest level of fuel consumption of the alternatives considered.

Response to Comment C-6-3.5
A construction time schedule was included in the DEIS Visual Impact construction section; however, it is too early to determine the actual length of construction at this time. Comment noted.
April 10, 2002

Michael W. Brocker
901 Del Sol Drive
Boulder City, NV 89005

NDOT Environmental Division
1263 S. Stewart
Carson City, NV 89712

Attn: Mr. Daryl James

Re: U.S. Highway 93 Alternative Routes

Dear Sir:

I am writing to express my opposition to any alternative construction to U.S. Hwy. 93 that would benefit Boulder City and bring the heavy trucks and the associated noise, pollution and safety concerns to my quiet little community. I am wholeheartedly against alternatives A, B and C. While I am not as thrilled with alternative D, the southern bypass, it is less offensive than the other alternatives.

I realize that a few downtown business owners are concerned that diverting some traffic south of town would be harmful to their businesses. I believe they are mistaken and that their concerns are exaggerated. Cross-country truckers and travelers that take the southern bypass probably wouldn't stop and spend money in Boulder City anyway with Las Vegas just 30 minutes farther up the road. However, the truckers on their way to Las Vegas or the Lake Mead National Recreation Area who are the most likely to utilize local Boulder City merchants would continue to take the existing Hoover Dam Bypass Boulder City route, just as they do today now.

Personally, I would prefer to see all four alternatives eliminated and simply enlarge the bridge at Laughlin and improve the existing U.S. Hwy. 95 then Searchlight to Railroad Pass to make it the designated route. This would be far more cost effective for the taxpayers as it would eliminate the proposed bridge and roadway south of Boulder Dam that will undoubtedly cost millions of dollars by the time it is completed.

Furthermore, expanding the current Searchlight route could be completed much faster than alternatives B or C. With safety and terrorism being used as an argument to fast track the Boulder City project, isn't this an important consideration? I know the trucking industry is opposed to the Searchlight route, but are they the ones calling the shots here? Aren't there more important concerns than their marginally increased costs, most of which, of course, have already been passed on to consumers?

Mr. James, this is a health, safety and quality of life issue that will profoundly affect the lives of all the people like me who have chosen to make Boulder City their home. Most of the

Response to Comment C7-2.25
Opposition to Alternatives A, B, and C, and comments noted.

Response to Comment C7-4.4
Economic impacts to businesses are discussed in Section 4.11 of the FEIS.

Response to Comment C7-6.3
Comment noted.
residents of our quiet, safe little town have a strong sense of community. They tend to be very involved and determined when it comes to maintaining the quality of life in this special and unique part of Southern Nevada. Any decision that would adversely affect that quality of life, such as alternatives A, B or C would undoubtedly elicit a ground swell of resistance that would grow exponentially when more and more people realized that their entire way of life was being threatened. An ardent, vigorous opposition to the in-town routes could potentially disrupt and delay those routes. The potential opposition must be factored in to any cost-benefit analysis used to determine which alternative is ultimately chosen. Alternatives A, B and C are simply insurmountable and unacceptable to the vast majority of Boulder City residents.

In summary, if the Sourthflight route is not a viable option, alternative D that bypasses the route south of town is the only other choice. The additional costs associated with this route would be more than offset by the continued serenity, prosperity and high quality family lifestyle enjoyed by those who live in Boulder City.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Braschke

Response to Comment C7-3.6
Preference for and rationale in support of Alternative D noted.
Mr. Daryl James  
NDOT Environmental  
1263 South Stewart Street  
Carson City, NV 89712  

Re: Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study

Dear Mr. James,

Attached please find an article and an editorial from the April 4, 2002, edition of Boulder City News. We request that you include these articles in the public comments that you are compiling for this project.

Sincerely,

Joe Cain

Enclosures
U.S. 93

From Page 1

* Alternative B, which would widen U.S. 93 to six lanes, make part of it a freeway with overpasses in the Raneway Valley, with other sections allowing business access.

* Alternative C would construct a four-lane freeway that would deviate some from the highway's current route. It would build a freeway along the base of the River Mountain and link up with the existing route in the Raneway Valley. This route would interfere with the proposed Boulder Ridge golf course and the city's proposed Boulder Ridge Park and outdoor amphitheater.

* Alternative D is the route that has the greatest support. It would build a four-lane freeway, essentially a highway, around the southern end of Boulder. It would have the current route just south of Railroad Pass, north of the Gold Hill portion on the city's south end, and cut through the River Mountains before linking up with the current highway near the Raneway Hotel and Casino. This option would cost $180 million more than the other options, according to the study.

Alternative D is the route that seems to have drawn the most local support. The Boulder City Bypass Coalition, a group of about 70 residents and business leaders, announced in a press release that it supported Alternative D. It said it would make the best decision for the residents and would improve the quality of life.

Boulder City Chamber of Commerce has also endorsed Alternative D. It issued a survey to all licensed local businesses asking for their support. According to Boulder City Chamber of Commerce President Tom walker, more than 70 percent of respondents favored the Boulder route. In addition, in 1996, a referendum approved by 61 percent of voters endorsed the idea of a southern bypass.

The public comment period is open until May 15. Written comments can be submitted to Knight Associates, 1500 Environmental, 1345 S. Stewart St., Carson City, NV 89701. Comments can also be made through the website: boulderbypass.com. The draft EIS can also be viewed at the website or at Boulder City Hall.
The future is at stake

A few-hour period tonight may ultimately determine the future of Boulder City.

Tonight's public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Boulder City Bypass Study will be the only chance residents have to ask questions and submit comments from the Nevada Department of Transportation and CEMEX about the project. It is the only public hearing that will take place on this initiative issue.

In other words, if you favor or dislike a particular alignment, this is your only chance to let those who are working on the project know your feelings.

Already, the Boulder City Chamber of Commerce, the Boulder City Bypass Committee and this newspaper have endorsed the idea of a southern bypass, a byway if you will, as the best way to deal with increased traffic going through town. If you need proof of the situation along U.S. Highway 95, try driving into or out of town during the daytime, or try and make a left turn into or coming out of a business along the road.

But there are those with differing views, and hopefully these people will come out to state their case. Some feel the southern route will devastate local businesses. Others don't want their view of the Eldorado Valley to include a freeway. And others still, do not want a wider highway destructing an area of expensive Lake Mead View homes.

And while U.S. 95 is part of the Coastal Highway, this project would be needed even if there were no talk of a freeway corridor running through the western United States and into Mexico and Canada. As it stands, the state of Montana lacks an American highway that has not been renewed.

Public feedback from tonight's meeting will help determine which of the four options being considered for a byway route will ultimately be chosen. Boulder City's future is at stake, and it is imperative that as many residents as possible show up to have their say on this crucial project.

Response to Comment C8-2.26
Support for Alternative D and comment noted.
Mr. Daryl James  
NDOT Environmental  
1283 South Stewart Street  
Carson City, NV 89712

Re: Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study

Dear Mr. James:

Attached please find an article from the April 6, 2002, edition of the Las Vegas Sun. We request that you include this article in the public comments that you are compiling for this project.

Sincerely,

Joe Cain

Endorse
Response to Comment C9-2.27
Comment noted.

Response to Comment C10-2.28
Comment noted.

Response to Comment C11-2.29
Support for Alternative D and comment noted.

Response to Comment C12-2.30
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternatives B and C would result in unavoidable adverse impacts on views of Lake Mead from the Laguna Lane residences.

Response to Comment C13-1.4
Section 3.14 of the FEIS identifies the affected pedestrian and bicycle facilities and the problems associated with bike paths and lanes, and Section 4.14 discusses the impacts of each alternative.

The construction of the preferred alternative (Alternative D) will not impact the completion of the River Mountains Loop Trail, which has been designed as a continuous multi-use path from Henderson through the River Mountains and down the Hemenway Wash. Pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians will use the trail, and it will allow for access to Lake Mead and Hoover Dam.
LETTERS
The 'Fifth Alternative'

To the Editor:

Add all people about the dam, bridge, highway, traffic, etc. and there will be 15 national newspaper, interstate, and 5 foreign news. A letter from the Fifth Alternative should identify the letter as such and should be signed by the sender. In addition, a letter from the Fifth Alternative should be signed by the sender. The letter should be addressed to the editor of the newspaper, and should not exceed three pages.

This 'Fifth Alternative' should be recognized as a predominant factor in all of the efforts put forth in creating world interest for vehicles on the dam. The bridge to be constructed should be planned to remove all traffic from the top of the dam. This planned recreation area provides a garden-type, homey, atmosphere and a comfortable access area for photography.

If the new bridge has to be unwise to erect within photo range, giving the whole scene a 'factory appearance', the garden-type view might help to try to preserve the simple beauty surrounding the Dam.

Route D had always been shown to connect directly in the new bridge over to the Gold Strike Casino (Nevada). Your letter does not indicate why this original plan was changed. As shown in your letter, all four recommended alternatives look like they were 'recommended' by the casino.

Response to Comment C14-6.4

Comment noted. Alternative D would be designed to tie into the Hoover Dam Bypass alignment. This interchange configuration has been determined by the Hoover Dam Bypass Project and can be reviewed in the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Preliminary Engineering Report Preferred Alternative (Alternative D Southern Bypass), November 2002.
Mr. Daryl James  
NDOT Environmental  
1263 South Stewart Street  
Carson City, NV 89712  

Re: Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study  

Dear Mr. James:  

Enclosed please find an article and four letters to the editor that appeared in the  
April 11, 2002, edition of the Boulder City News. We request that you include these in  
the public comments that you are compiling for this project.  

Sincerely,  

Joe Ginn  

Endorsements
Response to Comment C15-6.5
Comment noted.

Response to Comment C16-6.6
Comment noted.

Response to Comment C17-4.6
Comment and preference for Alternative D noted.

Response to Comment C18-4.7
Comment and preference for Alternative D noted.
Route D would not be bad for business

The letter in last week’s edition predicting doom and gloom for Boulder City businesses if Route 70 were selected as the new route for U.S. Highway 70 was misleading and took numerous flaws in the draft Environmental Impact Statement out of context. A complete reading of the entire FEIS would reveal that long-term negative impacts of the northern bypass are unwarranted.

Last week’s letter neglected to mention the statements in the FEIS that all routes would have some negative impacts on businesses; that long-term negative economic impacts are unlikely; that decreased congestion is a result of route D, and the increased land parcels of Boulder City; and that Route D would reduce travel times and provide a small economic benefit to Boulder City. I would like to receive all routes would have some negative impact on businesses in Boulder City.

As business owners, we do not believe Boulder City would suffer a measurable economic downturn from a choice of routes D, F, or G. In fact, the vast majority of Boulder City business owners already recognize this. The Boulder City Chamber of Commerce conducted a survey showing more than three-quarters of business owners support the southern bypass. Boulder City is not what you call a typical "highway town." It depends on state thru-traffic. As a tourist community, the Las Vegas area, which will continue to grow, we are not a town where consumer behavior is dependent on those who come to buy gas, Lake Mead will not serve as the new bypass was built. Hoover Dam would not serve if the southern bypass were built.

Most people who visit and spend money here will continue to do so if route D is built. Our nation needs to support the maintenance of the magnificent Lake Mead National Recreation Area, and should, green Boulder City. The type of water we need in our city would appreciate the environment changes that could be less severe, including the reduction of highway noise near residences that allow for a major highway route through the area of a small town.

Since visitors will enjoy it more as a result of less traffic, trucks, noise and pollution, the southern bypass would be good for business in the long run. We all need to consider what we want our town to look like in 10, 20 or even 50 years. If Alternative D becomes the new route, the area of our city will forever be preserved as the past green place we all knew and love. If another route is chosen, be prepared to watch a growing number of trucks pass through each day, bringing noise, pollution, congestion, and God forbid, a bat parade. This choice is profoundly clear.

ROD NER FAIR
Owner, Lake Mead Goddess

Chamber endorses D

Editor,

The Boulder City Chamber of Commerce has completed an independent survey concerning the U.S. 70 Boulder City Corridor. The survey was conducted from a list of business owners in the city of Boulder City businesses.

Questions asked the Boulder City business community: 1) Do you feel that Boulder City business owners have received enough valid information from the chamber, the city and other informational organizations to make an informed opinion? 2) If yes, how would you rate them as business as well as residents on a scale of 1-10, and finally which route they preferred?

Over 90% of respondents felt they were well informed and strongly supported Route D, the southern route traveling north of Las Vegas along the Lake Mead National Recreation Area. You should continue to be issues because of Route D. We would like to work with the city in helping to solve these issues by supporting Route D.

BOULDER CITY, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Response to Comment C19-4.8
Economic impacts to businesses are discussed in Section 4.11 of the FEIS. Preference for Alternative D noted.

Response to Comment C19-4.9
Comment and preference for Alternative D noted.
Response to Comment C20-2.31
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Section 2.4 of the FEIS describes the screening process of the initial alternatives. The PMT developed evaluation criteria taking into consideration the issues and concerns of Boulder City residents. Four alternatives (three build and one no build) were selected for further evaluation. The two initial alternatives that were combined to form Alternative D were ranked 2 and 3 based on the screening process and six criteria (FEIS Table 2-1).

Response to Comment C20-2.32
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment C21-2.33
Support for Alternative D and comment noted.

Response to Comment C21-2.34
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment C22-2.35

Opposition to Alternative D noted. See Section 2.6 in Volume I of the FEIS for discussion of the process and justification for the Alternative D selection.
Response to Comment C23-1.5
Preference for Alternative C noted.

Response to Comment C23-1.6
Opposition to Alternative D noted. Access to existing uses such as the landfill, rifle and pistol range, transmission line service roads, and LMRRA lands would be maintained upon construction of Alternative D, the preferred alternative.
Response to Comment C24-2.36
Opposition to Alternative D noted. See Section 2.6 in Volume I of the FEIS for discussion of the process and justification for the Alternative D selection.

Response to Comment C24-2.37
Preference for Alternative C noted.
Response to Comment C25-2.38
Opposition to Alternative D noted.

Response to Comment C25-3.7
Preference for Alternative C noted.
Response to Comment C26-2.39
The boundary of the Paiute-Eldorado Tortoise Management Area is approximately 18 miles south of the Alternative D corridor alignment. Opposition to Alternative D noted. See Section 2.6 in Volume I of the FEIS for discussion of the process and justification for the Alternative D selection.

Response to Comment C26-1.7
Preference for Alternative C noted.
Response to Comment C27-3.8
Opposition to Alternative D noted. See Section 2.6 in Volume I of the FEIS for discussion of the process and justification for the Alternative D selection.

Response to Comment C27-4.5
Preference for Alternative C noted.
Response to Comment C28-1.8
Access to existing uses such as the landfill, rifle and pistol range, transmission line service roads, and LMRNA lands would be maintained upon construction of Alternative D, the preferred alternative.
Response to Comment C28-2.40

Preference for Alternative C and opposition to Alternative D noted. Alternative D has been identified as the preferred alternative because it meets the purpose and need of the project and because of its broad public and agency acceptance based on: 1) comments received on the DEIS; 2) less noise, air quality, and visual impacts to the City of Boulder City compared to the other build alternatives; 3) less disruption of the existing corridor during construction than any of the other build alternatives; 4) provision for flexible staging of construction to match funding availability; and 5) maintenance of and probable improvements to the quality of life of the residents of Boulder City. FHWA has determined that the construction of Alternatives B and C would result in significant, adverse social and environmental impacts on Boulder City that would be avoided with Alternative D. A detailed discussion of the screening criteria used to identify the preferred alternative is in Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS.
Response to Comment C29-2.41

Opposition to Alternative D noted. Alternative D has been identified as the preferred alternative because it meets the purpose and need of the project and because of its broad public and agency acceptance based on: 1) comments received on the DEIS; 2) less noise, air quality, and visual impacts to the City of Boulder City compared to the other build alternatives; 3) less disruption of the existing corridor during construction than any of the other build alternatives; 4) provision for flexible staging of construction to match funding availability; and 5) maintenance of and probable improvements to the quality of life of the residents of Boulder City. FHWA has determined that the construction of Alternatives B and C would result in significant, adverse social and environmental impacts on Boulder City that would be avoided with Alternative D. A detailed discussion of the screening criteria used to identify the preferred alternative is in Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS.

Response to Comment C29-4.10

Preference for Alternative C noted.
Response to Comment C30-1.9
Preference for Alternative C noted.

Response to Comment C30-1.10
Opposition to Alternative D noted. Refer to response to Comment C28-1.8.
Koos, Elizabeth/SIC
From: Wilks, Jean/LAS
Sent: May 10, 2002 12:24 PM
To: Shoemaker, Patricia/SIC; Koos, Elizabeth/SIC
Subject: FW: U93 Bypass

--- Original Message ---
From: Laiko, Monti/MPI
Sent: May 10, 2002 11:54 AM
To: Wilks, Jean/LAS; Shoemaker, Patricia/SIC
Subject: FW: U93 Bypass

--- Original Message ---
From: Rawlins, Scott [mailto:scott.rawlins@dot.state.nv.us]
Sent: May 10, 2002 8:38 AM
To: Laiko, Michael/LAS
Subject: FW: U93 Bypass

fyi

J. Scott Rawlins, P.E.
Project Manager
Nevada Dept. of Transportation
1263 S. Stewart St.
Carson City, NV 89712
Ph: (775) 886-7317
Fax: (775) 886-7322

--- Original Message ---
From: Lindy@Boulder.com [mailto:Lindy@Boulder.com]
Sent: Friday, May 10, 2002 6:27 AM
To: rawlins@dot.state.nv.us
Cc: Admin@BoulderCity.com
Subject: U93 Bypass

I am opposed to Alternative D because it will affect pristine desert, historical sites and a view that is priceless.

The only people at the meeting in SC that were in favor of it were real estate agents (keeping the land in Hawthorne worth a lot of money) and people who lived in Hawthorne. Also, I think any time a city government lobbies using its own money for anything they must be up to secret plan.

I am in favor of Alternative C because it keeps the bypass in the area of the current bypass.

Lindy Casey
664 Avenue H
Boulder City, NV

05/10/2002

Response to Comment C31-2.42
Opposition to Alternative D noted.

Response to Comment C31-1.11
Preference for Alternative C noted.
Response to Comment C32-3.9
Preference for Alternative C noted. Opposition to Alternative D noted.
Response to Comment C33-2.43
Opposition to Alternative D noted.

Response to Comment C33-1.12
Preference for Alternative C noted.
Response to Comment C34-1.13

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Traffic modeling indicates that Alternative D would reduce traffic on existing U.S. 93 through Boulder City by diverting a percentage of through-traffic onto the southern bypass.

Response to Comment C34-2.44

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Section 4.10 of the FEIS describes the unavoidable adverse impacts on views of Lake Mead from Laguna Lane residences, as a result of Alternatives B and C.

The Hoover Dam Bypass is a separate project. All alternatives for that project were evaluated equally prior to selecting the Sugarloaf Mountain as the preferred alternative. The Hoover Dam Bypass EIS began in the early 1970s; the FEIS for this project was completed and released in February 2001 and the ROD was signed in March 2001.
Response to Comment C35-1.14

Chapter 1 of the FEIS discusses the importance of U.S. 93, and a purpose of the project is stated as “improving system linkage on U.S. 93 and maintaining route continuity.”

Alternative B was developed to maintain the existing U.S. 93 corridor and improve conditions to accommodate future traffic demands. Highway traffic would remain on U.S. 93 through the commercial corridor of Boulder City and through Hemenway Wash. Traffic would not be directed onto suburban surface streets, but it would remain on the existing designated highway.

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. The FEIS identifies the impacts of Alternative D on the existing environment in the land use, biological, cultural, and water-related sections of Chapter 4. The Alternative D alignment is routed through the Eldorado Mountains, and would contain 4,200 meters (m) of steep, but acceptable, and safe grades (6.0 percent). Pursuant to AASHTO guidelines, Alternative C would contain 1,500 m of its steepest grade (5.7 percent). The Preliminary Engineering Report indicates that Alternative C provides acceptable LOS for all critical intersections, interchanges, and links.

Response to Comment C35-3.10

The conceptual plan for each build alternative, including Alternative C, considers existing and predicted traffic through 2027. Each alternative identifies the number of lanes, interchanges, and other design features that would be necessary to accommodate predicted traffic.

Response to Comment C35-3.11

The conceptual plan for each build alternative includes eastbound and westbound U.S. 93/95 interchange ramps, which are predicted to operate at LOS C or better through 2027 (Preliminary Engineering Report, 2002). The actual design of the interchange would only be decided after a ROD on a build alternative is provided by FHWA.
Response to Comment C35-3.12
The description of the project limits and features is consistent with the NDOT long-range Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. Also, the conceptual plan for each alternative is consistent with NDOT and AASHTO design standards. It is also listed as a purpose in the Purpose and Need chapter (FEIS Chapter 1) to extend "freeway status to the U.S. 93/95 interchange."

Response to Comment C35-1.15
The conceptual plan for each build alternative is consistent with AASHTO standards. However, it is the intention of NDOT (as described in the Purpose and Need, FEIS Chapter 1) to only extend I-515 to the U.S. 93/95 interchange west of Boulder City.

Response to Comment C35-2.45
Support for Alternative C and comments noted.
Response to Comment C36-2.46
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Any land or property acquired for highway right-of-way would be per the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970. BLM is a member agency of the PMT for the project. NDOT and FHWA will coordinate with BLM once the design details of the project are determined and if/when land will be required from the BLM jurisdiction.

Response to Comment C36-3.13
FEIS Section 2.4 notes that the evaluation of 40 initial alternatives produced 16 potential alignments. These potential alignments were evaluated in the screening process described in FEIS Section 2.4. The screening process culminated in the detailed evaluation of four alternatives in the FEIS.

This combination of Alternatives B and C does not address the safety and accessibility considerations along existing U.S. 93. Furthermore, noise, air quality, and construction impacts would be increased along existing U.S. 93.

Additionally, the three southbound/one northbound lane section along U.S. 93 would make access to businesses along U.S. 93 (especially on the north side) very difficult – far worse than it is today.

The Preliminary Engineering Report for the project identifies the improvements necessary to achieve an acceptable LOS (D or better) under each build alternative.
Response to Comment C37-5.2
Preference for Alternative A noted.

Response to Comment C37-6.7
Comment noted.

Response to Comment C37-2.47
Opposition to Alternative D noted. Alternative D has been identified as the preferred alternative because it meets the purpose and need of the project and because of its broad public and agency acceptance based on:
1) comments received on the DEIS; 2) less noise, air quality, and visual impacts to the City of Boulder City compared to the other build alternatives; 3) less disruption of the existing corridor during construction than any of the other build alternatives; 4) provision for flexible staging of construction to match funding availability; and
5) maintenance of and probable improvements to the quality of life of the residents of Boulder City. A detailed discussion of the screening criteria used to identify the preferred alternative is in Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS. FHWA has determined that the construction of Alternatives B and C would result in significant, adverse social and environmental impacts on Boulder City that would be avoided with Alternative D.
Response to Comment C38-5.3
Comment noted.

Sir,

Believe me, the City Council carnival of April 22nd does not reflect the opinions and concerns of Old Town, Boulder City. Mr. Senator Bryan and his wealthy Hemenway Valley cohorts do NOT represent us.

People in Old Town wanted to unite with the Hemenway Valley hot tub fanatics and go for by-pass A, no dam bridges. When NV heard from Senator Reid that the bridges is inevitable, they panicked and went the freeway placed in Boulder City's natural ventilator, mouth of town.

Old Town doesn't have the political power and wealth of NV (the same thing) but we do have the courts . . .

Rayne Collins
611 Ave M
293-7679
Response to Comment C39-5.4
Preference for Alternative A noted.
Koons, Elizabeth/SCO

Subject: ENUFF

-----Original Message-----
From: Ray Collins <mailto:rcollins@sunrise.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 01, 2002 6:32 PM
To: info@city.state.nv.us
Subject: ENUFF

ALREADY.

Last Tuesday's (Apr. 23) City Council meeting, as seen on KCTV, was an
arrogant, rehearsed and well-financed political charade. I mean NOT
ONE person in Boulder City is against By-pass Alternative "B"?

Time grows short -- you have until May 10th to voice your opinion. Do
you want to see Old Town destroyed, forever, by whoch, greed and
opportunities? I think HDOT is required, by Nevada law, to choose the
most expedient and least expensive route. That's "B" or "C", the
present truck route 95, through Mesaba Valley.

See Vegas lawyer Bob Poise knows more about state law than I do. Is that
why he put his NE million-dollar mansion, with a Lake Mead view, on the
market this winter? His house will also have a lovely view of the new
firewall. Is he the first cat to leave the sinking ship?

The only way for citizens of Old Town to save Boulder City is a
class-action lawsuit to force HDOT and CHSM to follow the law. The two
Kiser kids' e-mail addresses are listed below -- why not click on the
underlined, blue link and tell them that you don't want to see your town
draped with a perpetual cloud of pollution and noise? Remember, if you
don't speak up May 10th is "lights out" for our Town . . .

mailto:tgore@city.state.nv.us  Tom GORE  (Mr. KOSOR)
mailto:mkowchenimmer.com  Mike KOWCHENIMMER  (Mr. BY-PASS)

A Public Service Announcement by the Boulder Bugle.

Response to Comment C40-5.5

Comment noted.
C41

Koos, Elizabeth/SCO

From: Wittle, Jean/LAS
Sent: May 05, 2002 8:34 AM
To: Koos, Elizabeth/SCO, Shoemaker, Patricia/SCO
Subject: FW: from next Sunday's Boulder Bugle

-----Original Message-----
From: Leasko, Michael/LAS
Sent: May 09, 2002 8:26 AM
To: Wittle, Jean/LAS
Subject: FW: from next Sunday's Boulder Bugle

-----Original Message-----
From: Basillas, Scott (mailto:scott@nmdoc.state.nv.us)
Sent: May 09, 2002 7:01 AM
To: Leasko, Michael/LAS
Subject: FW: from next Sunday's Boulder Bugle

FYI

R. Scott Basillas, P.E.
Project Manager
Nevada Dept. of Transportation
1263 S. Stewart Rd.
Carson City, NV 89712
Ph: (775) 684-7317
Fax: (775) 684-7322

-----Original Message-----
From: May Collins (mailto:maycollins@vcom.com)
Sent: Friday, May 03, 2002 4:33 PM
To: Scott Basillas
Subject: from next Sunday's Boulder Bugle

"O" is for ozone

Funny -- during the last Council meeting (BCVT-Aug. 22) the whole dam town was for by-pass Alternative D -- at least all the bought-and-paid-for hot tub sympathizers from Henderson Valley were for D. With a quaking voice, Mayor Ferraro told the throng egels in the audience he fell in favor of the legal alternatives. We adopted it would split our town in two.

The truth is, the town was split when the Council gave away land to the Albertsons' shopping mall. Now our dear friends from Greasy Gulch don't have to have a thing to do with Old Town -- why should they care if we tanks to death while they're enjoying their views of the lake?

Old Town needs to initiate a class-action lawsuit to let the courts decide what's right instead of relying on the opinion of ex-Senator Woody Unick. Why care if we tanks and have newfound riches. Alternatives B or C might make our friends and neighbors think twice next time they buy expensive property on a truck route. You only have until next Friday, May 10, to voice your opinion ...
Response to Comment C42-5.7
Prefered for Alternative C noted.

Mark D. Cook
785 Los Vare
BC NV 80005

05/14/2002
Mr. Daryl James
NDOT Environmental Division
1265 S. Stewart St.
Carson City, NV 89712

RE: Boulder City/US 93 Corridor

Dear Mr. James:

I would like to express my comments about the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor. I understand that there are four options being considered.

After reviewing all options, I believe Option D, Southern Alignment makes the most sense. I live near the intersection of Nevada Highway and US 93 in Boulder City. Since the tragedy of September 11, truck traffic has been diverted from crossing Hoover Dam. As a result, the decrease in the noise, air pollution, and traffic has been very noticeable. I also walk to many businesses in town. Before, traffic was often so heavy through town that it was nearly impossible to cross the streets safely. I can honestly say that the quality of my life in Boulder City has been greatly improved since the trucks and some traffic have been diverted.

Other options for the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor would increase noise in Boulder City and the residential areas, increase pollution, and increase danger from the transportation of hazardous materials especially if the nuclear dump at Yucca Mountain is opened. Last year there was a hazardous fuel spill when a tanker truck turned over at the intersection of Nevada Highway and US 93. It was a mess, inconvenient, and costly to clean up. The potential danger to health and property if it had been a truck full of nuclear waste is too terrible to think about.

I strongly urge NDOT to choose Option D, Southern Alignment for the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor so that the quality of life and the character of our unique community is preserved for all the people and future residents of Boulder City.

Sincerely,

Patricia J. Culler
Mr. Daryl James
MDOT Environmental Division
1263 S. Stewart St.
Carson City, NV 89712

RE: Boulder City/US 93 Corridor

Dear Mr. James:

I would like to express my comments about the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor. I understand that there are four options being considered.

After reviewing all options, I believe Option D, Southern Alignment makes the most sense. I live near the intersection of Nevada Highway and US 93 in Boulder City. Since the tragedy of September 11, truck traffic has been diverted from crossing Hoover Dam. As a result, the decrease in the noise, air pollution, and traffic has been very noticeable. I can honestly say that the quality of my life in Boulder City has greatly improved since the trucks and some traffic have been diverted.

Other options for the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor would increase noise in Boulder City and the residential areas, increase pollution, and increase danger from the transportation of hazardous material especially if the nuclear dump at Yucca Mountain is opened. Last year there was a hazardous fuel spill when a tanker truck turned over at the intersection of Nevada Highway and US 93. It was a mess, inconvenient, and costly to clean up. The potential danger to health and property if it had been a tank full of nuclear waste is too terrible to think about.

I strongly urge MDOT to choose Option D, Southern Alignment for the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor so that the quality of life and the character of our unique community is preserved for all the people and future residents of Boulder City.

Sincerely,

Thomas C. Culler, Jr.
Response to Comment C45-3.14

NDOT’s mission is to efficiently plan, design, construct, and maintain a safe and effective transportation system for Nevada’s economic, environmental, social, and intermodal needs. The statewide transportation planning process provides a framework for balancing needs with limited resources (STIP, 2001).
Response to Comment C46-2.50
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment C47-2.51
Refer to FEIS Sections 2.4 and 2.5 for information on the initial alternatives analyzed and a description of the alternatives eliminated from further consideration based on a screening evaluation.

Refer to FEIS Table 3-4 for the FHWA and NDOT design noise level criteria and noise abatement thresholds for various land use activity categories.

Response to Comment C47-3.15
An interchange for emergency access only is proposed where Alternative D crosses the WAPA access road and Buchanan Boulevard. This interchange will have a locked gate at both the exit and at the access road. The grade separation at the crossing will be above grade for the new facility and will allow for transport of WAPA equipment and vehicles.

In the initial screening of 16 alternatives, an alignment for the southern bypass south of the Mead Substation (further south than Alternative D) was eliminated because it did not provide additional positive features with respect to environmental considerations such as noise and visual impacts, and it provided negative qualities of an additional 2 miles of roadway (which makes the facility more costly to build and less attractive as a bypass) and additional drainage impacts (see FEIS Chapter 2, Section 2.4). Therefore, a facility further south was deemed not desirable in the EIS.

The concept for Alternative D and the other build alternatives takes into consideration predicted growth through 2027, including the growing demand for efficient and effective movement of goods, people, and services.
Response to Comment C48-2.52

Opposition to Alternative D and support of Alternative B noted. Alternative D has been identified as the preferred alternative because it meets the purpose and need of the project and because of its broad public and agency acceptance based on: 1) comments received on the DEIS; 2) less noise, air quality, and visual impacts to the City of Boulder City compared to the other build alternatives; 3) less disruption of the existing corridor during construction than any of the other build alternatives; 4) provision for flexible staging of construction to match funding availability; and 5) maintenance of and probable improvements to the quality of life of the residents of Boulder City. FHWA has determined that the construction of Alternatives B and C would result in significant, adverse social and environmental impacts on Boulder City that would be avoided with Alternative D. A detailed discussion of the screening criteria used to identify the preferred alternative is in Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FHIS.
Opposition to Alternative D noted. Alternative D has been identified as the preferred alternative because it meets the purpose and need of the project and because of its broad public and agency acceptance based on: 1) comments received on the DEIS; 2) less noise, air quality, and visual impacts to the City of Boulder City compared to the other build alternatives; 3) less disruption of the existing corridor during construction than any of the other build alternatives; 4) provision for flexible staging of construction to match funding availability; and 5) maintenance of and probable improvements to the quality of life of the residents of Boulder City. FHWA has determined that the construction of Alternatives B and C would result in significant, adverse social and environmental impacts on Boulder City that would be avoided with Alternative D. A detailed discussion of the screening criteria used to identify the preferred alternative is in Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS.
Response to Comment C50-2.54
Opposition to Alternative D noted.
Response to Comment C51-3.16
Opposition to Alternative D noted.
Response to Comment C52-1.18

A grade-separated crossing at Buchanan Boulevard, with emergency access, would be provided upon construction of Alternative D, the preferred alternative. Access to existing uses such as the landfill, rifle and pistol range, transmission line service roads, and LMNRA lands would be maintained.
From: Lasko, Michael/LAS
Sent: April 01, 2002 8:01 AM
To: Wittie, Jean/LAS
Subject: FW: Choices for upgrading U.S. 93

FYI

-----Original Message-----
From: Rawlins, Scott [mailto:arsrawlins@dot.state.wv.us]
Sent: April 01, 2002 7:04 AM
To: Lasko, Michael/LAS
Subject: FW: Choices for upgrading U.S. 93

fyi

S. Scott Rawlins, P.E.
Project Manager
Nevada Dept. of Transportation
1265 S. Stewart St.
Carson City, NV 89712
Ph: (775) 682-7317
Fax: (775) 682-7262

-----Original Message-----
From: dmercury@nvdot.state.nv.us [mailto:dmercury@nvdot.state.nv.us]
Sent: Sunday, March 31, 2002 7:52 PM
To: arsrawlins@dot.state.wv.us
Subject: Choices for upgrading U.S. 93

Wt appreciate the opportunity of sharing our thoughts on the above project.

My husband and I strongly support Alternative D, constructing a four-lane freeway routing traffic around Boulder City. In our opinion this will preserve the current small town atmosphere. That was one of the main reasons why we moved to Boulder City last year rather than Henderson or Las Vegas.

David and Gisela Gere
P.O. Box 62407
Boulder City, NV 89006-2407

Response to Comment C53-2.55
Support for Alternative D and comment noted.
Mr. Daryl James  
NDOT Environmental Division  
1263 S. Stewart St.  
Carson City, NV 89712  

RE: Boulder City/US 93 Corridor  

Dear Mr. James:  

I would like to express my comments about the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor. I understand that there are four options being considered.

After reviewing all options, I believe Option D, Southern Alignment makes the most sense. I live near the intersection of Nevada Highway and US 93 in Boulder City. Since the tragedy of September 17, truck traffic has been diverted from crossing Hoover Dam. As a result, the decrease in the noise, air pollution, and traffic has been very noticeable. I also walk to many businesses in town. Before, traffic was often so heavy through town that it was nearly impossible to cross the streets safely. I can honestly say that the quality of my life in Boulder City has greatly improved since the trucks and some traffic have been diverted.

Other options for the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor would increase noise in Boulder City and the residential areas, increase pollution, and increase danger from the transportation of hazardous material especially if the nuclear dump at Yucca Mountain is opened. Last year there was a hazardous fuel spill when a tanker truck turned over at the intersection of Nevada Highway and US 93. It was a mess, inconvenient, and costly to clean up. The potential danger to health and property if it had been a truck full of nuclear waste is too terrible to think about.

I strongly urge NDOT to choose Option D, Southern Alignment for the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor so that the quality of life and the character of our unique community is preserved for all the people and future residents of Boulder City.

Sincerely,

Ronald Stiller  
Markie B. Piller
C55

Koons, Elizabeth/SCO

Subject: FW: US 93 Bypass Corridor

---- Original Message ----
From: Koons, Elizabeth Phone: 702-455-2775
To: Koons, Elizabeth Phone: 702-455-2775
Subject: US 93 Bypass Corridor

FYI

R. Scott Rawlings, P.E.
Project Manager
Nevada Dept. of Transportation
1203 E. Stewart St.
Carson City, NV 89712
Phone: (775) 687-7317
Fax: (775) 687-7322

---- Original Message ----
From: RobertKoons@sonol.com (mailto:RobertKoons@sonol.com)
Date: Fri, May 10, 2002 10:42 AM
To: Koons, Elizabeth Phone: 702-455-2775
Subject: US 93 Bypass Corridor

Response to Comment C55-1.20
FEIS Section 4.11 discusses potential economic impacts of the project alternatives. Preference for Alternative C noted.

Response to Comment C55-2.57
Opposition to Alternative D and preference for Alternative C noted.
ALFRED L. HARTIG
440 AMERICA CT.
BOULDER CITY, NV.
89005-1594

APRIL 4, 2002

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

I DISAGREE OF THE WHOLE CONCEPT AT THIS TIME. SINCE THE
9-11 ATTACK ON THE TWIN TOWERS IN NEW YORK CITY NO TRUCKS
ARE PERMITTED TO CROSS THE HOOVER DAM. THE TRAFFIC ON ROUTE
93 HAS DIMINISHED APPRAISABLY DUE TO THE DETOUR OF TRUCKS
HEADED TO KINGMAN AND POINTS EAST AND SOUTH.

UNTIL THE BRIDGE SPANNING THE COLORADO RIVER THAT IS PLANNED
AND IS IN PLACE I THINK IT IS POISON TO PLAN IMPROVEMENTS TO
ROUTE 93. I SEE NO SENSE IN PLANNING A ROUTE DEAD ENDING AT
THE CASINO ON ROUTE 93, EVEN THOUGH IT IS OWNED BY THE FAMILY
OF A FEDERAL SENATOR. IT CERTAINLY WON'T BRING ANY MORE
BUSINESS. I'LL HAVE TO ADMIT I AM LIKE WILL ROGERS ALL I KNOW IS
WHAT I'VE READ IN THE NEWSPAPERS.

I ADVOCATE THE CONTINUED USE OF ROUTE 95 DETOUR WITH
IMPROVEMENTS TO STOP THE CARNAGE THAT IS OCCURRING ON THIS
TWO LANE ROAD DUE TO FAULTY DRIVING, AND ANTIQUATED ROAD
ENGINEERING.

WHEN THE BRIDGE IS BUILT I AM IN FAVOR OF THE BY-PASS ROUTED.

SINCERELY,

ALFRED L. HARTIG

Response to Comment C56-1.21
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the
preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the
rationale for this decision.

FEIS Section 4.11 discusses potential economic impacts of the project
alternatives. The Hoover Dam Bypass bridge is currently under design.

Response to Comment C56-6.8
Comment noted.
14 April 2002

Mr. James,

As a resident of Nevada, I recommend the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) consider the option of making Nevada Highway 95 South to Interstates 8, 10, and 40 the traffic corridor instead of the arduous and difficult option of a bridge across the Colorado River south of Hoover Dam.

For some reason, a bridge south on Hoover Dam has captured the attention of NDOT as it addresses the Highway 93 corridor from the South. It would seem that the widening of Highway 95 into a freeway and connecting with Interstates 8, 10, and 40 would be far less complicated and, more important, less disruptive to the growing community of Boulder City.

I believe the widening/upgrading of Highway 95 to freeway specifications would be a prudent option for the following reasons:

- Less expense than building a dam across one of the most difficult areas on the Colorado River, when considering the terrain, traffic disruptions, and potential security implications with regard to the proximity of Hoover Dam.
- Reinforces the strong traffic flow already using Highway 95 since the terrorist's attacks of 11 Sep 01.
- Makes a better traffic pattern for commercial traffic using Interstates 8, 10, and 40 West to proceed North to South Nevada and Utah.
- Improves the North/South Corridor from the Southern California/Arizona border with Mexico making Highway 95 a true commercial route.
- Interstates 8, 10, and 40 already afford crossing points over the Colorado River, it seems natural to improve Highway 95 to accommodate the traffic already using these national thoroughfares.

The intention of NDOT is commendable, but someone has mistakenly defined Highway 95 as integral to the North/South corridor in the vicinity of California, Arizona, and Nevada, rather than the obvious use of Highway 95.
14 April 2002
Mr. Daryl James

The security implications associated with Hoover Dam are not going to disappear. If you require, our company is prepared to provide you with a study of the issue. A bridge downstream from Hoover Dam imposes security risks far greater than those afforded by improving Highway 93 to interstate/freeway specifications and interchanges with the existing interstate highways of 8, 10, and 40.

Please feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss this matter further.

Daniel W. Harter
President

Signature
Response to Comment C58-2.56
Opposition to Alternative D and preference for Alternative C noted.
Mr. Daryl James  
NDDT Environmental Division  
1263 S. Stewart St.  
Carson City, NV 89712  

RE: Boulder City/US 93 Corridor  

Dear Mr. James:  

I would like to express my comments about the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor. I understand that there are four options being considered.

After reviewing all options, I believe Option D, Southern Alignment makes the most sense. I live near the intersection of Nevada Highway and US 93 in Boulder City. Since the tragedy of September 11, truck traffic has been diverted from crossing Hoover Dam. As a result, the decrease in the noise, air pollution, and traffic has been very noticeable. I can honestly say that the quality of my life in Boulder City has been greatly improved since the trucks and some traffic have been diverted.

Other options for the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor would increase noise in Boulder City and the residential areas, increase pollution, and increase danger from the transportation of hazardous material especially if the nuclear dump at Yucca Mountain is opened. Last year there was a hazardous fuel spill when a tanker truck turned over at the intersection of Nevada Highway and US 93. It was a mess, inconvenient, and costly to clean up. The potential danger to health and property if it had been a truck full of nuclear waste is too terrible to think about.

I strongly urge NDDT to choose Option D, Southern Alignment for the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor so that the quality of life and the character of our unique community is preserved for all the people and future residents of Boulder City.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Response to Comment C59-1.22

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment C59-2.59

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment C60-2.60

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

The ROD for the Hoover Dam Bypass Project (March 2001) resulted in the approval of the project and the Sugarloaf Mountain Alternative as the selected alternative.

Response to Comment C60-6.10

Comment noted.
Koos, Elizabeth/SCO

From: Leask, Michael/LAS
Sent: May 06, 2002 2:34 PM
To: 'Ingrid Koosz/
Cc: 'enews@enews.com'; White, Jean/LAS
Subject: RE: Route "D"

Ms. Koosz,

Thank you for your input. We will include your comments in our administrative record.

Regards,

Michael C. Leask, P.E.
2000 East Flamingo Rd. Suite A
Las Vegas, NV 89119
(702) 365-6504 ext. 217
Fax No. (702) 365-1107
mlask@oechc.com <mailto:mlask@oechc.com>

-----Original Message-----
From: Ingrid Koosz <enews@enews.com>
Sent: May 02, 2002 9:42 AM
To: Leask, Michael/LAS
Subject: Route "D"

Please do not split our town in half. Designation D is the answer. Why destroy some people and businesses life. Thank you, Mr. & Mrs. Koosz

Response to Comment C61-1.23
Preference for Alternative D noted.
Response to Comment C62-4.11
Comment noted.
C63

Daryl James
NDEOT Environment Division
1263 S. Stewart
Carson City, NV 89712

Who, but the citizens of Boulder City will be affected by the decisions made on the
Project suggested bypass?
Should they not then be the persons that you need to convince in the final decision?
I have previously suggested that you consider the proposed Cane Creek as part of your
determining factors.
Both could be solved with a widening to a six-lane freeway, Highway 95 south.
Yes, the tractors would be put to a few extra miles, but the fuel consumption, and
therefore the air-pollution would be less than the generated through the cut-backs
going down to and up from Hoover Dam!
If this is not comprehensible to you and your people; I can only ask the least by asking
that you "go with" Alternativ D.
Especially we who live in the Nevada valley will be most appreciative.

Sincerely,
Carl L. Lodige and Frances Virgina Lodige
453 Ranger Ct
Boulder City, NV 89005

Response to Comment C63-6.11
Comment noted.
C64
625 Malaga Drive
Boulder City, NV 89005-1513
March 30, 2002

Mr. Jeryl James
VCTER Environment Division
1353 S. Stewart
Persimmon City, NV 89712

Dear Mr. James:

DELS ON BOULDER CITY ROAD CONSTRUCTION ALTERNATIVES

We support the Southern By-Pass Alternative for Boulder City road construction since it is by far the least disruptive to the environment, both physical and human, of this city. We, therefore, urge its early adoption as the final decision of the Nevada Department of Transportation.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph A. Mendehall
Leone R. Mendehall

Response to Comment C64-2.61
Support for Alternative D and comment noted.
April 24, 2002

Daryl James, NDOT Environmental Division
1261 S. Stewart St.
Carson City, NV 89712.

Robert W. Merrill, M.D.
375 Ave I
Boulder City, NV 89005

RE: The Boulder City Corridor Study

Dear Mr. James,

I would like to highlight several significant points from the study.

Both ALTERNATIVE B AND ALTERNATIVE C ROUTES WILL RESULT IN BRINGING THE TRUCKS BACK INTO TOWN. The construction of either of these alternatives will dramatically curtail our community for 5 years or longer.

ALTERNATIVE B is an improvement of existing 93 from Railroad Pass to Buchanan Blvd with a 4 lane divided hi-way through Hemenway valley. The section between Veterans Memorial Drive to Buchanan Blvd will be a 7-lane arterial roadway with raised medians and/or left turn lanes. A new interchange will be added at Yucca Street. The average speeds are predicted to increase from 37 to 45 MPH. Five businesses along this section will either have to move or close down as the right of way to accommodate this alternative will require it.

ALTERNATIVE C will result in a 4-lane through town freeway from Railroad Pass to the dam, which will pass through the northern part of our city. Sound walls 8-14 feet will be necessary to mitigate the projected increase in noise from the trucks and increasing traffic predicted in years to come. This alternative will result in the loss of some of the hiking and biking trails of the River Mountains Loop Trail and leave an ugly scar along the base of the beautiful red mountain area with a large road that bisects our community in half.

ALTERNATIVE D (Southern bypass) is the only choice that will keep the trucks and through traffic out of our city for good. It will not result in increased noise for any residential area in the city including the southern part. Noise levels for the majority of the city are predicted to actually decrease with this alternative. Although there will be some economic impact on our city, the DEIS was unable to predict any long-term significant impact with this alternative. This choice does not result in the loss of businesses or residents presently established. D provides for the safest route around our community for hazardous materials to be transported, and allows Boulder City to establish the quiet escape towns most of us have chosen to live here for.

My family and I strongly support alternative D as the one and only solution to the traffic problems that plague Boulder City.

Robert Merrill

Response to Comment C65-1.24

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

In this study, NDOT is analyzing for a design year of 2027. Traffic estimates using computer modeling have shown that traffic levels in 2027, even without trucks, will produce failing levels of service between the study limits. The noise, air quality, and traffic impacts of each alternative vary to some degree, as described in Chapter 4 of the FEIS.

Response to Comment C65-1.25

Preference for Alternative D noted.
COPY OF PRESENTATION TO THE Boulder City Council

Dr. Merrill Presentation - April 23 Meeting

Mayor Ferraro, members of the Council, I also would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak before you today. My name is Dr. Robert Merrill and I am the president of the Boulder City Bypass Coalition. Our Coalition felt it was important to stand before you once again in support of the southern bypass now that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement has been released and the public comment period is open. As Senator Bryan stated, we need your support in these final critical weeks to ensure that there is no misunderstanding: Route D, the Southern Bypass, is the preferred route of the Citizens of Boulder City.

From the beginning, our Coalition has committed to thorough research of the facts. We pledged to you, and all Boulder City residents, that the information we disseminate would be accurate and based on objective evidence. The facts were always on our side because our effort has always been about what is best for Boulder City – not about protecting a certain neighborhood or certain special interests.

Several months ago I came before you with a presentation in which I outlined the various benefits of the southern bypass as compared to the other through-town build routes. While I do not intend to repeat all of this information today I do want to stress that all the points I made several months ago remain as valid today after the release of the DEIS as they did then. I also wanted to quickly highlight a few aspects of the DEIS, which clearly demonstrate alternative D will have the least adverse impact on Boulder City and will actually improve Boulder City's quality of life.

First, I would like to note that the Project Management Team, after considering the extensive research of many experts on 30 environmental criteria, gave Route D the highest rating among the alternatives being studied.

Second, I would like to reiterate that the through-town routes would destroy the special ambience Boulder City has worked so hard to preserve. Alternative B would make improvements to existing 93 by creating a seven-lane arterial roadway with raised medians and turn lanes between Veterans Memorial
Drive and Buchanan Boulevard. Average speeds would increase from 37 to 57 miles per hour and five businesses would have to move or close down to accommodate an expanded right-of-way.

Alternative C would be a four-lane through-town freeway that would pass through the northern part of our city. Sound walls 8-14 feet high would be necessary to mitigate expected noise increases from trucks and increasing traffic predicted in years to come. This alternative would result in the loss of some of the hiking and biking trails of the River Mountain Loop Trail and leave an ugly scar along the base of the beautiful Red Mountain area with a large freeway that divides our community in half.

The results of either B or C will result in loss of privately owned land, some residences and/or business presently in place.

The DEIS shows that noise levels throughout all the developed areas of Boulder City would decrease with route D, improving the quality of life for all city residents. The through town routes would increase noise so much that they would require the construction of sound walls.

The DEIS clearly states Route D would have the least impact on views. As I stated, the increased noise that would result from the through-town routes would require the construction of sound walls that obstruct views of Lake Mead and create major eyesores. Highway lighting on the new through-town routes could cause nighttime glare in some residential areas.

Route D — because it would be constructed on a new right of way on the outskirts of town — would by far be the least disruptive during construction of the project, which is expected to take five years.

Not only would Route D provide a safer roadway to transport hazardous wastes by reducing traffic-related accidents, it would take this waste further from homes in the event that there was some type of incident.

The effect of Route D on recreation land would be less than a new through-town route.
Although all of the proposed routes would potentially have adverse impacts on businesses along the corridor, "a severe long-term negative impact is unlikely" to be caused by route D. Decreased congestion in Boulder City could result in increased local patronage to Boulder City businesses. Proper signage would direct the tourist, lake and dam traffic to our city.

In less than 5 years we will have a four lane bridge across the Colorado river below the Hoover Dam connecting to a four lane highway on the Arizona Side. The government has put this on the fast track. (April 15, paper). In 1997 61% of the citizens gave directions to the current and future city council that they desired a southern bypass to deal with the traffic issues which city, NDOT, and Federal Highway Administration have identified.

As Boulder City's elected officials, you are in a unique position to serve as the mouthpieces of your constituents. We feel that your participation in this process is critical and we ask that you provide your personal statements in support of the southern bypass today to be preserved in the public record. We also ask that you relay to the PMT, NDOT, and the Federal Highway Administration the clear and unequivocal direction of the citizens of Boulder City for a southern bypass to connect to the Hoover Dam bridge project.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. Like the Senator said, I urge your support for our efforts in the final weeks of public comment and hope that we are able to preserve the Boulder City we love for future generations.

Robert W. Merrell, M.D.
Response to Comment C66-4.12
Preference for Alternative C noted.

Response to Comment C66-2.62
Alternative D will require the use of approximately 85 acres of LMNRA land. Specific measures to mitigate impacts on cultural resources will be included in a Memorandum of Agreement and Treatment Plan developed by NDOT and FHWA, in consultation with SHPO, ACHP, and interested Native American tribes.
Response to Comment C67-2.63
Opposition to Alternative D noted.

Response to Comment C67-1.26
Preference for Alternative C noted.
Response to Comment C68-3.17

Opposition to Alternative D noted. Alternative D has been identified as the preferred alternative because it meets the purpose and need of the project and because of its broad public and agency acceptance based on:

1) comments received on the DEIS; 2) less noise, air quality, and visual impacts to the City of Boulder City compared to the other build alternatives; 3) less disruption of the existing corridor during construction than any of the other build alternatives; 4) provision for flexible staging of construction to match funding availability; and

5) maintenance of and probable improvements to the quality of life of the residents of Boulder City. FHWA has determined that the construction of Alternatives B and C would result in significant, adverse social and environmental impacts on Boulder City that would be avoided with Alternative D. A detailed discussion of the screening criteria used to identify the preferred alternative is in Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS.
Response to Comment C69-1.27
Refer to response to Comment C52-1.18.

Response to Comment C69-1.28
Preference for Alternative C noted.
12th April 2002

Mr David James
NDOT Environmental Division
1265 S Stewart St
Carson City NV 89712

Dear Sir:

BOULDER CITY CORRIDOR STUDY

I live in Boulder City. My home and its value is not directly affected by any of the proposals.

This letter is to urge you to take the overall view of this project and choose the route that best serves everyone.

I am worried, and somewhat ashamed, by the group opposing alternatives B and C. No matter how they dress up their public statements, this group is narrow-minded and overly selfish. They are concerned only about their property values and do not demonstrate that once again they can do whatever they want in Boulder City. The core of this group is a set of people known for their arrogance in dealing with others in Boulder City.

Hence, I would appreciate it if you recognized this well financed group for their real objectives and by doing so giving everyone else in Boulder City the benefit of the best route based upon greater considerations.

Sincerely,

G D McWhed1
2 Hillside Drive
Boulder City NV 89005

Response to Comment C70-4.13

Comment noted. Alternative D has been identified as the preferred alternative because it meets the purpose and need of the project and because of its broad public and agency acceptance based on: 1) comments received on the DEIS; 2) less noise, air quality, and visual impacts to the City of Boulder City compared to the other build alternatives; 3) less disruption of the existing corridor during construction than any of the other build alternatives; 4) provision for flexible staging of construction to match funding availability; and 5) maintenance of and probable improvements to the quality of life of the residents of Boulder City. FHWA has determined that the construction of Alternatives B and C would result in significant, adverse social and environmental impacts on Boulder City that would be avoided with Alternative D. A detailed discussion of the screening criteria used to identify the preferred alternative is in Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS.
Response to Comment C71-4.14

Economic impacts to businesses are discussed in Section 4.11 of Volume I of the FEIS. Alternative D has been identified as the preferred alternative because it meets the purpose and need of the project and because of its broad public and agency acceptance based on:
1) comments received on the DEIS; 2) less noise, air quality, and visual impacts to the City of Boulder City compared to the other build alternatives; 3) less disruption of the existing corridor during construction than any of the other build alternatives; 4) provision for flexible staging of construction to match funding availability; and 5) maintenance of and probable improvements to the quality of life of the residents of Boulder City. FHWA has determined that the construction of Alternatives B and C would result in significant, adverse social and environmental impacts on Boulder City that would be avoided with Alternative D. A detailed discussion of the screening criteria used to identify the preferred alternative is in Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS.
621 Mt. Azure Way
Boulder City, NV 89005
April 2, 2002

Mr. Daryl James
NDOE Environmental
1263 S. Stewart Street
Carson City, NV 89712

Dear Mr. James:

We are residents of Boulder City, Nevada, and wish to add our voices in unequivocal support of the construction of the southern truck bypass (alternative D) to accommodate traffic on the proposed new bridge below Hoover Dam.

As you are aware, the majority of Boulder City residents support this alternative. Thank you!

Respectfully,

Mike and Marcia Novello

Response to Comment C72-5.8
Preference for Alternative D noted.
Response to Comment C73-4.15
Comment and preference for Alternative D noted. Economic impacts to businesses are discussed in Section 4.11 of the FEIS.
Response to Comment C74-2.64
Opposition to Alternative D noted.

My name is Gertrude L. Paige, Box 731, Diablo, CA 94528. I personally object to the installment of South Corridor, Alternative D. I, and my family are frequent visitors to the area and have family residing there. It would greatly interfere with our enjoyment of the national park, the beautiful surrounding desert landscape, and it would interfere with the present small town environment. It would affect the naturalness of the area. Consider the towns people - it’s their home and their desires should be accommodated!

The best idea is to upgrade the present Boulder City Bypass - less expense and happier Boulder City population!

Sincerely, G. L. Paige
Response to Comment C75-5.9
Preference for Alternative D noted.
Response to Comment C76-2.65

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. Refer to FEIS Section 2.3 for a description of the project history, and Sections 2.4 and 2.5 for background on the identification of alternatives.

This EIS is an environmental study looking at methods of best planning for roadway conditions on U.S. 93 in the design year of 2027. According to traffic projections, which are dependent upon the fast growth of the Las Vegas Valley and the region in general, continuing the existing detour of trucks through Laughlin will still produce an unacceptable level of traffic congestion in Boulder City. The Laughlin route was eliminated in the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS; therefore, it was not a consideration for this project.
1.0 Negative impacts on wildlife that is NOT impacted now.

Of the four alternatives presented I would prefer alternative B and C equally. My true preferred alternative would be Alternative D - send the traffic south through Laughlin. It seems to be working well now.

Thank you,
Leslie Paige
713 Aveonee A
Boulder City, NV 89005
(702) 293-7026
Response to Comment C77-3.18
The potential environmental impacts associated with each alternative vary and, in some cases (air quality), the impacts are comparable among the alternatives (FEIS, Section 4.2.1). The estimated cost of Alternative B is less than for Alternatives C and D.
Response to Comment C78-3.19

The potential environmental impacts associated with each alternative vary and, in some cases (air quality), the impacts are comparable among the alternatives (FEIS, Section 4.2.1). The estimated cost of Alternative B is less than for Alternatives C and D.
Response to Comment C79-3.20

Comment noted.

Another reason to pick Route 'B' is because it already exists. People along the route are already accustomed to vehicles. After all, they did purchase next to the highway. Thanks.
Response to Comment C80-2.66
Preference for Alternative D and comments noted.

My husband and I wish to give our support to route D. We moved to Boulder City with our 3 small children, for it's clean, quiet, small town atmosphere. We feel it's a 7 lane freeway through town would not be conducive to their lifestyle. We also feel Boulder who wish to visit Lake Mead, Hoover Dam, and Boulder City, will still do so, while the traffic and "Big Hug" that just want to go through AZ, could detour around the city.

We didn't have much choice on the bridge, we knew that the traffic on the current needed to be alleviated, but I hope all public comments are really taken into great consideration when it comes to what the citizens of Boulder City want. We hope that NDOT wants to work with the people of Boulder City, and give us what we love most about it. our small, quiet, clean town to stay the way it is.

Thank you,
Joseph & Dominique Pfiffer
592 Raini Pl.
Boulder City, NV
89005
Response to Comment C81-1.29
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative D contains interchanges at Railroad Pass, U.S. 95, and the eastern study limit and emergency access at Buchanan Boulevard.

A depressed roadway profile is not envisioned for Alternative D because of drainage considerations, particularly near the foothills of the Eldorado Mountains (see Drainage section of the Preliminary Engineering Report). Sound walls are not proposed with Alternative D.
Response to Comment C82-2.67
Support for Alternative D and comment noted.
Response to Comment C83-2.68
Support for Alternative B, opposition to Alternative D, and associated comments noted. Alternative D has been identified as the preferred alternative because it meets the purpose and need of the project and because of its broad public and agency acceptance based on: 1) comments received on the DEIS; 2) less noise, air quality, and visual impacts to the City of Boulder City compared to the other build alternatives; 3) less disruption of the existing corridor during construction than any of the other build alternatives; 4) provision for flexible staging of construction to match funding availability; and 5) maintenance of and probable improvements to the quality of life of the residents of Boulder City. FHWA has determined that the construction of Alternatives B and C would result in significant, adverse social and environmental impacts on Boulder City that would be avoided with Alternative D. A detailed discussion of the screening criteria used to identify the preferred alternative is in Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS.
Response to Comment C84-3.21

NDOT, at the direction of the PMT, attended meetings with many Boulder City associations, civic groups, businesses, city councils, Elks Lodge, Chamber of Commerce, homeowner associations, and other interested parties to discuss the development of the DEIS and FEIS. Additionally, the PMT has invited the public to attend two open houses and a public hearing on the DEIS. An additional presentation was made to the Boulder City Bypass Coalition at a meeting that was open and announced to the general public.
Response to Comment C85-2.69
Support for Alternative B and opposition to Alternative D noted. See FEIS Chapter 4, Section 4.9, for a discussion of Land Use impacts and mitigation for all of the alternatives.
Response to Comment C86-2.70
Preference for Alternative A noted.
Response to Comment C87-6.12

Comment noted.

Sandra Reuther
515 Birch
Boulder City NV 89005
Response to Comment C88-5.10
Preference for Alternative A noted.
C89

Wittle, Jean/LAS

From: Lasko, Michael/LAS
Sent: April 15, 2002 12:19 PM
To: Wittle, Jean/LAS
Subject: FW: Boulder City ByPass

Original Message
From: Rawlins, Scott [mailto:scrawlins@dot.state.nv.us]
Sent: April 15, 2002 10:07 AM
To: Lasko, Michael/LAS
Subject: FYI: Boulder City ByPass

FYI

R. Scott Rawlins, P.E.
Project Manager
Nevada Dept. of Transportation
1265 S. Stewart St.
Carson City, NV 89712
Ph: (775) 684-7317
Fax: (775) 684-7322

Original Message
From: Martin Rihel [mailto:martin.rihela@nv.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2002 3:22 PM
To: scrawlins@dot.state.nv.us
Subject: Boulder City ByPass

Mr. Scott Rawlins

I attended the public meeting on the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor Study last week and voted for Alternative D.
      After further consideration and physically exploring the proposed Southern ByPass (Alternative D) I wish to voice my objections to that route and vote in favor of C, the New Through Town Alignment.
      Considering the additional cost and disturbing so much additional desert land I think Alternative C is the better choice.
      My real choice would be that the bridge and connecting roads be built further south so that Boulder City would not be impacted at all. The Laughlin route is really the best way to go, especially since US 93 is already going to be widened.

REGARDS
Martin S. Rihel
1454 Bronco Road
Boulder City, NV 89005-5104
Phone 702-293-3824

Response to Comment C89-2.71
Support for Alternative C has been noted. Alternative C would cost $220 million and be 17.7 km (11 miles) in length, whereas Alternative D would cost $345 million and be 24 km (15 miles) in length.

Response to Comment C89-6.13
Comment noted.
April 4, 2002

Daryl N. James, P.E. Chief
Environmental Services Division
Department of Transportation
1263 South Stewart Street
Carson City, NV 89712

Re: Junction of SR 160 north on U.S. 95 to U.S. 93

Dear Mr. James:

I am a resident of Bullhead City, AZ and travel this route many times to Henderson and Las Vegas, NV for doctor’s appointments, shopping, etc. and this stretch of road has always been very dangerous and has had many deadly accidents including our best friend “Chela” son and now since the September 11th attacks and the Houston accident it has gotten even worse. I can tell you many many other stories about people passing large trucks and vehicles coming the other direction and to many “Almost” collisions and another deadly one that my husband and I witnessed a couple of weeks ago coming back from the airport which killed a small child. This stretch of road is traveled by so many people from Bullhead/Cottonwood area and now with all of the increased traffic it desperately needs to be a 4 lane with a center medians. How many more people have to die before something is done. At the rate we are going we are going to be up with the number that was lost on September 11. I plead with your agency to do something and do it as soon as you can.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sandie Rock
337 Riverfront Drive
Bullhead City, AZ 86442

Response to Comment C90-6.14

Comment noted.
Response to Comment C91-1.30

Chapter 4 of the FEIS details the environmental impacts of noise and air quality degradation of all four alternatives. Table 4-3 shows that seven receptors for Alternative B and nine receptors for Alternative C would experience noise levels that approach or exceed the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC), while Alternative D contains one receptor that exceeds the NAC. None of the alternatives, however, would exceed National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Preference for Alternative D noted.
R. Scott Rawlins, P.E.
Project Manager
Nevada Dept. of Transportation
1203 S. Stewart St.
Carson City, NV 89712
Ph: (775) 684-7317
Fax: (775) 688-7322

Subject: BCU/S 93 Corridor Study

Boulder City Resident/Public Comments to BCU/S 93 Corridor Study:

Recommendation: ALTERNATIVE A. NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE.

Instead of Alternatives B-C-D, the Project should improve the river crossing in Laughlin, NV and improve US 95 to handle the traffic.

Additionally, the Draft EIS does NOT integrate data and the environmental assessment if and when, Alternative D is approved and traffic continues through Boulder City on the existing highways. Therefore, the conclusions in Table ES 1- Summary of Impacts and Mitigation are inaccurate.

Sincerely,

Mary Shoppe
P.O. Box 61756
Boulder City, NV 89006
(702) 293-1599
mshoppe@law.uprigon.edu

09/14/2002

Response to Comment C92-6.15
Comment noted.

Response to Comment C92-1.31
The DEIS and FEIS contain a full and complete disclosure of the potential environmental impacts of all project alternatives.
LETTER TO THE EDITOR – BOULDER CITY NEWS

Editor:

A letter in last week’s edition muddled the most important issues regarding the Boulder City-U.S. 93 Corridor Study and arrived at conclusions that have no basis in fact. The writer suggested that Route D would result in a corridor lined with fast food establishments, gas stations, etc. This type of situation is exactly what Route D, the Southern Bypass, would avoid.

A review of the DEIS shows clearly that Route D’s only ingress and egress points are at the extreme ends of the bypass far from the developed areas of the city. Route D, therefore, would foreclose any opportunity for pass-through drivers and truckers to exit in the middle of town. Let there be any doubt, the study states clearly, on the very page cited in last week’s letter, that “because no access would be available along Alternative D, a shift in traffic-related commercial development would not be anticipated.”

When the study explains why long-term adverse impacts are unlikely, noting that uses of the “corridor” would change, it is talking about the existing corridor. What the study says is if the Southern Bypass were built, new types of businesses catering to locals and destination travelers would, over time, replace the traffic-related businesses along the present through town road. If U.S. 93 stays in the middle of town, increased traffic in the coming years would result in more and more traffic-related businesses popping up in town, rotting Boulder City’s ambiance from the inside out. Therefore, a closer look at the DEIS reveals that the through-town route would have the exact result last week’s writer is trying to avoid.

Finally, my reading of the DEIS is that the only point it makes regarding Boulder City’s control over land is that the future growth of the City’s economy will be much more impacted by the City’s land use decisions than the construction of the southern bypass. That means Boulder City’s proximity to growth areas and its tourist attractions mean that Boulder City has the luxury of deciding whether it wants to grow and how it wants to grow. I personally would rather have our mayor and council – who are locally elected – make these decisions, than be stuck with a through-town route that will leave us little choice of what kind of growth we will have.

The Southern Bypass is by far the superior choice for Boulder City.

Mike Simon
Resident and Business Owner
1200 Arizona Street
Boulder City, NV 89005

Response to Comment C93-1.32
Comment noted.

Response to Comment C93-4.16
Preference for Alternative D noted.
Response to Comment C94-5.11
Preference for Alternative D noted.
Response to Comment C95-1.33

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

In an Origin and Destination Study conducted in March 2000 at Veterans Memorial Drive, 43 percent of the 2,200 vehicles surveyed had a destination of Lake Mead, Hoover Dam, or Arizona, while 57 percent had a destination of Boulder City. Of those traveling beyond Boulder City, approximately 25 percent planned on stopping in Boulder City for food, gas, or other reasons.

As noted in Section 4.11.1 of the DEIS, a study of the likely impacts of a southern bypass, such as Alternative D, on Boulder City's local economy was also conducted in March 2000. The study concluded, in part, that a potential exists for a 5 percent loss in total sales and a 4 percent loss in total employment in Boulder City from implementation of Alternative D. This negative impact, however, could be counteracted to some extent by other positive influences resulting from increased mobility and reduced truck traffic in town, as well as from construction of proposed golf course developments, ongoing redevelopment of the historic downtown area, and Boulder City's proximity to the fast-growing areas of Henderson and Las Vegas.
April 15, 2002
The following is a letter we sent to the Boulder City News.

Editor:

We are alarmed that some residents of Boulder City are still ignoring the inevitability. Comments made at the U.S. 93 Corridor Study Public Hearing and issues we have read in the paper suggest that some residents still believe the recent diversion of truck traffic through Laughlin is something that can be sustained over the long term and that the Hoover Dam Bypass project and Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor project will simply vanish.

We have kept close track of the developments surrounding our highway project. As much as we also would like to see a long term diversion of traffic through Laughlin, we have neither seen, heard or read anything to suggest that this is possible. Harry Feild, the number two person in the U.S. Senate, has told Boulder City residents that the Hoover Dam bypass project is not only moving forward, but is being sped up as a result of the events of September 11 and that support for this in Congress is widespread. Reports in the news have further confirmed this. The bridge project has been in the making for decades and many millions of dollars have been spent to get the project to a point where construction will begin shortly. In other words, it's going to happen. In addition, NDOT and the Federal Highway Administration have expanded a great deal of effort and expense on the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Project. They would not do this unless they were serious. Every indication points to the fact that both projects will be built. There is nothing to suggest that they won't.

As a result, those residents who think these projects will go away are in denial. The worst possible scenario is that this denial will result in no corridor project being built. If this were to happen, five or six years from now, trucks will begin streaming across the new bridge. Instead of being diverted around the city along the Southern Bypass, they will come through the middle of our town on an inadequate road that will be more clogged than anything we have experienced in the past.

We own two businesses directly affected by Boulder's local economy and believe that Boulder will be a much better place to live and visit without the highway or traffic jams through town. Would Boulder be a better place to visit with a safe highway running through its center? The clear choice, supported by an overwhelming majority of residents and the findings in the draft environmental study, is that Route D is by far the superior alternative. We all need to rally behind Route D, as the other alternatives are simply unacceptable.

Rob and Gretchen Storey
1307 Alpine Drive
Boulder City, NV
293-7430

Response to Comment C96-3.22
Design of the Hoover Dam Bypass Project is underway. Four alternatives are evaluated in the FEIS, including Alternative A (No Build) and three build alternatives. Action on the project by NDOT and FHWA is pending completion of the environmental documentation and process.

This EIS is an environmental study looking at methods of best planning for roadway conditions on U.S. 93 in the design year of 2027. According to traffic projections, which are dependent upon the fast growth of the Las Vegas Valley and the region in general, continuing the existing detour of trucks through Laughlin will not provide an acceptable level of traffic congestion in Boulder City. The Laughlin route was eliminated in the Hoover Dam Bypass; therefore, it was not a consideration in this project.

Response to Comment C96-4.17
Comment and preference for Alternative D noted.
Response to Comment C97-5.12

Comment noted. Alternative D has been identified as the preferred alternative because it meets the purpose and need of the project and because of its broad public and agency acceptance based on:

1) comments received on the DEIS; 2) less noise, air quality, and visual impacts to the City of Boulder City compared to the other build alternatives; 3) less disruption of the existing corridor during construction than any of the other build alternatives; 4) provision for flexible staging of construction to match funding availability; and 5) maintenance of and probable improvements to the quality of life of the residents of Boulder City. FHWA has determined that the construction of Alternatives B and C would result in significant, adverse social and environmental impacts on Boulder City that would be avoided with Alternative D. A detailed discussion of the screening criteria used to identify the preferred alternative is in Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS.
Response to Comment C98-1.34
Preference for Alternative D noted.

Response to Comment C98-2.72
Preference for Alternative D noted.
April 4, 2002

Mr. Daryl James
NDOT Environment Division
1263 S. Stewart
Carson City, NV 89712

Dear Mr. James:

As a homeowner in the Bella Vista Subdivision of Boulder City we strongly support Alternative "D" the Southern Bypass Route for the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor.

This alternative is by far the least disruptive and safest for all residents of Boulder City. We are not only concerned with the noise, air pollution and ugliness, but also the danger posed by the large number of trucks that will use this highway transporting all types of cargo including nuclear waste.

We kindly request your support for the selection of the Alternative D.

Very truly yours,

Mary Jane Therrien

Response to Comment C99-2.73

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Daryl James  
NDOT Enforcement Division  
1267 S. Stewart  
Carson City, NV 89712  
April 4, 2002  

Dear Sir or Madam,  

As a resident of Boulder City, I am writing to express my strong support for Alternative D, the southern bypass project. All of the other proposed routes seem to pose a serious threat to the present and future quality of life of residents in our city.  

I would also like to register my concern for the overall impact of this project, regardless of the alternative decided upon. Won't these proposals just create a further bottleneck situation at the dam? Why not widen I-515 southbound to provide a viable alternative into Arizona rather than create a situation where the dam will be put under further strain from traffic - not to mention create a security nightmare since more vehicles than ever would be trying to get to the dam? I think we should discourage commercial use of the dam (i.e., trucking) for passage to the south. A new bypass would only encourage potentially dangerous vehicles to use the dam as a crossing. Needless to say, this should be of particular concern in these times of increased threats from terrorism. Thank you for your time.  

Sincerely,  

Dr. Michelle Tumen  
Professor of History  
University of Nevada-Las Vegas  
636 Grandad Drive  
Boulder City, NV 89005  

Response to Comment C100-2.74  
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.  

Response to Comment C100-6.16  
Comment noted.
Response to Comment C101-2.75
The impacts resulting from implementation of all three build alternatives, and the no build alternative, have been reviewed in some detail in the FEIS. Impacts to the human environment as experienced by the residents of the City of Boulder City would generally be least upon the enactment of Alternative D, while it would have the greatest impact on relatively undisturbed desert habitat.

There is no evidence that urban expansion to the south of the City of Boulder City, if it occurred, would be accelerated by the enactment of Alternative D. By local statute, the expansion of the City is constrained to a low annual rate and subject to the review and approval of the appropriate regulatory and planning agencies.

Potential adverse effects to historic properties prior to mitigation would occur from the enactment of any of the build alternatives, but impacts to historic properties from the enactment of the preferred Alternative D would be somewhat less. The relative impact on undeveloped lands outside the City of Boulder City is greatest with the implementation of Alternative D. These are desert lands that have witnessed much incursion and development in the last century. The area is crisscrossed with access roads, utility rights-of-way, facilities such as the sewage treatment plant and the City landfill, and casual-use tracks and trails.

Visual impacts resulting from the implementation of Alternative D, as well as the other alternatives, have been analyzed in the FEIS. Certain viewsheds from recreational and undeveloped lands would be impacted more from Alternative D, but the viewsheds of the residents of the City of Boulder City would be least impacted by the preferred alternative.

Preference and basis for preference noted.
C. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC

Response to Comment C102-1.35
A traffic report was written in support of the DEIS, which is available as an appendix to the Engineering Report. The traffic analysis addresses traffic impacts for individual system elements and systemwide effects. Such an approach accounts for ingress/egress conditions.
Response to Comment C103-2.76
Comment noted.
April 3, 2002

Daryl N. James, P.E.
Chief, Environmental Services Division
Nevada Department of Transportation
1263 South Stewart Street
Carson City, NV 89712

Dear Mr. James,

I hereby approve of the widening of US 95 to four travel lanes from SR 163 to the junction of US 95/US 93. It is a project that should have been done years ago.

I strongly oppose comments on the dangers of that strip of highway. I drive it often enough to have seen cars pass in no passing zones, drive oncoming traffic off the road, and in other ways exhibit irresponsible driving practices. Cars have driven side by side in the truck passing lanes so no one could pass.

With the advent of the additional truck traffic things have gone from bad to worse. While driving on Nevada 95 last week I ended up behind a camper doing 40 MPH. There was a long stream of traffic behind it and passing was difficult due to all the oncoming cars, campers and trucks. This sort of thing leads to impatience and dangerous maneuvers. I have even seen cars pass on the shoulder.

I hope this is a project that will be implemented quickly.

Sincerely,

Ruth Zeman
5168 Tazl Way
Bullhead City, AZ 86426

Response to Comment C104-6.17
Comment noted.
TO: NDOT
SUBJ: Boulder City/US 93 Corridor Study
ATTN: Daryl James

Gentlemen:

The attached article from the LVRG (4-13-02) excellently depicts the reason most Boulder City residents object to Alternative "C".

At any one time, there are probably more bicycles, hikers and bighorn sheep in the River Mountains area than at Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area. In other words, it is very popular.

A freeway or truck route skirting the area will seriously harm the beautiful and enjoyable area.

Thanks,

FRANKE ENGREN
P.O. BOX 6170
BOULDER CITY, NV 89006

Response to Comment C105-2.77
Potential construction and operational impacts to bighorn sheep associated with all of the build alternatives, including Alternative C, will be mitigated in accordance with measures described in FEIS Sections 4.4.2 and 4.4.3.
ROCKY THRILLS: Rough Riders

Bootleg Canyon in Boulder City attracting mountain bikers from far and wide

By JOAN WHITELY
REVIEW-JOURNAL

Ever get the urge to hurtle yourself down the side of a steep, rocky hill, with no harness or parachute at 60 miles an hour?

One way to handle it is to see a psychiatrist.

Another way is to go mountain biking in Boulder City.

That's just what biking aficionados from around the country and world have been doing.

Japan, Germany, Canada, Alaska and Florida are home base for some of the riders who have visited the trails, which various biking Web sites tout as among the country's best.

In March, Missy "the Missile" Grove of San Diego, a pro biker who has been the women's world downhill champ several times, tried out the Boulder City trails for several days of training.

"The riding's very technical," she says approvingly, "pulling off her full-face racing helmet after a downhill run had coated it with dust. "The dirt here is difficult. It's hard-pack (rocks) with loose on top."

Boulder City's trails perch on sliver-thin ledges. They thread gullies and sometimes hemorrhage intersect - as a rider goes airborne over a gap between large rocks.

The trails are on a dolomite peak that overlooks Lake Mead.

Locals call the peak Radar Mountain, for the communication equipment installed at the top. It's the one with the big white-painted "BC" on its flank.

The trail network sprawls near the overcast intake, like a giant but faint doodle.

Bootleg Canyon is what Boulder City people call the area around Radar Mountain. The evocative name dates from the '90s, when enterprising
individuals traversed the area to smuggle contraband liquor onto the federal site that housed workers building Hoover Dam.

The cave was just outside the federal reservation limits. "The (federal) government couldn't enforce anything," says Dennis McBride, a historian associated with the Boulder City Hoover Dam Museum. "And Nevada never really enforced the bootleg law. But once in a while, they did a raid" to discourage action in the cave.

That risk-taking spirit lives on in the mountain bikers of Hoover Canyon. Their action is legal, but categorized with good reason as an extreme sport.

How about a trail that features a 1,000-foot drop in elevation over two miles? Then, ride it in less than five minutes. That was the winning time for a downhill event recently held on Ginger, one route in the burgeoning 36-mile trail system.

The name of the trail is cute but misleading because its terrain is tough. Truth in advertising applies to the names of some of the other downhill, figuratively breakneck trails: Armageddon, Reaper and Kevorkian.

"Laser rock" is how Boulder City trail master Brent Thomson describes the tricky riding surface. "Hoover Canyon blood douser" is the slogan he'd like to put on a promotional T-shirt someday, to distinguish Boulder City from mountain biking spots with soft loamy soil that cater to beginners.

Ginger was christened after a mild-mannered dog, Thomson's pet. Thomson gets to name all the trails. After all, he designs them.

"She's kind of spicy. She's not 'easy'" Tongue in cheek, the 40-year-old talks about the trail as if it were an alluring woman with surprises in store.

At many mountain biking sites, the title of trail master goes informally to whoever built the first, or the most, trails.

Thomson qualifies on that count. And in November, he also became the city's official hired hand for developing, maintaining and promoting the trails.

He got into mountain biking about 10 years ago, for physical fitness following a quadruple bypass and angina. "So an artist and owns Brent Thomson Art & Framing, a Boulder City business.

At first he and friends just took their bicycles off-road, on the open corridors that host high-tension power lines.

As they improved, they searched out rougher routes away from trails that were busy with bikers and hikers.

Windy tracks worn by bighorn sheep caught Thomson's eye, and inspired his

Imagination. From 1994 to about 1996, he and other avid mountain bikers did something that he admits was "totally illegal."

They took shovels, rakes and elbow grease, and fashioned more than 12 miles of unauthorized -- truly bootleg -- trails on city property to the southwest of the current trails.

Most of the trails progressed from "saddle to saddle," Thomson says. He's referring to natural contours on the mountainside, which the bighorn trails also seemed to follow.

The city started negotiating in 1998 to lease that land to MGM Grand for a golf course, so Thomson and crew went to city hall to campaign for new land on which to build authorized trails. Today the original biking area is occupied by Cascada Golf Club, which is owned by Park Place Entertainment.

"We can all get along, and ride our mountain bikes and play golf," was Thomson's line of argument.

As Boulder City physician and mountain biker Robert Kessler recalls, the small lobby also presented information about Moab, Utah, a struggling mining town that has prospered since it became a mountain biking mecca in the early 1990s.

"Boulder City's been dying for an identity. It's sitting next to superstar Las Vegas. Were in the shadow of them all the time," Thomson says.

His tourism strategy: Lure bikers with Las Vegas' cheap airfares and room rates. Bikers can access Boulder City even in the winter when many mountain biking destinations morph into ski resorts.

The city bought Thomson's idea. It built a restroom-cum-shower for bikers near the bottom of Radar Mountain, and maintained the road to the mountainside.

It also gave Thomson a $40,000 one-year contract. He groomed the existing trails, oversaw a cadre of trail-building volunteers, lined up events for the caucuses and handled e-mail queries from bikers around the globe.

The result is today's Bootleg Canyon, which is still sprouting trails and "cheater routes," bike-jerking for alternative segments to some of the more difficult turns, jumps and grades.

It has earned ink in sports magazines including Mountain Bike Action and Bike.

The International Mountain Biking Association certified it as an "epic" ride, a title awarded to only 18 locations to date.

Boulder City Mayor Bob Ferraro gives Thomson looks.

"We didn't see any problem" in creating the trail system, Ferraro says. "No one was using the land and it was not obstructing anything."

Boulder City businessman Jeff Spriggs bought Bike Stuff, a supply and repair shop, because he is a biking enthusiast. He endorses Bootleg Canyon's thrill factor.

The cross-country trails "flow very nicely," Spriggs says. These trails are fairly level, conducive for greenhorns and account for more than half of the total trail inventory.

And the downhill?

"It's pretty sick stuff," Spriggs says, with admiration. "There's the thrill of jumping off a rock, and (still) living at the bottom."

This story is located at:
Response to Comment C106-5.13
Preference for Alternative D noted.

Mr. Daryl James
NDOE Environmental
1263 S. Stewart Street
Carson City, NV 89712

March 31, 2002

Dear Mr. James:

Unfortunately we will not be able to attend the public hearing in Boulder City on Thursday, April 4, however, we wish to take this means to reiterate our support, as expressed in our September 4, 2001, letter to Mr. Tom Groo, for Alternative D, the Southern Alignment.

Thank you for taking our view into consideration.

Sincerely,

Richard W. and Mary Y. Allessee
Response to Comment C107-2.78
Comment noted.

Response to Comment C107-2.79
Rationale for opposition to Alternatives B and C and preference for Alternative D noted. As noted in FEIS Section 4.3.1, noise-sensitive areas located along the existing U.S. 93 alignment would experience major reductions in traffic noise levels through implementation of Alternative D. Social impacts associated with each of the build alternatives are described in FEIS Section 4.12.2. Alternative D would divert most non-local traffic away from developed areas in Boulder City, resulting in substantially decreased congestion, noise, and traffic safety impacts compared to existing conditions.
sound walls, noise increases, high-speed traffic through the middle of town, obstructed views of Lake Mead and glare from highway lighting are just some of the negative impacts the DEIS shows would occur from the construction of the through-town route.

Alternative D, on the other hand, would result in net circulation benefits for the entire town, a reduction in noise throughout the developed areas of Boulder City and would best preserve the small-town ambiance Boulder City has worked so hard to protect.

We are confident that the Project Management Team and the decision-makers at NDOT and the FHWA will all conclude that alternative D would have the least adverse impacts on Boulder City and its surrounding environment. This is essentially the conclusion reached by the PMT when it ranked the original 16 routes that were considered. The PMT ranked the corridor alternatives that were blended to make Alternative D, SA101 and SA101A, far higher than the through-town routes as far as their environmental desirability. Based on our review of the DEIS, we see no reason why project decision makers would arrive at a different conclusion now, especially since public opinion in support of Alternative D has been overwhelming.

Our Coalition has been pleased by the overwhelming support we have received from Boulder City residents and elected officials in support of Alternative D. To that end, I further request that you add some additional information to the public comment pertaining to a Boulder City Council meeting that took place on April 23, 2002, at which all members of the Boulder City Council stated their strong support for Alternative D.

Councilwoman Andrea Andersen said she "fully supports" Alternative D, citing the "devastating" impacts that the through-town routes would have on Boulder City. She further stated that Alternative D is the only route that would preserve the community.

Councilman Joe Hardy cited several reasons why he supports Alternative D, including the importance of protecting Boulder City's quality of life and the impacts the other routes would have on pollution, noise, views and safety. Councilman Hardy further stated that Alternative D would enhance public enjoyment of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area by creating a new scenic vista of the lake. He concluded by saying that he, along with the majority of Boulder City residents, "fully supports" Alternative D.

Councilman Mike Pacini also expressed his support for Alternative D, concluding: "When you look at what's best for Boulder City overall, for high school seniors, or senior citizens, Alternative D is the only route that makes sense."

Councilman Bryan Nix mentioned the 1998 Boulder City referendum on this issue, calling the results a "landslide" in favor of a southern bypass. He said the temporary elimination of truck traffic through town has resulted in improvements in noise, air quality and
congestion and that this could be maintained in the future by Alternative D. He said that after
reading the DEIS and speaking with many residents, "there is no question ... that Alternative
D is the only option for Boulder City." He concluded by saying "Alternative D would have the
least adverse impacts on Boulder City residents and businesses and Boulder City's scenic
views of Lake Mead.

Mayor Ferraro concluded the council remarks by saying all the members of the council
have studied the issue very closely. He said he has spoken to "hundreds of people" and that
there is "certainly a very strong opinion generated for Alternative D." He said Alternative D "is
the only alternative that makes sense for Boulder City now and into the far future." Mayor
Ferraro noted that Boulder City has developed through "careful planning and a lot of input and
we can't dare destroy it by selecting an alternative that would run right straight through the
middle of this community." He said if a through-town route were selected, "we would lose what
we have gained over the years." The Mayor concluded by saying "there is nothing that would
suggest to any of us that we should do anything other than support Alternative D" and that he
"completely, 100 percent supports Alternative D."

These statements were a unanimous and unequivocal expression of support from the
Boulder City Council, the elected officials with the most direct link to the citizens of Boulder City.
I have enclosed for your review a videotape of the Boulder City Council meeting so that you
may view the complete comments of the city council members in support of Alternative D.

Also, please note that several other dignitaries attended the hearing in support of
Alternative D and that several other elected officials provided written letters of support for alternative
D.

U.S. Senator Harry Reid's Regional Director, Jerry Reynolds, stated Senator Reid
supports Alternative D because it will protect the quality of life in Boulder City. He said Senator
Reid has long been aware of the special nature of this community and the efforts of its leaders
and citizens to preserve the quality of life in Boulder City. He said Senator Reid "remains
committed to Alternative D and the people of Boulder City" and their office is looking at the
funding that will be required to make the project happen.

Mike Dayton, Chief of Staff for Congressman Jim Gibbons, stated Congressman
Gibbons is committed to working with Senator Reid in support of Alternative D and urged the
Council's support for Alternative D.

Clark County Commissioner Bruce Woodbury, chairman of the Clark County Regional
Transportation Commission, wrote that Alternative D is the only alternative which will improve
the quality of life in Boulder City, protect the legitimate interests of our business community
and allow for an acceptable flow of interstate transportation and commerce.
State Senator Jon Porter wrote: “The Southern Bypass is the only option that would allow Boulder City to escape the negative effects associated with this increased traffic.” He further wrote: “We have worked hard to protect Boulder City’s unique environment and the Southern Bypass is the only option that would preserve the city we love.” He concluded by urging the Boulder City Council to urge NDOT and the Federal Highway Administration to select Alternative D as the preferred route.

Copies of these letters are enclosed for your review.

While many Boulder City citizens have expressed their support for Alternative D, we know that many others remain quiet and are relying on their elected officials to champion the Southern Bypass on their behalf. Because these elected officials receive comment and feedback from Boulder City citizens on a daily basis, we believe their sentiments are representative of the silent majority’s strong backing of Alternative D.

Finally, please note that several members of the Boulder City Bypass Coalition and other community organizations spoke on behalf of Alternative D at the Council meeting. Chad Bair, representing the Boulder City Chamber of Commerce, stated that organization’s endorsement of Alternative D. He cited a Chamber of Commerce survey of all businesses in Boulder City in which more than three-quarters of businesses indicated their support for Alternative D. Tom Christ, representing St. Jude’s Ranch for Children, described at length the detrimental impacts that the through-town routes would have on St. Jude’s. Members of our Coalition began the presentations and discussed the findings in the DEIS that demonstrate Alternative D would have the least adverse impacts on Boulder City’s environment.

While this letter could go on for pages espousing the merits of Alternative D and the negative impacts of the through-town routes, the comments and presentations made at the April 23 Boulder City Council meeting speak for themselves and I urge you to review the enclosed videotape.

The U.S. 93 project will have a profound impact on the future of Boulder City. Only one route, Alternative D, will preserve Boulder City’s unique environment for future generations. On behalf of the Boulder City Bypass Coalition, I urge the PMT to choose the Southern Bypass, Alternative D, as the preferred route in the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor Study.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Response to Comment C107-2.82
Comment noted.
cc (two ens.):

U.S. Senator Harry Reid
Congressman Jim Gibbons
Governor Kenny C. Guinn, Chairman, NDOT Board of Directors
Lt. Governor Lorraine Hunt, NDOT Board of Directors
Attorney General Frankie Sue Del Papa, NDOT Board of Directors
State Controller Kathy Augustine, NDOT Board of Directors
Mayor Bob Ferraro, Boulder City
Andrew Anderson, Boulder City Council
Dr. Joe Hardy, Boulder City Council
Byron Mox, Boulder City Council
Mike Pedini, Boulder City Council
Ted Benda, Federal Highway Administration
Thomas E. Stephens, P.E., NDOT Director
Scott Rawkins, NDOT Project Manager
Michael Lasko, CH2M HILL
Dr. Robert Merrell, Boulder City Bypass Coalition

Endosures
U.S. 93/Boulder City Corridor Study - Fact Sheet
(Prepared by the Boulder City Bypass Coalition)

The Boulder City Bypass Coalition:

The Boulder City Bypass Coalition is a group of concerned citizens who live throughout our community. Our goal is to champion the community's preference for a southern truck bypass for U.S. 93. Residents voted by a margin of more than 61% in favor of this route in a 1999 referendum. This "fact sheet" contains information about the issue and our analysis of why we voted greatly when we endorsed the southern truck bypass in 1999.

We need your help! For more information about the Coalition, contact Rick Brown, President of the Boulder City Bypass Coalition, at 293-7647, (fax) 293-7648, e-mail: HooverJr@msn.com or Darcy Martin, Chairman of the Board, at 293-0891, (fax) 293-0777, e-mail: darcym@desertnevada.com.

What is the Boulder City Corridor Study?

At the request of Boulder City, Henderson, and the Clark County Regional Transportation Commission, the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) is currently conducting a study of several U.S. 93 route alternatives through and around Boulder City. The Corridor Study is evaluating alternate route options with the goal of reducing traffic and improving safety along U.S. 93 in the Boulder City area.

Role of the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT):

It is helpful to understand NDOT's role in this process. NDOT is conducting the Boulder City Corridor Study at the request of local government and is acting as the administrator of the environmental study on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration. NDOT is not creating problems for Boulder City residents, it is seeking a solution to them. The purposes of this study—and any resulting project—is to analyze U.S. 93-related problems and to fix them. We wish to play a responsible role in deciding which of the project alternatives is best for Boulder City residents and maintain a good working relationship with NDOT.

Improvements to U.S. 93 are Inevitable

The southwestern United States is one of the fastest growing regions in the country. For many travelers, U.S. 93 is, and will continue to be, the route of choice to get them to their destinations. As this growth continues, so will the volume of cars and trucks on U.S. 93. While many of us wish that Boulder City could remain a tranquil from the breakdown growth of our neighboring cities, the reality is that we cannot ignore its existence. The traffic on U.S. 93 through the center of town has increased significantly year by year, exposing us to traffic congestion, increased pollution, noise, and dangerous conditions for drivers and pedestrians.

Southern Truck Bypass—Alternative "B"— Is the Best Alternative for Boulder City

The only way to preserve Boulder City and to provide a permanent solution to congestion, noise,
pollution and other U.S. 93-related concerns is to recognize the NDOT study and do everything in our power to ensure that the southern truck route is chosen. If the southern truck route is selected, through truck traffic will bypass the city entirely. Trucks will no longer congest our roadways, leaving room in their wake and creating dangerous conditions for drivers and pedestrians. Not only will the bypass improve travel along U.S. 93, it will improve the quality of life in Boulder City by reducing present noise, traffic, pollution, and hazardous conditions downtown.

The southern truck bypass will make existing U.S. 93 more convenient for local traffic and the entire downtown area more appealing for residents and those passing through who stop in Boulder City. It will relieve our community from the dangers who pass through Boulder City on their way to and from Las Vegas and other destinations, who never would have stopped here anyway. The southern truck bypass is a permanent solution to concerns about U.S. 93's impact on our community. We would no longer have to deal with increased traffic on the roadway because the traffic would be diverted far from our homes.

In 1999, Boulder City residents officially expressed their determination that a southern bypass is the community's preferred route. More than 87% of residents voted in support of a southern bypass and as a result NDOT is actively studying the merits of this route as one of the alternatives. Financing the southern bypass will not be a problem. U.S. Senator Harry Reid, the Majority Whip, stated publicly on May 24, 2001: "No one in Boulder City needs to be concerned that the state of Nevada will be unable to find the resources necessary to build a bypass if that is the will of the community and state."

Alternatives "A," "B," and "C" Would Be Bad for Boulder City

Alternative "A" in the Corridor Study, the "No-Build" alternative, would ignore the savings the existing roadway is facing and would likely lead to a road crisis in the near future. Federal law requires the "no-build" alternative be considered, but congestion and safety problems currently being experienced make this option very unrealistic for our situation. If the solution were as easy as not doing anything, our local officials and NDOT would have already given that option serious consideration.

Unlike the southern truck bypass, the through town routes would be very disruptive to Boulder City. These roadways divide the town and keep traffic - with all of its problems of noise, pollution and safety - in our midst. Both the "B" and "C" alignments would require the condemnation of residences. The homes left behind to near the larger roadways would become less desirable. Both of these alignments would also be very disruptive during the construction stage.

Route "B," consisting of improvements to the existing road and including a raised median through town, would basically be a Band-Aid approach. While it may increase the capacity of U.S. 93 in the short-term, it would ignore all of the same problems of congestion, noise, pollution and safety hazards in the center of town. Over time, route "B" improvements would become inadequate to deal with increases in the number of vehicles passing through.

Route "C" would be the construction of a new highway through Boulder City, running almost parallel to the existing U.S. 93. It would require the condemnation of a greater number of residences and
would likely conflict with street patterns—making it more difficult to get around Boulder City.

No Relation to the Hoover Dam Bypass and CANAMEX

Two other federal projects that have created some public discussion have no relation to the Boulder City Corridor Study.

One is the Hoover Dam bypass bridge location. Sources in Washington, D.C. see little chance of federal action to repeal the approval already granted for construction of the Hoover Dam bypass bridge at Sugarloaf Mountain. In any event, whether the bridge is built or not has no effect on the Corridor Study selection—the traffic will continue to grow with or without the bridge.

The other is the congressional action in 1995 of U.S. 93 as part of the CANAMEX route. It has little or no effect on the Boulder City Corridor Study. CANAMEX is nothing more than a name designation. Changing the CANAMEX route to a different highway—which would require an act of Congress—would not divert traffic, or stop the increase in traffic. Truckers and tourists will continue to do what they have always done: utilize the route that is most convenient for them.

Why Boulder City Residents Need to Stick Together

NDOT is operating under a federal mandate that requires it to take an objective look at the environmental impacts of the various project alternatives. It is currently analyzing the impacts the various routes would have on traffic, social conditions, the economy, air quality, cultural resources, floodplains, local use: wetlands, wildlife noise, water resources, and other criteria. Among the most important is a factor within our control—the alignment preference of the citizens of Boulder City, expressed directly by us and through our elected representatives.

When the experts have completed their studies on these various factors, NDOT will release a draft Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") containing its findings. This is now expected in fall 2001. After a public comment period, NDOT will announce a "preferred route." This will be what NDOT considers the best route in light of the analysis of the factors mentioned above. Part of this process includes approval by the NDOT Board of Directors, whose members include Governor Kemp Clark, Lieutenant Governor Lauren Rhodes, Attorney General Frankie Sue Del Papa and State Controller Kathy Augustine. Once NDOT has approved a route, it will become very difficult to change this decision. This is why it is crucial that the public comments NDOT receives strongly back the southern truck bypass.

Conclusion

The U.S. 93 problem will grow worse every day unless corrected. NDOT statistics show that traffic volumes through Boulder City are expected to double by 2027. Conditions at some intersections in Boulder City are already unacceptable during peak periods and will deteriorate to a "gridlock" status by 2016. These areas are located in the corridor study area from 1995 to 1999 and it is only expected to get worse. The only option on the table that will allow Boulder City to maintain its small town charm and keep noise, traffic, pollution and hazardous conditions to a minimum is the southern truck bypass—alternative "C."
April 23, 2002

Mayor Robert Ferraro  
City of Boulder City  
401 California Avenue  
Boulder City, NV 89005

Dear Mayor Ferraro and City Council Members:

Please accept this expression of my support for the resolution urging NDOT and the FHWA to select Route D, the Southern Bypass, as the preferred route for the U.S. Highway 93 improvement project. This is the only alternative which will improve the quality of life in Boulder, protect the legitimate interests of our business community and allow for an acceptable flow of interstate transportation and commerce.

To fully achieve these objectives, trucks must be required to use the bypass unless they are based or making deliveries in the city. We also need to insist upon substantial signage to advise motorists who might stop and make purchases in the city of the many services and shops available to them. Finally, the bypass should be far enough to the South so that the nearest neighborhoods are not adversely impacted.

I look forward to working with you, as well as the state and federal agencies involved in this important project, to obtain the funding and to assure its successful implementation as soon as possible. Thank you for your leadership and service on behalf of our community.

Sincerely,

BRUCE L. WOODBURY
April 3, 2002

Mayor Robert Ferraro
City of Boulder City
601 California Avenue
Boulder City, NV 89005

Dear Mayor Ferraro and City Council Members:

I am writing to urge you to support Alternative D, the Southern Bypass, as the preferred route for the Boulder City-U.S. 93 Corridor Study Project taking place in and around Boulder City. This alternative best meets the Purpose and Need for the study.

U.S. 93 is a vital travel corridor for the entire country. It links two of the fastest growing metropolitan areas in the United States, Phoenix and Las Vegas. Experts agree that traffic along this route will continue to grow especially locally and regionally once the Hoover Dam Bypass Bridge is completed in 2007. The Southern Bypass is the only option that would allow Boulder City to escape the negative effects associated with this increased traffic.

The residents of our community have themselves studied this issue. They are aware of the need for a solution and have officially expressed their views in support of a Southern Bypass in the June 1999 referendum. Additionally, within the last month, the Boulder City Chamber of Commerce has endorsed Alternative D with approximately 75% of the local business community supporting the project.

We have had this project on the books in one form or another for more years than I can count. As we move forward, I want to encourage Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada, NDOT and the Federal Highway Administration to use all their resources, their ingenuity and creativity in expanding it. For our part Boulder City will provide $5 million worth of real assets that will allow NDOT to avoid common delays often associated with acquiring the right-of-way in residential or commercial areas.

JON C. PORTER, R.N.
President
Western Nevada Business Council
In addition, I would ask NDOT to take special care in honoring their commitment to work with our local business community in making this bypass work for everyone, including making Boulder City a destination stop on U.S. 95 in association with the Lake Mead National Recreation Area and Hoover Dam.

Locally, we have worked hard to protect Boulder City’s unique environment and the Southern Bypass is the only option that will preserve the city we love. We must all urge NDOT and the Federal Highway Administration to select Alternative D as the preferred route and ultimately in their Record of Decision anticipated in the spring of 2003.

I look forward to providing any assistance you may require with this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
AGENDA
CITY COUNCIL, REGULAR MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBER, 441 PARKER AVENUE
BOULDER CITY, NEVADA 89005

TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 2000 • 7:00 P.M.

ALL ITEMS ARE FOR ACTION UNLESS DESIGNATED BY AN ASTERISK (*)

APPROVAL OF REGULAR AGENDA (From Reg. 3/27, p. 3)

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA (From Reg. 3/27, p. 3)


2. RESOLUTION NO. 982, AUTHORIZING INITIAL ADOPTION NO. 04-764 BETWEEN THE CITY OF BOULDER CITY AND THE BOULDER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION FOR THE FISCAL 2000 TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ASSISTANCE

3. RESOLUTION NO. 983, ADOPTING AMENDMENT NO. 82-561 BETWEEN THE CITY OF BOULDER CITY AND EMPLOYER A, INC. PROVIDING A GUARANTEE TO THE CITY AND TO APPROVE A GUARANTEE PAYMENT TO MUNICIPAL FIRST MORTGAGE

4. RESOLUTION NO. 984, ADOPTING CASE NO. 184 FOR THE EQUITY CHARGE

5. RESOLUTION NO. 985, AUTHORIZING A BID FOR THE PURCHASE OF MIDDLE SCHOOL INTERMEDIATE CARDS NO. 830-218-97 BID LETTER P-179/00 (1/11/00)

6. RESOLUTION NO. 986, AUTHORIZING A BID FOR APPOINTMENT OF BOULDER CITY/BOULDER COUNTY REGIONAL FORMER A, INC. PROJECT NO. 47-990-967


8. CITY BUDGET'S REPORT

a. CASH FUND REPORT, DECEMBER 2000

b. FINANCIAL REPORT, DECEMBER 2000

MAYOR'S REPORT

a. PRESENTATION OF A REPORT OR RECOMMENDATION REGARDING A HOME FOR THE ELDERLY PROJECT

b. PRESENTATION OF A REPORT OR RECOMMENDATION REGARDING A BUSINESS FOR THE ELDERLY PROJECT

c. PRESENTATION OF A REPORT OR RECOMMENDATION REGARDING A HOME FOR THE ELDERLY PROJECT

d. CONSIDERATION OF STC NO. 2309, AUTHORIZING A TAXING MEASUREMENT TO CARRY OUT SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT UNDER MAY 28, 1990, PROVIDING TO THE CONSIDERATION OF MAY 28, 1990
b. INCREASE REVENUE BONDS RESOLUTION NO. 93-250. APPROVING THE PREPARATION OF A REVENUE BONDS DEBT SERVICE BUDGET FOR THE DEBT ISSUANCE OF ALDERA

c. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 93-154

d. RESOLUTION NO. 93-259. ADOPTING A TRANSITORY TAX

25. a. INTRODUCTION OF RUL. NO. 150. AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING THE EXCESS OF UNEXPENDED AND UNENCUMBERED FUNDS FOR NO. 150, CITY OF EUGENE, URBAN Renewal Authority, and amending the existing ordinance

b. INTRODUCTION OF RUL. NO. 151. ADOPTING LAND BOND AMENDMENT NO. 02-165 RESERVING THE CITY OF EUGENE FOR THE COUNTY OF EUGENE AND NEWBERN BOND AND REFERENCE AMENDMENT FOR PROPERTY APPRAISED TO THE COUNTY OF EUGENE AND NEWBERN BOND AND REFERENCE AMENDMENT

26. INTRODUCTION OF RUL. NO. 155. AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING FUNDS TO SUPPORT THE OPERATIONAL COSTS OF THE VICTORIAN COMMUNITY CENTER, WILSON PARK AND THE WILSON CIVIC CENTER (AMEND RUL. 92-327)

27. RESOLUTION NO. 950. APPROVING A BUDGET APPROPRIATION FOR THE CITY OF EUGENE AND CITY OF EUGENE FOR A MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONAL COSTS OF THE CITY OF EUGENE CIVIC CENTER FOR MANAGEMENT OF EUGENE CIVIC CENTER


29. BEFORE CONSIDERING THE APPROPRIATION OF A MUNICIPAL BUILDING FUND AGREEMENT, CITY OF EUGENE AND THE CITY OF EUGENE, CITY COUNCIL RELATING TO LANDSCAPING OF CITY OF EUGENE

30. PERMIT REQUEST (location may not be taken on matters considered during this period until specifically included on an agenda as an active item.)

31. CITY ENGINEER'S REPORT

32. CITY COUNCIL'S REPORT

Accompanying informational materials on the agenda items in an accessible and available for public inspection at the City Clerk's Office, 631 California Avenue, Eugene, Oregon.

To ensure compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, members of the public who are deaf or hard of hearing may make arrangements to receive assistance in the form of closed captioning. The meeting is broadcast on cable television (KTV) at least seventy-two hours in advance of the meeting.
10. PRESENTATION COORDINATED BY THE BOULDER CITY NEIGHBORHOOD COALITION

10.1. ACCEPTANCE ALTERNATIVE 1 OF THE BOULDER CITY Bypass Study (An Argumentative Essay)

Mr. Bob Reade introduced Senator D.A. Senator Richard Bryan. Senator Bryan stated that this was the construction of a bypass road that there had been a construction project which will have such profound impact on Boulder City as the improvements on D.A. 25. He stated Boulder City has created a special

ambiance in its community through a controlled growth ordinance and zoning

restriction. He said a cut through the city would literally cut the city in half and have a tremendous impact on the city's quality of life. He noted

the bridge bypass over Hoover Dam is a reality, and the construction time line for the bridge crossing has been accelerated. He said the decision regarding the bridge crossing has been made; however, Boulder City can influence the

construction of the corridor within its boundaries. He said now is the

appropriate time for members of the Boulder City Council and for the citizens of the community to let their sentiments be known before the epic period ends May 10. He asked the City Council to adopt the following resolution from the coalition:

Resolution Number 32003040

10.2. The Boulder City Bypass Coalition, in the name of the residents of Boulder City and the Boulder City Council, respectfully requests that the City Council consider the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the City of Boulder City is faced with the decision of constructing a bypass around Hoover Dam; and

WHEREAS, the construction of a bypass would have a significant impact on the quality of life in Boulder City; and

WHEREAS, the residents of Boulder City have a right to be heard on this matter; and

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the City Council of Boulder City that:  

1. The City Council should consider all available alternatives, including

   Alternative 1, before making a decision on the construction of a bypass; and

2. The City Council should seek the input of the residents of Boulder City on the

   construction of a bypass; and

3. The City Council should work with the Boulder City Bypass Coalition to

   ensure that the construction of a bypass is done in a manner that minimizes

   the impact on the quality of life in Boulder City.

Approved by the City Council on May 10, 2003.
quality of life.

Bob Stanley said he and his family have been residents of Boulder City for the past twelve years. He said he and his wife traveled all over the United States to look for a place to retire and raise their family. They chose Boulder City as their home and became interested in the revitalization of the downtown area. He noted this decision regarding the bypass is one of the most important decisions which will impact the very character of our community. He also stated together to persuade and governmental agencies to limit our speed limit to protect our present way of life. He said the city should not be divided through the heart of our community by a highway. Bob said alternative B is the least accessible in many respects including environmentally and in regard to air and noise pollution. He said that a bypass will also serve as a protective barrier around our community.

Jerry Reynolds, also a resident of Boulder City, said the bypass would divide the heart of our community by a highway. He said that a bypass will also serve as a protective barrier around our community.

Mike Dayton, Chief of Staff for Congressman Gibson, said Congressman Gibson is committed to working with Senator Reid, and he is hopeful the city council will support Alternative B.

Bob Sears, representative for State Senator Jim Porter, read a letter from Senator Porter, writing the city council's support of Alternative B. Mr. Sears stated the bypass would divide the heart of our community by a highway. He concluded the city council should support Alternative B in the only option that will protect the city we all love.

Glen Blair, Vice President for the Chamber of Commerce, said the Chamber of Commerce supports Alternative B and the U.S. 93 Corridor Study. He said the Chamber of Commerce supports a survey of all city businesses holding Boulder City business licenses, and 76% of the respondents said they were well informed regarding this issue and supported Alternative B.

Jon Christ, St. Jude's Ranch for Children, said the bypass would divide the heart of our community by a highway. He concluded the city council should support Alternative B to protect and preserve the city's quality of life.

Senator Richard Bryan said he would appreciate any comments of support of Alternative B by the City Council and others because the May 20 deadline of public comment period is nearing.

Couple of Hawaii said supports Alternative B because of the negative impacts of the other alternatives, including noise pollution, air pollution, and visual impacts. She said that she would like to see the number of residents and visitors who support the City Council's support of Alternative B.

He also asked that alternative C will result in increased noise and traffic through our city and will impact St. Jude's, its residents, and their quality of life. He urged the city council to support Alternative B to protect and preserve the city's quality of life.
hence, it will result in less pollution and any pollution will be situated further away from the City. (He said sound walls are needed in Boulder City, neither sound/noise should just be preserved instead.) He said another lessen is that of safety, and Alternative D is safer to build because there will be no structure to the community and it provides a continuous drive without intersections. He said the new Measure Recreation Center and the view from going over the hill provides one of the greatest views in this region and this view should be protected. In addition to these beautiful vistas, Alternative D will provide the opportunity for additional vistas of Lake Mead. Councilman Hardy noted that appropriate signage along the bypass is needed to secure the economic viability of our businesses. We added that he supports Alternative D of the U.S. 93 Corridor Study Plan.

Councilman Petti said there has been some misconception that the bypass which has been referred to during this discussion is the current Laughlin route. He noted the Laughlin route should not be confused with the bypass or Alternative D. He said he supports Alternative D because it is in the best interest of the community overall, and it is the only route that makes sense.

Councilman Hines thanked everyone for their presentations. He said that when you take into consideration that the bridge is going to be built, there is no question, directing the traffic nowhere can be addressed. He said the "no build" alternative is really not an alternative at all. He said he has studied the PTA and Alternative D is the only true alternative for Boulder City. He added he has some concerns with the specific sitting of the bypass, however. He said he believes Alternative D will have the least impact on residents, businesses and on the view in our community. He suggested that a timeframe of the testimony be forwarded to the mayor and the PTA.

Mayor Pernaas said there is no doubt Alternative D is the only alternative that makes sense for Boulder City, both for now and into the future. He said a corridor through our community would result in noise and air pollution. He added his support to Alternative D of the U.S. 93 Corridor Study Plan.

Mayor Pernaas called for a brief recess at 8:15 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:30 p.m.
MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Hotline # 2002-096

FROM: Kimberley E. Byrn, Hotline Coordinator

TO: Nevada Department of Transportation

The enclosed hotline complaint, submitted by Ronald B. McAlister, is being forwarded to your attention for review and appropriate action.

Please notify the Office of Inspector General Hotline referencing the above assignment number in future communications with our office regarding this matter.

Should you have any questions, please contact me on 202-260-2000.

(see next page)
Ronald B. McAlister  
633 Marina Dr.  
Boulder City, NV. 89005

April 29, 2002

Mr. Daryl Jones  
NEOT Environmental  
1263 S. Stewart St.  
Carson City, NV. 89712

Dear Mr. Jones:

This letter is my response to “public comments” now being accepted in regards to the Boulder City Corridor Study.

I am a 7-year resident of Boulder City. I am also a Marketing Specialist very aware of the factors contributing to the Boulder City traffic situation.

Most importantly, the need for a second bridge over Hoover Dam is totally illogical. As the study contends, proposals are made on a 25-year traffic projection. By diverting the commercial trucking, existing roads, with little improvement would be quite sufficient for the next 25-years. This is a fact that can be verified easily, based upon reduced traffic conditions, since the trucks were diverted after 9/11/01.

NUMBER ONE

It's a well known marketing fact that tourists from throughout the U.S. and abroad come visit Hoover Dam and pass through Boulder City to and from the Grand Canyon and Las Vegas in large numbers. This number will continue to increase, but again, without the trucks, this increase can be easily handled with the existing highway system. The tourist traffic is also a good source of business for Boulder City.

NUMBER TWO

Commercial trucking not only presents an extreme danger to the security of Hoover Dam now and in the future, but will destroy the pristine beauty of this National Recreational Area through both noise and increased air pollution.

As you must be aware, Hoover Dam has two large intakes directly in front of the Dam. In a matter of minutes, with weapons that could have easily been setup inside a large truck these intakes could be destroyed.

Response to Comment C108-6.18  
Comment noted.

Response to Comment C108-4.18  
Comment noted.

Response to Comment C108-1.36  
This comment pertains to the Hoover Dam Bypass project.
If the intakes to Hoover Dam are destroyed, this would cut off electricity to a large portion of the Southwest United States. It would take years to reconstruct the intakes and a major Federal expenditure. *Is this worth the risk?*

Also, more and more smog is beginning to destroy the natural aesthetics of the area. It's wrong that political and Union decisions made nearly 3,000 miles away, that obviously have not considered these consequences, are determining this important destiny.

**SOLUTION**

A much less expensive, direct and effective solution is an expansion of Highway 88 west from Kingman, Arizona, to Highway 95, then an expansion of Highway 95 north to Highway 93. This also leaves routing through Needles, California as a very efficient back-up route.

The savings with this plan would be in the hundreds of millions of dollars and would protect and preserve one of America's most beautiful regions to the benefit of the people for years to come.

If the second bridge over Hoover Dam is to be constructed, even after considering the extreme long term security risk and what will end up a million dollar plus expenditure, a corridor around Boulder City would be the only solution.

**ROUTE D IS THE ONLY ROUTE WHICH WOULD PROTECT, PRESERVE AND BEST SERVE BOULDER CITY AND THIS BEAUTIFUL LAND.**

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ronald B. McAllister
Boulder City Resident
and U.S. Citizen

Copies: U.S. Department of Defense
Secretary of Defense: Donald H. Rumsfeld
White House
President: George W. Bush
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - MC-2410

Response to Comment C108-2.83
FEIS Sections 3.2 and 4.2 describe the air quality setting and project consequences, respectively.

Response to Comment C108-6.19
Comment noted.

Response to Comment C108-5.14
Comment noted.
MAY 23

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Ronald B. McAllister
633 Marinas Drive
Boulder City, NV 89005

Dear Mr. McAllister:

This correspondence is to confirm receipt of your letter to the U.S. EPA Inspector General Fraud, Waste and Abuse Hotline.

The purpose of this Hotline is to receive complaints of fraud, waste, and abuse in U.S. EPA programs and operations including mismanagement or violations of law, rules, or regulations by EPA employees or program participants. Examples of reportable violations include:

- Contract, procurement, and grant fraud, such as, contractor mischarging and bid rigging
- Significant mismanagement and misuse of funds
- Conflicts of interest
- Travel fraud
- Abuse of authority
- Theft and abuse of Government property
- Bribery and acceptance of gratuities
- Computer crimes

Your complaint is not under the purview of this Hotline, however, I have referred it to the following office for further review:

Nevada Department of Transportation
1201 South Stewart Street
Carson City, Nevada 89712
id 775-887-5000
fax 775-887-7115
info@dot.state.nv.us

Highway System
(775) 685-7465

Related EPA Info
http://www.epa.gov/oig/emaileducation/whistleblt.htm
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Nevada Regional Office Branch (56557)
Ariel Site Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue,NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 566-0321

Kimberley E. Bittinger
Hotline Coordinator

This product is recyclable. Please dispose of with regular garbage at no extra cost to you.
April 4, 2002

Mr. Daryl James
NDOT Environment Division
1363 S. Stewart
Carson City, NV 89712

Dear Mr. James:

As a homeowner in the Bella Vista Subdivision of Boulder City we strongly support Alternative "D" the Southern Bypass Route for the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor.

This alternative is by far the least disruptive and safest for all residents of Boulder City. We are not only concerned with the noise, air pollution and ugliness, but also the danger posed by the large number of trucks that will use this highway transporting all types of cargo including nuclear waste.

We kindly request your support for the selection of the Alternative D.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Ronald P. Therrien

Response to Comment C109-2.84

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D1-4.1
Preference for Alternative D noted.

Response to Comment D1-3.1
Social impacts of Alternative C are detailed in FEIS Section 4.12. The opinion of the bisection effect of Alternative B has been noted in the evaluation of the alternatives.

Alternatives B and C would have greater construction-related impacts on the residential areas within Hemenway Valley (see FEIS Section 4.17). Following construction, both alternatives keep U.S. 93 traffic within Hemenway Valley.
Response to Comment D2-1.1
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. As part of the mitigation effort, adequate signage will be required for any build alternative to promote the economic viability of Boulder City. The suggestion will be considered as part of this mitigation and in any subsequent design.

Response to Comment D2-1.2
The widening of U.S. 93 is intended to alleviate the congestion on the roadway, and access points will be distributed in Hemenway Valley through use of a frontage road. However, Alternative B does present the greatest amount of difficulty with respect to access and turns of all the build alternatives.
Response to Comment D3-2.1
Support for Alternative D and comment noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D3-1.3
In the initial screening of 16 alternatives, an alignment for the southern bypass south of the Mead Substation (further south than Alternative D) was eliminated because it did not provide additional positive features with respect to noise and visual impacts, and it provided negative qualities of an additional mile of roadway and drainage impacts (see FEIS Chapter 2, Section 2.4).
Response to Comment D4-2.2
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D4-2.3
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D5-1.4
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D5-4.2
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D5-3.2
The estimated cost of each of the alternatives is included in the Executive Summary of the FEIS. According to the Preliminary Engineering Report, the estimated cost of construction and engineering for each alternative is as follows: Alternative A, no cost; Alternative B, approximately $220 million; Alternative C, approximately $220 million; and Alternative D, approximately $345 million. This, however, does not include associated costs of mitigation for features such as drainage and biological requirements.

One of the goals of the environmental process is to identify the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative while taking into consideration social, environmental, and economic impacts (as presented in the FEIS). Cost of construction is not a factor unless it renders an alternative not practicable to be constructed. If this is determined to be the case, the alternative is removed from consideration during the initial screening of alternatives.
**Response to Comment D6-2.4**

Alternative D (southern bypass) would not preclude truck usage of existing U.S. 93; however, a reduction in total traffic through Boulder City is predicted with implementation of Alternative D.

---

**Response to Comment D6-5.1**

Comment noted.
Response to Comment D7-2.5
Position and comment concerning Alternative D noted.

Response to Comment D7-1.5
Social impacts of Alternatives B and C are detailed in FEIS Section 4.12.
Because Alternative B contains an arterial segment and traffic signals and the other build alternatives are full freeways, Alternative B is projected to contain the most overall congestion (Preliminary Engineering Report) of the build alternatives, but it does retain an acceptable LOS in the design year of 2027.
Response to Comment D8-2.6

Alternatives B and C would require noise barriers ranging in height from 2 m (8 feet) to 3 m (10 feet) at specific locations along the route (FEIS, Section 4.3.2).

Under Alternative D, no adverse noise effects are expected to occur anywhere in the developed portion of the project area. Areas within a distance of about 165 m (550 feet) would experience substantial noise level increases; however, noise abatement is not required because the affected lands are not considered "frequent human use" areas (FEIS, Section 4.3.1).
Response to Comment D9-2.7

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Altered views would result from construction and operation of all the build alternatives (FEIS, Section 5.1.9). Alternatives B and C include the Pacifica Way interchange. This proposed elevated crossing over U.S. 93 would obstruct views of Lake Mead from the nearby residential area.

The temporary air emissions and noise associated with construction of Alternatives B and C would impact Boulder City residents due to the proximity of residential and commercial uses. Mitigation for these impacts is identified in FEIS Sections 4.2.2 and 4.3.2, respectively.

Generally, higher concentrations of CO, nitrogen oxide (NOₓ), and ozone (O₃) are anticipated with implementation of Alternative A (No Build) rather than with the build alternatives (FEIS, Section 4.2.1).

Also see response to Comment D6-2.4.

Response to Comment D9-3.3

Refer to response to Comment D5-3.2. Social impacts of Alternatives B and C are detailed in FEIS Section 4.12.
Response to Comment D10-2.8
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D10-1.6
The design development of Alternatives B and C contain a full freeway from the River Mountains Trailhead in Hemenway Valley to the eastern study limit. Therefore, at Pacifica Way, both alignments are freeways and a school bus stop could not be located there. The school bus would be routed to a frontage road or through some other local route instead of the new facility if either of these alternatives were constructed.
Response to Comment D11-2.9
Comment noted. Alternative A (No Build) would disturb the least amount of desert land. Of the build alternatives, Alternative B would disturb the least amount of existing undeveloped land.

Response to Comment D11-4.3
Preference for Alternative C noted.

Response to Comment D11-5.2
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D12-1.7
This is correct with the exception of the area north of existing U.S. 93 within the River Mountains.

Response to Comment D12-2.10
See response to Comment D8-2.6.
Response to Comment D13-3.4
Refer to response to Comment D5-3.2.

Response to Comment D13-6.1
The situation described in the comment would be identical for all four alternatives in the Boulder City project, as the eastern study limit of the Boulder City EIS is just beyond the Hacienda Hotel and Casino, west of Hoover Dam.

The Hoover Dam Bypass project has completed its EIS, and design is underway. The potential for drive-by shootouts of Hoover Dam is not considered a major issue for the project.

Response to Comment D13-3.5
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. See also response to Comment D5-3.2.

Response to Comment D13-2.11
See response to Comment D9-2.7.
Response to Comment D14-2.12
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D14-1.8

The design development of Alternative D contains interchanges at Railroad Pass, U.S. 95, and the eastern study limit. The Boulder City Council has provided a written request for an interchange to not be constructed at Buchanan Boulevard.

Instead, an interchange for emergency access only is proposed where Alternative D crosses the WAPA access road and Buchanan Boulevard. This interchange will have a locked gate at both the exit and at the access road. The grade separation at the crossing will be above grade for the new facility and will allow for transport of WAPA equipment and vehicles.
Response to Comment D15-2.13
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Both Alternatives B and C propose through-town alignments that would carry mixed-flow traffic (trucks and automobiles). Refer to responses to Comments D6-2.4, D8-2.6, and D9-2.7.

Response to Comment D15-5.3
Comment noted.
Comment Form
Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing
April 4, 2002

Please print:
Name: Blackwell Charles
Address: 117 Boulder City Ave., NV

Please add my name to your mailing list. [ ] Yes [ ] No

1. Which alternative do you prefer most and why? Alternative “D”
   - Accomplishment of prime agenda, an efficient route for current heavy traffic and future heavy traffic increase.
   - The main highway will include off/turns into Boulder City businesses and residential areas.

2. Which alternative do you prefer least and why? Alternative “B”
   - Least preferred - Too much truck traffic.
   - Traffic in residential areas, noise pollution, safety potential.

Response to Comment D16-5.4
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D16-2.14
Comment noted. As described in FEIS Section 4.3.1, potential impacts to noise-sensitive areas would experience major reductions in traffic noise levels through implementation of Alternative D.

Air quality impacts are discussed in FEIS Section 4.2.1. Alternative A has the highest estimated CO concentration at the U.S. 93/Railroad Pass intersection. Alternative B has the lowest CO concentration at the U.S. 93/Railroad Pass intersection, but it has the highest concentration at the U.S. 93/ Buchanan Boulevard intersection. Alternative C has the lowest concentrations at the U.S. 93/Buchanan Boulevard intersection, and it is only moderately higher than the lowest concentrations at the U.S. 93/Railroad Pass intersection. Alternative D is estimated to have the same CO concentrations at both intersections, which are higher than the other build alternatives at the U.S. 93/Railroad Pass intersection and fall between the other build alternatives at the U.S. 93/Buchanan Boulevard intersection.
Response to Comment D17-6.2
Comment supporting Alternative D has been noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

The Hoover Dam Bypass project EIS addresses traffic and safety problems at the U.S. 93 crossing of the Colorado River, and the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study EIS ties directly into this project. Each EIS addresses problems located within their respective study limits.
Response to Comment D17-1.9
The design development of Alternative D contains interchanges at Railroad Pass, U.S. 95, and the eastern study limit.
Response to Comment D18-6.3

Alternative A does not have a provision for a truck route through Laughlin or bypassing Boulder City. Alternative A is the No Build Alternative, which would mean no improvements to the existing highway route through Boulder City. Alternative D, the preferred alternative, does bypass Boulder City, but not as a truck route (though in initial stages of construction, the highway may be a designated truck route).

The potential for a truck route through Laughlin was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass project (see the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS Appendix B for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project.

Response to Comment D18-2.15

Position and comment concerning Alternatives B, C, and D noted. The estimated cost of each build alternative is presented in the Preliminary Engineering Report for the project.
Response to Comment D19-1.10

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

In this study, NDOT is analyzing for a design year of 2027. Traffic estimates using computer modeling have shown that congestion on U.S. 93 in 2027, even without trucks, will produce failing levels of service between the study limits. However, there is the potential for the first phase of construction of the southern bypass (Alternative D) to be a truck bypass road, as traffic projections in the shorter term (2018 and sooner) do provide an acceptable LOS for a truck route only.
Response to Comment D20-2.16

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Construction of Alternative D would produce the least amount of construction-related traffic and activities through town and on existing U.S. 93.
3. Other comments

First I do not like alone!
Response to Comment D21-5.5
Comment noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D21-4.4
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D21-1.11
The eastern study limits were set in the initial stages of this study at the western study limits of the Hoover Dam Bypass project. The connection point for the Boulder City / U.S. 93 Corridor Study will be with the Hoover Dam Bypass final design.
Response to Comment D22-4.5
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D22-4.6
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D23-5.6
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D24-1.12

The study limits for the project are shown in the FEIS as on the western side the Foothills grade separation and on the eastern side at the western limit of the Hoover Dam Bypass project. The focus of this project is not to determine a corridor between Phoenix and Las Vegas, as outlined in Chapter I of the FEIS, Purpose and Need.
Response to Comment D25-2.17
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D25-2.18
A description of the demographics around each alternative can be found in Sections 3.12 and 3.13 of the FEIS. Possible impacts to these populations as a result of the alignments can be found in Sections 4.12 and 4.13.

As discussed in Section 2.5 of the FEIS, Alternative B would be constructed within existing U.S. 93 right-of-way.

Response to Comment D25-1.13
The development of Alternative C within the DEIS would not require the relocation of any businesses in Boulder City. Alternative B would likely require the displacement of five businesses.
Response to Comment D26-1.14
The diversion of truck traffic alone from existing U.S. 93 to an alternative route (Alternatives B, C, or D) would not improve its service level to an acceptable LOS. Alternative D would be for cars and trucks not destined for Boulder City.

Response to Comment D26-4.7
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D26-4.8
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D26-1.15

In this study, NDOT is analyzing for a design year of 2027. Traffic estimates using computer modeling have shown that congestion on U.S. 93 in 2027, even without trucks, will produce failing levels of service between the study limits.

Presently, for security reasons, trucks are detoured away from Hoover Dam and the Boulder City area. Prior to implementation of truck diversion measures, trucks made up approximately 10 percent of the total traffic on U.S. 93 through Boulder City. Permanently removing trucks from U.S. 93 through Boulder City would not be enough to satisfy goals set forth in the Purpose and Need for the project.
Response to Comment D27-4.9
Preference for Alternative D noted.

Response to Comment D27-1.16
Social impacts of Alternative C are detailed in FEIS Section 4.12. Alternative C is a full freeway that would maintain a high speed of traffic through Boulder City, which tends to reduce air pollution as compared to idling vehicles (see FEIS Air Quality Sections 3.2 and 4.2). Cumulative Impacts are shown in Chapter 6 of the FEIS.

Noise increases would be minimized using sound barriers. Safety would be achieved by separating through-town freeway traffic from arterial sections of Boulder City.

Response to Comment D27-2.19
Comment noted. See response to Comment D9-2.7.

Response to Comment D27-4.10
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D27-2.20
Comment noted. See response to Comment D9-2.7.
Response to Comment D27-2.21
Comment noted. See response to Comment D15-2.13.

Response to Comment D27-4.11
Economic impacts are evaluated in Section 4.11 of the FEIS.

Response to Comment D27-2.22
Refer to response to Comment D6-2.4.
Response to Comment D28-5.7
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D28-2.23

Comment noted.
Response to Comment D29-3.6
Construction of Alternative D would be visible from locations near its termini (Railroad Pass on the west and LMNRA on the east) and from residential areas near San Felipe Drive and the intersection of Buchanan Boulevard/Georgia Avenue.

Construction and operation of Alternative D would not require noise mitigation.

Response to Comment D29-4.12
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D29-4.13
Comment noted.
3. Other comments:

Boulder City has a lot of people who come here. Make it a destination and not just a through town. That's enough people who see the Dam - the Lake - the mountains - the casino. Keep the town the same, tourist friendly.
Response to Comment D30-2.24

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D30-1.17

Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a bypass for through-town traffic that would minimize traffic through Boulder City. The decrease in traffic through Boulder City would improve traffic operations in problem areas.

Response to Comment D30-4.14

Comment noted.
Response to Comment D31-2.25
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D31-6.4
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. U.S. 95, south of Boulder City, is being widened. Phase One, from Searchlight to 18 miles north of Searchlight, is under construction. Phase Two, from 18 miles north of Searchlight to the U.S. 93 interchange, is scheduled to be completed by summer 2005. However, this, in itself, has been determined to not meet the Purpose and Need of the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study EIS.

Response to Comment D31-2.26
The location of noise barriers for each of the alternatives is discussed in Section 4.3 of the FEIS. A discussion of their visual impact can be found in Section 4.10.
CONSIDER THE NEEDS OF RESIDENTS SERIOUSLY - NOT JUST WINDOW DRESSING.
Response to Comment D32-6.5
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

NDOT has a project in the 3-year Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to widen the two-lane segment of U.S. 95 from Laughlin Highway (State Route [SR] 163), which is west of Laughlin, to U.S. 93 west of Boulder City. This segment of U.S. 95 will be widened to a four-lane highway. Improvements to U.S. 95 will be a three-phase project. The first phase is from the northern limits of Searchlight to 29 km (18 miles) north. This phase was completed in the fall of 2003. The second phase will be from the northern end of the first phase, to the junction with U.S. 93 at Railroad Pass. Phase 2 will be developed to be compatible with the preferred alternative (Alternative D), and it is scheduled to be completed by late 2004. The third phase is from Searchlight to SR 163, 32 km (20 miles) to the south, with construction anticipated to begin in fall 2004, again depending on traffic, safety needs, and funding availability. It is anticipated Phase 3 will be constructed in late 2005 or 2006.

A bridge crossing at Willow Beach was eliminated from consideration in the early stages of the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS, predominantly due to very high impacts on the LMNRA.

Response to Comment D32-5.8
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D33-2.27
Comment noted. Refer to responses to Comments D6-2.4 and D9-2.7.

Response to Comment D33-1.18
It is a goal of the development of all build alternatives to create a safer transportation corridor (see FEIS Purpose and Need, Chapter 1). FHWA, the lead agency, has identified Alternative D as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision, based in part on the conclusion that Alternative D is a safer travel corridor compared to Alternatives B or C.

Response to Comment D33-1.19
In an Origin and Destination Study conducted in March 2000 at Veterans Memorial Drive, 43 percent of vehicles surveyed had a destination of Lake Mead, Hoover Dam, or Arizona, while 57 percent had a destination of Boulder City. This information was used in the subsequent traffic modeling of the potential number of vehicles that would divert from the existing roadway to a bypass. According to these projections, Alternative D would provide an acceptable level of service in the design year of 2027 for vehicles on the existing roadway.

Response to Comment D33-4.15
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D33-1.20
It is a goal of the development of all build alternatives to create a safer transportation corridor (see FEIS Purpose and Need, Chapter 1).
Response to Comment D34-2.28
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D34-4.16
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D34-4.17
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D34-2.29
Comment noted. Refer to response to Comment D34-2.28. Local transit is addressed in Chapter 1 of the FEIS.
Response to Comment D35-1.21
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a bypass for through-town traffic to utilize that would minimize traffic through Boulder City.

Response to Comment D35-3.7
Comment noted. Refer to response to Comment D5-3.2.

Response to Comment D35-6.6
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Traffic and congestion over Hoover Dam are not directly addressed by this project. The Hoover Dam Bypass project has selected an alternative to construct a bridge south of the dam, which will ease traffic congestion.

The combination of the Hoover Dam Bypass and Alternative D would promote smoother traffic flow through Boulder City and across the Colorado River, thus minimizing backups at Hoover Dam into Boulder City.
Response to Comment D35-6.39

Comment noted.

The potential for a route through Laughlin along U.S. 95 instead of using U.S. 93 was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass project (see the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS, Appendix B, for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project. A truck route along U.S. 95 does not address traffic congestion or safety concerns at Hoover Dam, and traffic modeling indicates that the route will not sufficiently alleviate congestion in Boulder City in the design year of 2027.
Response to Comment D36-3.8
Refer to response to Comment D5-3.2.

Alternative B keeps traffic on the existing U.S. 93 Corridor, but with a widened roadway, and it is projected that it would provide an acceptable LOS at key links and intersections in the design year of 2027, as well as adhering to other requirements put forth in the Purpose and Need.

Response to Comment D36-4.18
Preference for Alternative B noted.

Response to Comment D36-2.30
Position and comment concerning Alternative B noted. Refer to responses to Comments D8-2.6, D9-2.7, and D15-2.13.

Response to Comment D36-4.19
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D37-2.31
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

See also response to Comment D25-2.18.
Response to Comment D37-6.38
The Hoover Dam Bypass EIS has been completed, and design is underway. In that EIS, the pollutant contamination potential of the Colorado River was deemed less significant than the existing U.S. 93 crossing or the Promontory Point Alternative, which, in a catastrophe, could produce contamination of Lake Mead and the Las Vegas water supply.

This comment does not directly relate to the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study.
Response to Comment D38-2.32
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 discusses the rationale for this decision. Refer to response to Comment D9-2.7.

Response to Comment D38-3.9
Refer to response to Comment D5-3.2.
Response to Comment D39-6.7

Alternative A does not have a provision for a mandatory truck route south on U.S. 95. Alternative A is the No Build Alternative, which would mean no improvements to the existing highway route through Boulder City.

Routing trucks on U.S. 95 will not fulfill the Purpose and Need of the project, in that traffic projections indicate that removing trucks from U.S. 93 will not alleviate congestion to acceptable levels in the design year of 2027.
Response to Comment D40-4.20
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D41-1.21
In the initial screening of 16 alternatives, an alignment for the southern bypass south of the Mead Substation (further south than Alternative D) was eliminated because it did not provide additional positive features with respect to noise and visual impacts, and it provided negative qualities of an additional mile of roadway and drainage impacts (see FEIS Chapter 2, Section 2.4).

The access area for Boulder City growth is the same for Alternative D as it is shown in the DEIS and as it would be if routed south of the Mead Substation. The alternative crosses west to east within WAPA land, outside the Boulder City limits. See FEIS Figure ES-1.

See also response to Comment D14-1.8 concerning vehicle access only at Buchanan Boulevard.

Response to Comment D41-5.9
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D42-6.8
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

The potential for a truck route through Laughlin was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass Project (see the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS Appendix B for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project. A route through Laughlin does not address traffic congestion or safety concerns at Hoover Dam, and traffic modeling indicates that not enough traffic would choose the route to alleviate congestion in Boulder City in the design year of 2027.

Response to Comment D42-2.33
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D43-1.22
Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a bypass for through-town traffic (including trucks) to utilize that would minimize traffic through Boulder City.

Response to Comment D43-2.34
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

See also response to Comment D8-2.26.
Response to Comment D43-1.23
The Roadway Capacity section of the Purpose and Need (FEIS Section 1.3.1) discusses this need, along with the current congestion and difficult access on the existing roadway.

Response to Comment D43-2.35
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D44-5.10
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D44-2.36
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D45-3.10
Refer to response to Comment D5-3.2. Social impacts of Alternative C are detailed in FEIS Section 4.12. Economic impacts of all build alternatives on Boulder City businesses are discussed in FEIS Section 4.11.

Response to Comment D45-3.11
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer also to response to Comment D5-3.2. In the Noise Impacts section of the FEIS (Section 4.3), Alternative D was projected to have the least impact on noise receptors. Other environmental impacts are discussed in Chapter 4 of the FEIS.

All alternatives end at the same point at the eastern study limit, just east of the Hacienda Hotel and Casino on existing U.S. 93. Alternative D would retain the longest route (distance) to the Hoover Dam Bypass bridge of all alternatives and would also take the longest amount of travel time, approximately 3 minutes longer than Alternatives B and C. This information is provided in the Preliminary Engineering Report.
Response to Comment D46-2.37
Support for Alternative D and comment noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D46-4.21
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D46-2.38
Refer to responses to Comments D6-2.4 and D9-2.7, and Sections 4.5 and 4.7 of the FEIS.
Response to Comment D47-2.39
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D47-2.40
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. See also response to Comments D6-2.4 and D25-2.18.

Response to Comment D47-4.22
Comment noted.
Boulder City is unique in many ways. It is the only City in the State of Nevada that has no open space within City limits. A Contrived growth ordinance is home to Hoover Dam. One of the seven engineering wonders of the world. A Lake, Mead. Bringing a major 414 lane highway through the middle of our town will devastate our "clean, green, quiet community where we live in..."
Boulder City

COMMENT FORM
Boulder City U.S. 93 Corridor Study
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing
April 4, 2002

PLEASE PRINT
Name: FERNE DISMUK
Address: 309 UTAH ST. O.C. $9005

Please add my name to your mailing list: Yes ☐ No ☐

1. Which alternative do you prefer most and why? D !!!

- Keep town traffic
- Truck Utility Vehicles
- Shift out of town
- Bridge Building
- Bridge Building Supplies out

At west junction: Truck Route → Boulder City & Old Town
Huge sign: "Welcome"

2. Which alternative do you prefer least and why?

- Boulder City
- Hiking Old Town
- Home of Hospitality
- Front Food & Lodging
- Shopping & Be prepared
- Rest Room & View
- Bed & Breakfast
- Visitor Information at the
Boulder Dam Hotel on Arizona Street

Response to Comment D48-1.24
Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a bypass for through-town traffic (including truck traffic and utility vehicles) to utilize that would minimize traffic through Boulder City. According to the Air Quality section (FEIS Section 4.2), particulate matter (dust) levels would be approximately the same for any of the alternatives considered in this study.

Comment regarding signage is noted.
Response to Comment D49-2.41
Alternatives B and C would cost approximately $220 million, while Alternative D would cost approximately $345 million. Comment noted.
Response to Comment D49-4.23
Comment noted.

Boulder City

3. Other comments:

(4) 4. If you build a new road I believe that it will take business away from downtown also.

Submit comments at the meeting or mail comments to:
D.J. Jones, P.E. Chief, Environmental Services Division,
Nevada Department of Transportation, 2361 South Rancho Drive, Carson City, NV 89713
Response to Comment D50-1.25
Preference for Alternative C noted. Alternative C was developed as a through-town freeway that would move traffic through Boulder City at higher speeds while relieving congestion on the existing roadway. Alternative C would provide access to the commercial corridor with exits from the freeway at Railroad Pass, U.S. 95, an extended Buchanan Boulevard and Lakeshore Road.
Response to Comment D50-6.9
The Purpose and Need for the project is presented in Chapter 2, Volume I, of the FEIS. Purposes for the study include the traffic congestion on U.S. 93 through Boulder City, roadway deficiencies, and safety considerations at high-crash intersections.
Response to Comment D51-2.42
Comment noted. Refer to responses to Comments D8-2.6 and D9-2.7.

Response to Comment D51-5.11
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D52-6.10
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

The potential for a route through Laughlin was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass Project (see the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS, Appendix B, for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project. A route through Laughlin does not address traffic congestion or safety concerns at Hoover Dam, and traffic modeling indicates that not enough traffic would choose the route to alleviate congestion in Boulder City in the design year of 2027.
Response to Comment D53-1.26
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Social impacts of Alternatives B and C are detailed in FEIS Section 4.12. The opinion of the bisection effect of Alternative B has been noted in the evaluation of the alternatives.
Response to Comment D54-5.12
Comment noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D54-3.12
The potential impacts of Alternatives B and C are described in FEIS Chapter 4.
Response to Comment D54-2.43
Comment noted. Refer to responses to Comments D6-2.4 and D9-2.7.

Response to Comment D54-2.44
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D54-3.13
The conceptual plan for each alternative is consistent with NDOT and AASHTO design standards and to meet 2027 traffic conditions.

Response to Comment D54-6.11
FHWA completed the environmental process and selected the Sugarloaf Mountain Alternative for the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS. It does not consider the selection to be poor.
Response to Comment D55-2.45
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D55-4.24
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D56-6.12
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

NDOT has a project in the 3-year Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIF) to widen the two-lane segment of U.S. 95 from Laughlin Highway (State Route [SR] 163), which is west of Laughlin, to U.S. 93 west of Boulder City. This segment of U.S. 95 will be widened to a four-lane highway. Improvements to U.S. 95 will be a three-phase project. The first phase is from the northern limits of Searchlight to 29 km (18 miles) north. This phase was completed in the fall of 2003. The second phase will be from the northern end of the first phase, to the junction with U.S. 93 at Railroad Pass. Phase 2 will be developed to be compatible with the preferred alternative (Alternative D), and it is scheduled to be completed by late 2004. The third phase is from Searchlight to SR 163, 32 km (20 miles) to the south, with construction anticipated to begin in fall 2004, again depending on traffic, safety needs, and funding availability. It is anticipated Phase 3 will be constructed in late 2005 or 2006.
Response to Comment D56-6.13

The situation described in the comment would be identical for all four alternatives in the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study project, as the eastern study limit of the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study EIS is just beyond the Hacienda Hotel and Casino, west of Hoover Dam.

The Hoover Dam Bypass project has completed its EIS, and design is underway. The potential for nuclear explosions causing devastation to Hoover Dam is not considered a major issue for the project.
Response to Comment D57-3.14
Section 1.3.5 of the FEIS discusses this City Initiative, in which citizens voted by a 61.3 percent majority to accept a diverted highway containing three characteristics. Alternative D retains all three of these characteristics, but the 1999 vote was not specifically concerning Alternative D.

Response to Comment D57-2.46
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D57-2.47
Position and comment concerning Alternative A noted. Refer to responses to Comments D6-2.4, D8-2.6, and D9-2.7.
Response to Comment D57-3.15
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative B would widen the existing U.S. 93 Corridor to achieve an acceptable LOS at key links and intersections in the design year of 2027. Alternative C bypasses the commercial corridor of Boulder City, and then it connects with the Alternative B route at the River Mountains Trailhead in Hemenway Valley. Alternative C would also provide an acceptable LOS in the design year.
Response to Comment D58-2.48

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer also to responses to Comments D6-2.4 and D15-2.13. Design features (i.e., roadway configuration and geometrics) incorporated into the conceptual plan for each build alternative would reduce the potential for vehicular collisions.
Response to Comment D59-2.49
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer to Chapter 4 of the FEIS and the response to Comment C1-2.1.

Response to Comment D59-4.25
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D59-2.50
Support for Alternative D and comment noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Boulder City

COMMENT FORM
Boulder City U.S. 51 Corridor Study
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing
April 4, 2002

PLEASE PRINT
Name: Bob FERRERO
Address: 515 Northridge Dr.
Boulder City, NV

Please add my name to your mailing list: Yes [ ] No [ ]

1. Which alternative do you prefer most and why?

   **ALTERNATIVE D**

2. Which alternative do you prefer least and why?

   **ALTERNATIVE IS AND J**

Response to Comment D60-5.13
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D61-2.51

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities as a result of mitigation from the construction of the Build Alternatives are discussed in Section 4.14 of the FEIS.
Response to Comment D62-1.27
Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a bypass for through-town traffic to utilize that would minimize traffic through Boulder City.

However, Alternative D does not leave the truck route the same as it is at present. At present, the trucks are routed through Laughlin. Alternative D would produce a route that trucks can use to get around Boulder City, crossing just north of the Mead Substation.

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D62-1.28
Vehicles accessing U.S. 93 using Alternative B from Lake Mountain Drive would use the frontage road to access the facility at the Lakeshore Road interchange.

Response to Comment D62-2.52
Four alternatives are evaluated in the FEIS, including Alternative A (No Build) and three build alternatives. Action on the project by NDOT and FHWA is pending completion of the environmental documentation and process. Public input and participation is critical to the process.
Response to Comment D63-3.16

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. Alternative D would be the longest route (distance) to the eastern study limits of all alternatives, and it would also take the longest amount of travel time, approximately 3 minutes longer than Alternatives B and C. Travel time is approximately 30 seconds shorter for Alternative C than Alternative B, and Alternative C is approximately 200 m shorter than Alternative B. This information is provided in the Preliminary Engineering Report.

Alternative D would cause the least amount of noise impacts on Boulder City residents (see FEIS Section 4.3) and less construction-related impacts on the existing residential areas of Boulder City (see FEIS Section 4.17).
Response to Comment D64-2.53
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

See also response to Comment C5-2.5.

Response to Comment D64-2.54
Comment noted. See response to Comment C13-1.4.
Boulder City

3. Other comments

[Handwritten text]

Submit comments at the meeting or mail comments to Daryl Bates, P.E., Chief, Environmental Services Division,
Nevada Department of Transportation, 1365 South Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89712
Response to Comment D65-1.29
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative C would provide a separate freeway with controlled access and would not allow for pedestrian travel along it. As part of the mitigation effort (outlined in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Section 4.14 of the FEIS) for any build alternative, pedestrians and bicyclists must be accommodated.

Alternative B would contain an arterial segment from Veterans Memorial Drive into Hemenway Wash at the River Mountains Trailhead. It is only in this segment where trucks would likely be traveling alongside bicyclists and pedestrians. Mitigation would be required to increase safety in this location as well.

Response to Comment D65-5.14
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D66-5.15
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer to FEIS Executive Summary and Chapters 4 and 5 for descriptions of the potential impacts.

Response to Comment D66-4.26
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D67-6.14
The Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study is a planning project considering traffic and safety impacts in a design year of 2027. The project is not an evaluation of present-day conditions.

The potential for a route through Laughlin was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass project (see the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS, Appendix B, for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project. A route through Laughlin does not address traffic congestion or safety concerns at Hoover Dam, and traffic modeling indicates that not enough traffic would choose the route to alleviate congestion in Boulder City in the design year of 2027.

One of the goals of the Hoover Dam Bypass project was to preserve the Hoover Dam National Landmark. Constructing a bridge to bypass the dam and take all but tourist traffic off the dam will aid in accomplishing this goal.

Response to Comment D67-2.55
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

The potential impacts vary among the four alternatives and are outlined in the FEIS in Chapter 4.
Response to Comment D67-6.15
The potential for a route through Laughlin was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass project (see the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS, Appendix B, for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project. Any speculation of economic gain cannot sufficiently make up for not meeting a purpose and need in an environmental document.

Response to Comment D67-4.27
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D68-2.56

Alternative D has been realigned approximately 70 m (230 feet) north of its original alignment (as described in the DEIS) in the vicinity of the Boulder Rifle Range. The realignment will allow the rifle range to remain open in its current position.

Response to Comment D68-1.30

The design development of Alternative D contains interchanges at Railroad Pass, U.S. 95, and the eastern study limit. An interchange for emergency access only is proposed where Alternative D crosses the WAPA access road and Buchanan Boulevard. This interchange will have a locked gate at both the exit and at the access road. The grade separation at the crossing will be above grade for the new facility and will allow for transport of WAPA equipment and vehicles.
3. Other comments:

It is impossible to see how the DEIS can take into account the preservation or at least consideration of items such as recreational bicycle routes & Equestrian parking areas which are seldom used, but completely failed to consider the Boulder Rifle & Pistol Range which is used by the public every single day!

If the Rifle Range is not considered as an historical resource (seeing that it has been in existence since the 1930s) it should at least be considered as a valuable recreation resource. I'll go on; it is the only shooting area open to the general public without charge in all of Clark Co.

It is estimated that relocation of the Rifle Range would cost in excess of $500,000. The just the earth work alone, not counting the cost of relocating the structures, walls, targets, etc. would vastly exceed the cost of shooting at the Range.

It is my understanding that the proposed shooting complex in North Las Vegas is expected to need $20 million for operation (if not developed) it will cost $2 million more than a change in location of this Range.

Boulder City plans on building a Range in the Boulder Valley which also is a way out, and does not account for the retention of properties. I would agree.

Response to Comment D68-2.57
See response to Comment D68-2.56.

Response to Comment D68-3.17
The conceptual plan for each alternative describes major design features. The choice of material and other specifics will be addressed in the design phase (following a ROD) should a build alternative be selected by FHWA.
Response to Comment D69-2.58

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer to responses to Comments D8-2.6 and D9-2.7.

Response to Comment D69-1.31

All three build alternatives have been developed to address the problem of traffic congestion. The traffic analysis of Alternatives B and C predicts an acceptable LOS at critical links and intersections for the design year of 2027. The social impacts associated with the amount of traffic through Boulder City are addressed in FEIS Section 4.12.
Response to Comment D70-5.16
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D71-2.59
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative D would cost approximately $345 million, while Alternative B would cost approximately $220 million.

Response to Comment D71-2.60
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D71-6.16
The Hoover Dam Bypass project has completed its EIS, and design is underway for a bypass bridge 1,500 feet south of the dam (the Sugarloaf Mountain Alternative).

This comment does not directly pertain to the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study EIS.
Response to Comment D72-3.18
Refer to response to Comment D5-3.2. Social impacts of Alternative C are detailed in FEIS Section 4.12. Economic impacts of all build alternatives on Boulder City businesses are discussed in FEIS Section 4.11.

Response to Comment D72-3.19
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

In the initial screening of 16 alternatives, an alignment for the southern bypass south of the Mead Substation (further south than Alternative D) was eliminated because it did not provide additional positive features with respect to noise and visual impacts, and it provided negative qualities of an additional mile of roadway and drainage impacts (see FEIS Chapter 2, Section 2.4).
Response to Comment D73-4.28
The preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D74-5.17
Refer to response to Comment D66-5.15.
Response to Comment D74-6.17

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

NDOT has a project in the 3-year Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to widen the two-lane segment of U.S. 95 from Laughlin Highway (State Route [SR] 163), which is west of Laughlin, to U.S. 93 west of Boulder City. This segment of U.S. 95 will be widened to a four-lane highway. Improvements to U.S. 95 will be a three-phase project. The first phase is from the northern limits of Searchlight to 29 km (18 miles) north. This phase was completed in the fall of 2003. The second phase will be from the northern end of the first phase, to the junction with U.S. 93 at Railroad Pass. Phase 2 will be developed to be compatible with the preferred alternative (Alternative D), and it is scheduled to be completed by late 2004. The third phase is from Searchlight to SR 163, 32 km (20 miles) to the south, with construction anticipated to begin in fall 2004, again depending on traffic, safety needs, and funding availability. It is anticipated Phase 3 will be constructed in late 2005 or 2006.

The Hoover Dam Bypass project has completed its EIS, and design is underway for a bypass bridge 1,500 feet south of the dam. The potential for terrorist activity impacting Hoover Dam from the bridge is not considered a major issue for the project.

Security at Hoover Dam will be increased with the Hoover Dam Bypass by allowing only tourist traffic at the dam.
Response to Comment D75-3.20
Refer to response to Comment D5-3.2.

Response to Comment D75-1.32
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D75-2.61
See response to Comment D68-2.56.
Response to Comment D76-2.62
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer to responses to Comments D6-2.5 and D9-2.6.

Response to Comment D76-3.21
Alternative B would widen the existing U.S. 93 Corridor to achieve an acceptable LOS at key links and intersections in the design year of 2027. If, in the future, actual growth were to exceed current projections causing deficiencies in the performance of Alternative B, expansion of Alternative B to accommodate actual growth would be the most difficult of all the alternatives.
Response to Comment D77-2.63
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative D requires no relocation of businesses in Boulder City. Alternative B contains business impacts, including relocations.

Response to Comment D77-1.33
In order to produce a facility that could accommodate the amount of traffic projected in 2027 to an acceptable LOS, the development of Alternative C requires four lanes. Additionally, in order to provide sufficient access to the business corridor and Hemenway Wash residents, a frontage road and interchange points are necessary.
Response to Comment D77-3.22
Four alternatives are evaluated in the FEIS, including Alternative A (No Build) and three build alternatives. Action on the project by NDOT and FHWA is pending completion of the environmental documentation and process.
Response to Comment D78-2.64
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer to response to Comment D9-2.7.

Response to Comment D78-2.65
Position and comment concerning Alternatives B and C noted. Refer to responses to Comments D8-2.6 and D9-2.7.

Response to Comment D78-3.23
Alternative B would widen the existing U.S. 93 Corridor to achieve an acceptable LOS at key links and intersections in the design year of 2027. Alternative C bypasses the commercial corridor of Boulder City, then connects with the Alternative B route at the River Mountains Trailhead in Hemenway Valley. Alternative C would also provide an acceptable LOS in the design year.

If, in the future, actual growth were to exceed current projections causing deficiencies in the performance of either of the build alternatives, expansion of Alternative B to accommodate actual growth would be the most difficult to accomplish.
Response to Comment D79-1.34
The preferred alternative (Alternative D) would keep trucks farther from Boulder City than any other alternative.
Response to Comment D80-2.66
Comment noted. See response to Comment D62-2.52.
Comment Form
Boulder City U.S. 93 Corridor Study
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing
April 4, 2002

Please PRINT
Name: Edward H. Jensen
Address: 938 West Drive
Boulder City NV 89005

Please add my name to your mailing list. Yes □ No □

1. Which alternative do you prefer most and why?
Eliminate the increased traffic through Boulder City.

I live in Hemenway Valley and many times I have a difficult time turning onto Desert Pines Drive off of U.S. 93.

2. Which alternative do you prefer least and why?
No Build - The traffic problem has to be addressed in some manner. Most Sundays there is a backup at the entry to AB in Hemenway Valley. The backup can be all the way back to downtown Boulder.
Thats in 2002.

Response to Comment D81-1.35
All three build alternatives have been developed to remedy this problem. Part of the development of Alternatives B and C was to improve access to U.S. 93 in Hemenway Valley using a frontage road and on-ramps (see Preliminary Engineering Report for locations). Alternative D contains the strategy of removing through-town traffic from the existing roadway, and the decrease in congestion will allow for easier turns.
Response to Comment D82-1.36

The Roadway Capacity section of the Purpose and Need (FEIS Section 1.3.1) discusses this need.
Response to Comment D83-6.18

The Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study is a planning project considering traffic and safety impacts in a design year of 2027. The project is not an evaluation of present-day conditions.

The potential for a route through Laughlin was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass project (see the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS, Appendix B, for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project. A route through Laughlin does not address traffic congestion or safety concerns at Hoover Dam, and traffic modeling indicates that not enough traffic would choose the route to alleviate congestion in Boulder City in the design year of 2027.

The route through Nelson was dropped from consideration during the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS predominantly due to high impacts on the LMNRA.
Response to Comment D84-3.24
Refer to response to Comment D63-3.16.

Response to Comment D84-4.29
Preference for Alternative C noted.

Response to Comment D84-2.67
See response to Comment D16-2.14.

Also, all of the build alternatives (B, C, and D) were developed to satisfy the need for reducing the frequency of vehicle crashes in comparison to the No Build (Alternative A).

Response to Comment D84-4.30
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D84-5.32
The route mentioned in the comment, which passed through the area north of the Hemenway residential area, was the northern alternative (NA101), which was eliminated during the initial screening of alternatives. This corridor was eliminated due to very high environmental impacts, operations and safety concerns, and very high costs. Truck and commercial traffic is currently routed through Laughlin, but this is not intended to be a permanent rerouting.
Response to Comment D85-2.68
Support for Alternative D and comment noted. Refer to responses to Comments D8-2.6 and D9-2.7.

Response to Comment D85-2.69
Position and comment concerning Alternatives B and C noted. Refer to responses to Comments D8-2.6, D9-2.7 and D15-2.13.

Response to Comment D85-1.37
Traffic is projected to increase through the design year of 2027 for U.S. 93 through Boulder City. This project cannot influence the decision of whether to transport nuclear waste through Boulder City, but the potential will be addressed in the Hazardous Waste sections (3.15 and 4.15) of the FEIS.
Response to Comment D86-1.38
Alternative B, which keeps traffic on the existing U.S. 93 Corridor but with a widened roadway, would provide an acceptable LOS at key links and intersections. Alternative C provides a freeway around the commercial area and links with the existing roadway at the River Mountains Trailhead.

For both Alternatives B and C, the presence of a frontage road in Hemenway Valley would aid in access maintenance and improve safety by separating local traffic from through-town traffic. However, trucks would continue to travel through the commercial corridor with Alternative B.

A discussion of case studies of highway bypasses, as well as comparisons to this study, can be found in FEIS Sections 3.11 and 4.11 (Economics).

Response to Comment D86-1.39
From the River Mountains Trailhead to the eastern study limit (mostly Hemenway Valley), Alternatives A, B, and C all utilize the existing U.S. 93 Corridor. All traffic would use this route for each of the alternatives, though it would be on a widened freeway for Alternatives B and C, which is intended to alleviate congestion.

FEIS Section 4.11 discusses the potential economic impacts associated with each of the build alternatives. Potential impacts to local businesses are anticipated to be relatively similar for both Alternative B and Alternative C when compared to Alternative A.

Response to Comment D86-4.31
Comment noted.
Boulder City

3. Other comments:

by any of the proposed bus routes. That bus ridership will not occur unless the others will still use them. One would maintain these bus riders.

Alphonse Ray
Response to Comment D87-1.40
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative D proposes a route through a less populated area, as shown in Figure 2-7 of the FEIS.

Response to Comment D87-2.70
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Impacts to desert wildlife and vegetation are discussed in Section 4.4 of the FEIS. Alternative D would result in the largest area of habitat disturbance (679 acres) versus Alternatives A, B, or C.

Response to Comment D87-4.32
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D87-2.71
Comment noted. See response to Comments D87-2.70 and C1-2.1.
Response to Comment D87-4.33
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Submit comments at the meeting or mail comments to Daryl Jesse, P.E., Chief, Environmental Services Division, Nevada Department of Transportation, 1265 South Seven Springs Drive, Carson City, NV 89710.
Response to Comment D88-2.72
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D88-2.73
Comment noted. See response to Comment C1-2.1.

Response to Comment D88-4.34
Comment noted.
ADDITIONAL ECONOMIC IMPACT IS REALIBILITY OF MANY HOMEOWNERS LEAVING THE AREA. THIS DEPRESSION VALUES OF PROPERTY AND LOW INCOME FAMILY’S FILLING THE VOID WHICH Turner LUMEN’S THE TAX BASE. THIS MAY SOUND WILISTIC BUT IT IS A FACT.

Response to Comment D88-4.35
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D89-1.41
Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a route for through-town traffic to utilize that would minimize traffic through Boulder City. Alternatives B and C both utilize existing corridors.

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D89-2.74
Comment noted. See responses to Comments D8-2.6, D16-2.14, and C1-7.1.
D89-533
Response to Comment D89-533
This route was eliminated during the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS. Refer to
the EIS for information on its elimination from consideration.

WE LIVED IN A TOWN THAT WAS SPLIT IN TWO BY A TRUCK ROUTE/FREeway OVER 20 YEARS
AGO. A CITY CALLED CALIFORNIA WAS DEVASTATED
SOCially, ECONOMICALLY, CRIMINALLY AND EVEN
PERMANENTLY. IT IS JUST BEGINNING TO RECOVER
AND BECOME ONE TOWN AGAIN AND NOT
"WORTH" TOWN AND THE DREADED "SOUTH" TOWN.
WE STILL DO NOT MISS THE 24 HOUR/DAY
STREET BOAR OF THE TRAFFIC SEVERAL MILES
AWAY. HALF OF OUR FAMILY STILL LIVES
IN NEARBY COMMUNITIES AND HATES THE
WAY IT WAS PLANNED RIGHT THE EXISTING TOWNS.
WHAT IS WRONG WITH IMPROVING THE
EXISTING 95 TRUCK ROUTE?

POLITICS STILL SUCK.

Thanks for the opportunity to voice my opinion.

Sincerely,
[Signature]

[Additional comments and contact information]
Response to Comment D90-2.75
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer to responses to Comments D8-2.6 and D9-2.7.
Response to Comment D91-2.76
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D92-1.42
Part of the development of Alternatives B and C was to improve access to U.S. 93 in Hemenway Valley using a frontage road and on-ramps (see Preliminary Engineering Report on file with NDOT). Alternative D would remove a large portion of through-town traffic from existing U.S. 93, which would improve safety.

Response to Comment D92-1.43
Social impacts of Alternatives B and C are detailed in FEIS Section 4.12. Both alternatives contain freeway sections that are intended to promote safer driving, as they would be separated from arterial sections of Boulder City.

Response to Comment D92-4.36
Comment noted.
We don't need politics entering into this decision. We need what is best for the people of Boulder City.

Submit comments at the meeting or mail comments to Daryl Jones, P.E., Chief, Environmental Services Division, Nevada Department of Transportation, 1263 South Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89713.
Response to Comment D93-1.44
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D93-4.37
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D93-6.19
Comment noted.
D94-3.25

Response to Comment D94-3.25
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer to response to Comment D5-3.2.

One of the goals of the environmental process is to identify the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative while taking into consideration social, environmental, and economic impacts (as presented in the FEIS). Cost of construction is not a factor unless it renders an alternative not practicable to be constructed. If this is determined to be the case, the alternative is removed from consideration during the initial screening of alternatives.
Response to Comment D95-4.38
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D95-1.45
The Roadway Capacity section of the Purpose and Need (FEIS Section 1.3.1) discusses this need.
Response to Comment D95-2.77
Comment noted. See responses to Comments D8-2.6, D16-2.14, and C1-2.1.
Response to Comment D96-4.39
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D96-2.78
Comment noted. See responses to comments D8-2.6, D16-2.14, and C1-2.1.
Response to Comment D97-5.18
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D97-2.79
Comment noted. See responses to Comments D8-2.6, D16-2.14, and C1-2.1.
Response to Comment D98-2.80
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

As discussed in Section 4.12 of the FEIS, the proposed alignment for each build alternative would have no direct impact on residential properties.

Response to Comment D98-1.46
Part of the development of Alternatives B and C was to improve access to U.S. 93 in Hemenway Valley using a frontage road and on-ramps.

Response to Comment D98-4.40
Comment noted.
3. Other comments:

Leave the politics out of this decision and that of the proposed clown of BC. There needs to be a realistic given whether near the town.
Response to Comment D99-5.19
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D99-4.41
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D99-1.47
FEIS Section 1.3.3 details the vehicular crash and associated fatality history of U.S. 93 within the project area. Part of the development of Alternatives B and C was to improve access to U.S. 93 in Hemenway Valley using a frontage road and on-ramps. Alternative D, the preferred alternative, will alleviate congestion at this intersection by removing a portion of the traffic from existing U.S. 93 and onto the southern bypass.
3. Other comments:

PROPERTY VALUATIONS WILL ONLY GO DOWN IF B OR C IS ADOPTED.

Submit comments at the meeting or mail comments to Daryl James, P.E., Chief, Environmental Services Division, Nevada Department of Transportation, 7263 South Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89702.
Response to Comment D100-1.48

Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a route for through-town traffic to utilize that would minimize traffic through Boulder City. Alternative D would provide the least amount of noise impact to Boulder City, but the greatest noise impact to the LMNRA.
Response to Comment D101-1.49
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. The preferred alternative would keep trucks farther from Boulder City than any other alternative.

Response to Comment D101-2.81
Refer to responses to Comments D8-2.6 and D15-2.13.
Response to Comment D102-5.20
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D102-4.42
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D102-2.82
Refer to responses to Comments D9-2.7, D15-2.13, and D54-2.44.
Response to Comment D103-1.50

Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a route for through-town traffic to utilize that would minimize traffic through Boulder City. Access would be accommodated to recreational areas.
Response to Comment D104-2.83
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative D would involve right-of-way acquisition of commercial property (about 10 acres) and public lands, but no residential property. Alternative C would involve less residential and commercial land than Alternative B; both would require substantially less public land than Alternative D.

Response to Comment D104-1.51
The widening of U.S. 93 included in Alternative B is intended to alleviate the congestion on the roadway, and access points will be distributed in Hemenway Valley through use of a frontage road. Traffic modeling has projected an acceptable LOS for all build alternatives in the design year of 2027.
Response to Comment D105-3.26
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer to response to Comment D5-3.2. Additionally, the comment correctly notes that Alternative D would have less impact during construction to the existing roadway through downtown Boulder City (see FEIS Section 4.17).

Response to Comment D105-2.84
FEIS Table 4-3 provides a comparison of existing and projected (2027) peak-hour noise levels. Noise is expected to increase or decrease commensurate with the predicted traffic through Boulder City for each alternative.

Response to Comment D105-2.85
Comment noted. Refer to response to Comment D9-2.7. Mitigation measures to minimize dust and noise during construction are presented in FEIS Section 4.3.2.
Response to Comment D106-4.43
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D106-2.86
A discussion of the noise impacts associated with this alternative can be found in Section 4.3 of the FEIS. See response to Comment C8-2.6.

Response to Comment D106-4.44
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D106-4.45
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D107-2.87
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D107-1.52
Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a route for through-town traffic (including truck traffic) to take that would minimize traffic through Boulder City. The decrease in traffic would provide increased safety in problem areas. FEIS Sections 4.11 and 4.12 discuss the potential economic and social impacts associated with implementation of Alternative D.

Response to Comment D107-2.88
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D107-1.53
See response to Comment D107-1.52.

Response to Comment D107-4.46
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D107-2.89
Comment noted. See response to Comment D61-2.51.

Response to Comment D107-1.54
Alternative B keeps traffic on the existing U.S. 93 Corridor, but with a widened roadway, would provide an acceptable LOS at key links and intersections. The presence of a frontage road in Hemenway Valley would aid in access maintenance.

Response to Comment D107-2.90
From U.S. 95, Alternative C turns northward across existing U.S. 93 and toward the lower elevations of the River Mountains, and it bisects the proposed Boulder Ridge Public Golf Course.
Response to Comment D107-2.91

Unavoidable adverse impacts are addressed in Chapter 5 of the FEIS.
From the Comment Form:

**D108**

**Comment Form**

Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing
April 4, 2002

**D108-2.27**

Response to Comment D108-3.27

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer to response to Comment D5-3.2.

Response to Comment D108-6.20

Comment noted.

Response to Comment D108-1.55

The design development of Alternative D contains interchanges at Railroad Pass, U.S. 95, and the eastern study limit. A single ramp for emergency access only is proposed where Alternative D crosses the WAPA access road and Buchanan Boulevard. This ramp will have a locked gate at both the exit and at the access road. The grade separation at the crossing will be above grade for the new facility and will allow for transport of WAPA equipment and vehicles.
D109

COMMENT FORM
Boulder City U.S. 93 Corridor Study
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing
April 4, 2002

Please print:
Name: Billie Miller
Address: 635 Ave K, Boulder City, NV 89005

Please add my name to your mailing list: Yes ☑ No ☐

1. Which alternative do you prefer most and why? (D) - it will be the least offensive to everyone.

2. Which alternative do you prefer least and why? A, B or C - it goes through town.

Response to Comment D109-5.21
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D110-2.92
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer to responses to Comments D6-2.4 and D8-2.6.

Response to Comment D110-2.93
Comment noted. Refer to responses to Comments D9-2.7 and D15-2.13.
Response to Comment D111-3.28
Refer to response to Comment D5-3.2. The comment correctly notes that Alternative D would have less existing road impacts during construction (see FEIS Section 4.17).

Response to Comment D111-2.94
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Support for Alternative D and comment noted. Refer to responses to Comments D8-2.6 and D9-2.7.

Response to Comment D111-2.95
Position and comment concerning Alternative B noted. Refer to responses to Comments D8-2.6, D9-2.7, and D15-2.13.
Response to Comment D112-2.96
Support for Alternative D and comment noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D112-3.29
One of the goals of the environmental process is to identify the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative while taking into consideration social, environmental, and economic impacts (as presented in the FEIS). Cost of construction is not a factor unless it renders an alternative not practicable to be constructed. If this is determined to be the case, the alternative is removed from consideration during the initial screening of alternatives.

Response to Comment D112-4.47
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D113-6.21
NDOT has a project in the 3-year Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to widen the two-lane segment of U.S. 95 from Laughlin Highway (State Route [SR] 163), which is west of Laughlin, to U.S. 93 west of Boulder City. This segment of U.S. 95 will be widened to a four-lane highway. Improvements to U.S. 95 will be a three-phase project. The first phase is from the northern limits of Searchlight to 29 km (18 miles) north. This phase was completed in the fall of 2003. The second phase will be from the northern end of the first phase, to the junction with U.S. 93 at Railroad Pass. Phase 2 will be developed to be compatible with the preferred alternative (Alternative D), and it is scheduled to be completed by late 2004. The third phase is from Searchlight to SR 163, 32 km (20 miles) to the south, with construction anticipated to begin in fall 2004, again depending on traffic, safety needs, and funding availability. It is anticipated Phase 3 will be constructed in late 2005 or 2006.

Response to Comment D113-2.97
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Included in the recommendation of the preferred alternative is the maintenance of the quality of life of Boulder City residents, including views of Lake Mead. Visual impacts of a new freeway facility through Hemenway Valley are presented in Section 4.10 of Volume I of the FEIS.

Response to Comment D113-2.98
A description of Alternative C can be found in Section 2.7 of the FEIS. A discussion of all of its environmental impacts can be found throughout Chapter 4.

Response to Comment D113-4.48
Comment noted.
Boulder City

3. Other comments:

I already gave my comment.

Perhaps consider the impact of our business community.

B.C.
Response to Comment D114-6.22
The Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study is a planning project considering traffic and safety impacts in a design year of 2027. The project is not an evaluation of present-day conditions.

The potential for a route through Laughlin was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass project (see the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS, Appendix B, for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project. A truck route through Laughlin does not address traffic congestion or safety concerns at Hoover Dam, and traffic modeling indicates that the route will not sufficiently alleviate congestion in Boulder City in the design year of 2027.

Response to Comment D114-2.99
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D115-6.23

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. The potential for a route through Laughlin was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass project (see the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS, Appendix B, for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project. A route through Laughlin does not address traffic congestion or safety concerns at Hoover Dam, and traffic modeling indicates that not enough traffic would choose the route to alleviate congestion in Boulder City in the design year of 2027.

The environmental process dictates that public involvement is allowable and requested throughout the process up until the ROD, which will be released upon completion of the FEIS and response to comments on the FEIS.

Response to Comment D115-1.56

The Safety section of the Purpose and Need (FEIS Section 1.3.3) discusses this need.
Response to Comment D116-4.49
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D116-2.100
Refer to responses to Comments D6-2.6 and D9-2.7.

Response to Comment D116-2.101
Refer to response to Comment D9-2.7.
Response to Comment D117-6.24

The situation described in the comment would be identical for all four alternatives in the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study project, as the eastern study limit of the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study EIS is just beyond the Hacienda Hotel and Casino, west of Hoover Dam.

The Hoover Dam Bypass project has completed its EIS, and design is underway. The potential for terrorism impacting Hoover Dam as a result of bridge construction is not considered a major issue for the project.
Response to Comment D118-2.102
Refer to response to Comment D6-2.4.

Response to Comment D118-2.103
Refer to responses to Comments D8-2.6, D9-2.7, and D15-2.13.
Response to Comment D119-1.57

Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a route for through-town traffic to utilize that would minimize traffic through Boulder City.

The preferred alternative (Alternative D) would keep trucks farther from Boulder City than any other build alternative.
Response to Comment D120-2.103
Position concerning Alternatives B and C noted. Alternatives B and C include the Pacifica Way interchange. This proposed elevated crossing over U.S. 93 would obstruct views of Lake Mead from the nearby residential area.
Response to Comment D121-1.58
Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a route for through-town traffic to utilize that would minimize traffic through Boulder City. Visitors would have access to Boulder City on either end of Alternative D.

Response to Comment D121-1.59
Social impacts of Alternative B are detailed in FEIS Section 4.12. The opinion of the bisection effect of Alternative B has been noted in the evaluation of the alternatives.
Response to Comment D122-1.60

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

In the initial screening of 16 alternatives, an alignment for the southern bypass south of the Mead Substation (further south than Alternative D) was eliminated from further evaluation and consideration because it would provide positive features comparable to Alternative D but cause potentially greater impacts (refer to FEIS Section 2.4).

Additionally, in the initial screening of 16 alternatives, 2 alignments for the southern bypass east of Alternative D were eliminated from further evaluation because each would potentially cause substantial adverse impacts on the LMNRA and traverse zones of high protection established by NPS (refer to FEIS Section 2.4).
3. Other comments:

- Take Southern Avenue as far South as possible and extend it as far East as possible.
Response to Comment D123-5.22
Refer to response to Comment D66-5.15.

Response to Comment D123-4.50
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D123-2.104
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D124-2.105
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D124-2.106
Refer to response to Comment D8-2.6.
Response to Comment D125-2.107
Support for Alternative C and comment noted. A discussion of visual impacts is presented in Section 4.10 of the FEIS. See response to Comments C12-2.30 and C34-2.44.

Response to Comment D125-6.25
The Hoover Dam Bypass project addresses traffic congestion at and approaching the dam. FHWA has completed the EIS for this project, and design is underway for a bypass bridge south of the dam.

The Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study focuses on traffic congestion and safety considerations on U.S. 93 through Boulder City. The proposed highway alternatives address these problems in the design year of 2027 and are not directly related to traffic congestion at the dam.

Response to Comment D125-2.108
A discussion of visual impacts is presented in Section 4.10 of the FEIS. The residences of San Felipe would have a very distant view of Alternative D, located 2.5 km (1.5 miles) to the east.

Response to Comment D125-1.61
Projected population growth in the region and other factors are expected to cause increases in traffic through 2027 and beyond. The Traffic Analysis Report that accompanies the Preliminary Engineering Report for the project does not assume that there will be increased traffic solely due to construction of a highway.
Response to Comment D125-6.26

The potential for a route through Laughlin was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass project (see the Hoover Dam bypass EIS, Appendix B, for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project. A route through Laughlin does not address traffic congestion or safety concerns at Hoover Dam, and traffic modeling indicates that not enough traffic would choose the route to alleviate congestion in Boulder City in the design year of 2027. Additionally, the 22 extra miles would produce a large economic impact on the trucking industry if that were the required route.

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. The Boulder City bypass is not intended to alleviate traffic at Hoover Dam; the outcome of the Hoover Dam EIS will provide alleviation of Hoover Dam traffic by diverting all traffic except tourist traffic to a new bridge south of the dam.

The Hoover Dam Bypass project has completed its EIS, and design is underway. The potential for terrorism impacting Hoover Dam as a result of bridge construction is not considered a major issue for the project.
Response to Comment D126-2.109

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Support for Alternative D and comment noted. Refer to responses to Comments D6-2.4 and D8-2.6.
Response to Comment D127-1.62
Traffic modeling predicts an initial decrease in through-town traffic; however, in the long term (2027), traffic is expected to increase due to growth of the region.

Response to Comment D127-2.110
Comment noted. Refer to responses to Comments D6-2.4 and D8-2.6.

Response to Comment D127-2.111
Position and comment concerning Alternative B noted. Refer to responses to Comments D8-2.6 and D15-2.13.
Response to Comment D128-2.112
Position and comment concerning Alternatives A and C noted. Refer to responses to Comments D6-2.4, D8-2.6, and D9-2.7.
Response to Comment D129-4.51
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D129-4.52
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D130-1.63
Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a route for through-town traffic to utilize, which would minimize traffic through Boulder City. However, according to the Origin and Destination Study performed in March 2000, at Veterans Memorial Drive, 43 percent of vehicles surveyed had a destination of Lake Mead, Hoover Dam, or Arizona, while 57 percent had a destination of Boulder City. The traffic destined for Boulder City would not use Alternative D. Therefore, though Alternative D would provide acceptable congestion levels, it would not eliminate traffic on city streets entirely.

Response to Comment D130-2.113
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

FEIS Section 4.15.2 notes that all of the build alternatives are intended to satisfy the need for reducing the frequency of vehicle crashes in comparison to No Build (Alternative A). Therefore, the build alternatives would indirectly reduce the occasion for accidental spillage associated with vehicle crashes. Cleanup of hazardous waste or materials spills associated with a vehicle crash would be expected as a part of the response to each crash.

Response to Comment D130-1.64
See response to Comment D130-1.63.

Response to Comment D130-2.114
See response to Comment D65-2.55.

Response to Comment D130-1.65
The widening of U.S. 93 through Hemenway Valley (a characteristic of both Alternatives B and C) is intended to alleviate congestion. Access points will be distributed in Hemenway Valley through use of a frontage road.
Response to Comment D130-3.30

Because Alternative D passes through mostly open desert area, the options for future expansion or staged construction are feasible.
Response to Comment D131-1.66
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Benefits of other alternatives are presented in the FEIS, in addition to negative aspects of Alternative D.

Response to Comment D131-1.67
Social impacts of Alternative B and C are detailed in FEIS Section 4.12. Alternatives B and C contain full freeway sections that would maintain a high speed of traffic through Boulder City, which tends to reduce air pollution as compared to idling vehicles (see FEIS Air Quality Sections 3.2 and 4.2).

Noise increases would be minimized using sound barriers. Safety would be achieved by separating through-town freeway traffic from arterial sections of Boulder City.
Response to Comment D132-2.115
The Notice of Availability of the DEIS was placed in the Federal Register on February 15, 2002, and the public hearing was held on April 4, 2002. Public hearings were held for this project in accordance with NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1506).

Response to Comment D132-2.116
A description of Alternative C (through-town alternative) can be found in Section 2.5 of the FEIS. A discussion of all of its environmental impacts can be found throughout Chapter 4. The alternative referred to as the "Northern Alternative" was a corridor through the River Mountains north of Boulder City. This alternative was eliminated in the original evaluation of the 16 corridors (see FEIS Chapter 2).

Response to Comment D132-1.68
Alternative D is a southern bypass around Boulder City, south of which there is no residential development. The centerline of the alignment, as of the most recent development, is 0.8 mile from the nearest residence, at a location in the southern portion of the development along Buchanan Boulevard (see Preliminary Engineering Report drawings).
Please, a last sheet should be mailed to Secretary Boulder City, Resident and Conference copy will copied as the EIR be available, Boulder City at public press.

Thank you.

[Signature]

[Date] 4/5/02
Response to Comment D133-2.117
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer also to response to Comment D6-2.4.

Response to Comment D133-2.118
Alternative B would widen a substantial portion of the existing U.S. 93 through Boulder City and add grade-separated interchanges at key locations. Comment noted.
Response to Comment D134-2.119
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer to response to Comment D6-2.4.

Response to Comment D134-3.31
Comment noted. See response to Comment D78-3.23.
Response to Comment D135-3.32
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D135-5.23
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D135-6.27

The Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study is a planning project considering traffic and safety impacts in a design year of 2027. The project is not an evaluation of present-day conditions.

The potential for a route through Laughlin along U.S. 95 instead of using U.S. 93 was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass project (see the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS, Appendix B, for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project. A truck route along U.S. 95 does not address traffic congestion or safety concerns at Hoover Dam, and traffic modeling indicates that the route will not sufficiently alleviate congestion in Boulder City in the design year of 2027.
Response to Comment D136-1.69
Alternatives B and C utilize more of the existing corridor than Alternative D, which would require additional land acquisition from Boulder City, BLM, and NPS. FEIS Section 4.9.2 discusses potential direct and indirect land use impacts associated with implementation of the build alternatives. Overall, potential land use impacts associated with Alternative D would be similar, the same, or less than for Alternatives B and C. FEIS Chapter 7 evaluates potential impacts to Section 4(f) properties, including historic sites and public parkland. Section 4(f) impacts would be greatest for Alternative C compared to Alternatives B and D.

Response to Comment D136-3.33
Comment noted. Refer to response to Comment D5-3.2.

Response to Comment D136-2.120
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

As discussed in Section 2.5 of the FEIS, Alternative B would be constructed within existing U.S. 93 right-of-way. Alternative C would occur mostly within existing right-of-way.

Response to Comment D136-2.121
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. Alternative D would result in the largest area of habitat disturbance (679 acres) versus Alternatives A, B, and C.

Response to Comment D136-4.53
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D136-2.122
As described in Section 4.14, Alternative D would affect recreational trails and NPS backcountry roads. Appropriate mitigation measures, including the construction of crossings at backcountry roads and recreational areas, are further described in this section of the FEIS.
Response to Comment D136-2.123
The Notice of Availability of the DEIS was placed in the Federal Register on March 15, 2002, and the public hearing was held on April 4, 2002. The comment period closed on May 10, 2002. The DEIS was available through the project website as of March 15, 2002. Public hearings were held for this project in accordance with NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1506), requiring a 45-day comment period for review and comment on the document.

Response to Comment D136-2.124
Two public meetings were held in January and April 2000, in which alternatives were developed based on the problems and recommended solutions identified by residents of Boulder City and Henderson. Following the scoping period and continuing up through the DEIS public hearings, the public outreach process will continue through the completion of the FEIS and approval of the ROD. The following is a list of the key public outreach activities and processes being undertaken for this project:

- Public Meetings/Open House Forums
- Public and Agency Chartering Meetings
- Presentations at City Council Meetings
- Presentations to Stakeholder Groups
- Boulder City Cable Television Programs
- Community Working Group Meetings

Response to Comment D136-2.34
The estimated cost of the preferred alternative, including the cost of mitigation, will be presented in the ROD for the project.

Response to Comment D136-2.125
FEIS Section 4.3.2 identifies mitigation for project impacts on the LMNRA. The increase in noise within the LMNRA does not exceed the FHWA threshold required for construction of sound barriers.

Response to Comment D136-2.126
The DEIS has been made available to the public in accordance with NEPA regulations. DEIS availability was advertised prior to public release of the DEIS on the project web page, project newsletters, and local newspapers.
Response to Comment D137-1.70

The FEIS presents negative impacts for all four alternatives considered, which are summarized in the Executive Summary.

In the initial screening of 16 alternatives, an alignment for the southern bypass south of the Mead Substation (further south than Alternative D) was eliminated because it did not provide additional positive features with respect to noise and visual impacts, and it provided negative qualities of an additional mile of roadway and drainage impacts (see FEIS Chapter 2, Section 2.4).
Response to Comment D138-5.24
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D138-6.28

The potential for a route through Laughlin along U.S. 95 instead of using U.S. 93 was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass project (see the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS, Appendix B, for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project. A truck route along U.S. 95 does not address traffic congestion or safety concerns at Hoover Dam, and traffic modeling indicates that the route will not sufficiently alleviate congestion in Boulder City in the design year of 2027.

The Hoover Dam Bypass project has completed its EIS, and design is underway. The location of 1,500 feet south of the dam is not considered by FHWA to be too close to the dam.
Response to comment D139-2.127
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Refer also to responses to Comments D6-2.4 and D8-2.6.

Response to Comment D139-2.128
Comment noted. Refer to response to Comment D54-2.44.
Response to Comment D139-2.129
Comment noted. See response to Comment C1-2.1.

My grandparents live right where the freeway [option] will be. This is a home where my great-grandparents grew up. It means a lot to our family. This choice would only bring more traffic and noise to Boulder City. I feel [option] would benefit everybody. There are no homes where the [option] is routed. I hope that everything gets resolved so everyone is happy. Thank you for your time.

Steven Riley
Response to Comment D140-5.25
Comment noted.
Boulder City

COMMENT FORM
Boulder City U.S. 83 Corridor Study
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing
April 4, 2002

Please print.

Name: Barbara & Ron Schuster
Address: 1533 Dallas Way
           Boulder City, NV

Please add my name to your mailing list. [ ] Yes [ ] No

1. Which alternative do you prefer most and why?
   [ ] D only

2. Which alternative do you prefer least and why?
   Any of the others!

Response to Comment D141-5.26
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D142-5.27
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D143-1.71
The construction of Alternative D would require some traffic rerouting and other construction impacts at either study limit (near Railroad Pass and at the east end). However, construction impacts would be much greater for either Alternative B or C, as they both utilize the existing U.S. 93 Corridor (see FEIS Section 4.17, Construction Impacts).

Response to Comment D143-2.130
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D143-4.54
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D143-2.131
A roadway pullout and vista point lookout would be developed atop Eldorado Ridge to provide views of Lake Mead.

Response to Comment D143-2.132
Alternative D would traverse primarily open space within Boulder City. Because development has not been planned for this area, the potential for conflicts with future land uses is limited. Since the city is the adjoining landowner, Boulder City has full control over whether adjoining development would occur (Section 4.9 FEIS).
Response to Comment D144-1.72
See response to Comment D143-1.71.

Response to Comment D144-2.133
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D144-1.73
Alternative B, which keeps traffic on the existing U.S. 93 Corridor but with a widened roadway, would provide an acceptable LOS at key links and intersections.

Response to Comment D144-4.55
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D144-2.134
See response to Comment D143-2.131.

Response to Comment D144-2.135
See response to Comment D143-2.132.
Response to Comment D145-5.28
Comment noted.

1. Which alternative do you prefer most and why?
   - D SAVE OUR CITY

2. Which alternative do you prefer least and why?
   - C will DISRUPT our QUALITY OF LIFE
Response to Comment D146-1.74
Preference for Alternative C noted. Alternative C was developed as a through-town freeway that would move traffic through Boulder City at higher speeds while relieving congestion on the existing roadway. The environmental and economic impacts of Alternative C are identified in Chapter 4 of the FEIS.

Response to Comment D146-4.56
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D146-1.75

The Purpose and Need chapter (FEIS Chapter 1) identifies the current and future deficiencies of the existing U.S. 93 highway, including safety considerations and traffic projections. The diversion of traffic as part of Alternative D onto the new southern bypass will decrease traffic on U.S. 93 through Boulder City, thus reducing the potential for crashes.

Additionally with Alternative D, a new interchange at Railroad Pass, the existing intersection with the worst safety record within the project, will be constructed, addressing safety concerns.
Response to Comment D147-2.136
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer also to responses to Comments D8-2.6 and D9-2.7.
Response to Comment D148-3.35
Section 4.12 Social Impacts of the FEIS discusses the impacts on homes for each alternative. Alternative D would require no displacement of residences.

Response to Comment D148-4.57
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D148-4.58
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D149-4.59
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D150-5.29
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D150-2.137
Opposition to Alternative B noted.
Response to Comment D151-2.138
Support for Alternative D and comment noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D151-2.139
Comment noted. See response to Comment D151-2.138.
3. Other comments:
A would support any plan that bypassed Boulder City but not B or C.

[Signature]

[Handwritten notes]

[Additional comments]

[Handwritten comments at the bottom]

Submit comments at the meeting or mail comments to Daryl Jones, P.E., Chief, Environmental Services Division, Nevada Department of Transportation, 1303 South Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89712
Response to Comment D152-2.140
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer also to responses to Comments D8-2.6 and D9-2.7.

Response to Comment D152-6.29
The Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study is a planning project considering traffic and safety impacts in a design year of 2027. The project is not an evaluation of present-day conditions.

The potential for a route through Laughlin along U.S. 95 instead of using U.S. 93 was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass project (see the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS, Appendix B, for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project. A truck route along U.S. 95 does not address traffic congestion or safety concerns at Hoover Dam, and traffic modeling indicates that the route will not sufficiently alleviate congestion in Boulder City in the design year of 2027.
Response to Comment D153-2.141

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer also to responses to Comments D8-2.6, D15-2.13, and D6-2.4.
Response to Comment D154-5.30
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D154-2.142
Based on the analysis contained in Section 4.3 of the FEIS, Alternative D would not warrant noise abatement.
Response to Comment D155-3.36
Refer to response to Comment D5-3.2. Alternative C is described as a "new through-town alignment" with sufficient capacity to achieve an acceptable LOS at key links and intersections in the design year of 2027, as well as adhering to other requirements put forth in the Purpose and Need.

Response to Comment D155-3.37
Comment noted. The centerline of Alternative D passes approximately 0.8 mile from Georgia Avenue.

Response to Comment D155-2.143
Refer to response to Comment D9-2.7.
Response to Comment D156-1.76
Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a bypass for through-town traffic (including truck traffic) to utilize that would minimize traffic through Boulder City. The decrease in traffic, coupled with other necessary mitigation, would provide increased safety in problem areas.

The potential impacts of hazardous waste transport are addressed in the Hazardous Waste sections (3.15 and 4.15) of the FEIS.
Response to Comment D156-3.38
The Hoover Dam Bypass EIS has been completed, and bridge design is currently underway for a bypass 1,500 feet south of the dam. However, this is a separate project from the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study and has no direct impact on the schedule of this project.

Response to Comment D156-4.60
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D157-2.144
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D157-4.61
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D157-3.39
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D157-1.77
Congress designated U.S. 93 as a CANAMEX route because it is a major commercial corridor for interstate and international commerce. This is further discussed in FEIS Section 1.1.
Response to Comment D157-2.145
See response to Comment D143-2.131.

Response to Comment D157-4.62
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
Response to Comment D158-4.63
Preference for Alternative B noted.

Response to Comment D158-2.146
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative D traverses open space land; however, uses such as the Mead Substation, rifle range, landfill, and transmission lines exist along the proposed alignment. Access to existing uses would be maintained, and wildlife crossings and other mitigation efforts would be incorporated into the final design.
Response to Comment D159-2.147

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Also see responses to Comments D6-2.4 and D8-2.6.
Response to Comment D160-1.78
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. Preference for Alternative D is noted.

It is yet to be determined what would be done with the existing highway should the preferred alternative be constructed.

Response to Comment D160-2.148
See responses to Comments D8-2.6, D16-2.14, and C1-2.1

Response to Comment D160-1.79
The access points for Alternatives B and C were determined in the engineering development to be the most efficient means of maintaining access while minimizing congestion. See Preliminary Engineering Report for details of access points.
Response to Comment D160-2.149
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D160-4.64
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D161-1.80
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative D would provide a bypass for traffic not destined for Boulder City. The projected decrease in through-town traffic would provide increased safety in problem areas.

Response to Comment D161-1.81
FEIS Section 1.3.3 identifies the concerns raised in the comment as "needs" for the project. Alternatives B and C each propose a route within the developed area of Boulder City while providing access to businesses and communities. The FEIS does indicate that access to businesses would still be difficult with Alternative B. Alternative C would provide access to the commercial corridor with exits from the proposed U.S. 93 freeway at an extended Buchanan Boulevard and Lakeshore Road.
Response to Comment D161-4.65
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D161-1.82
The Roadway Capacity section of the FEIS (Section 1.3.1) discusses this need.

Response to Comment D161-1.83
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

NDOT is performing this study considering a design year of 2027. All analyses are being performed considering traffic conditions for this year, and alternatives are developed based on the design year.
Response to Comment D162-4.66
Preference for Alternative B noted.

Response to Comment D162-1.84
The Preliminary Engineering Report indicates that Alternative B would contain 1,250 m of its steepest grade (5.7 percent), Alternative C would contain 1,500 m of its steepest grade (5.7 percent), and Alternative D would contain 4,200 m of its steepest grade (6.0 percent).

Response to Comment D162-2.150
See response to Comment D25-2.18.

Response to Comment D162-4.67
Preference for Alternative B noted.

Response to Comment D162-2.151
All of the Build Alternatives (B, C, and D) would result in improved air quality versus the No Build (Alternative A) (see FEIS Section 4.2).
Response to Comment D162-4.68
Comment noted.

3. Other comments
The people that live along Highway 93 knew that was an important highway when they bought their property.
Response to Comment D163-2.152
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer also to responses to Comments D25-2.25, D25-2.26, D25-2.28, and D30-2.32.

Response to Comment D163-2.153
Position and comment concerning Alternative C noted.

Response to Comment D163-4.69
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D164-2.154
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.


Response to Comment D164-6.30
The Hoover Dam Bypass project addresses traffic congestion at and approaching the dam. FHWA has completed the EIS for this project, and design is underway for a bypass bridge south of the dam.

Response to Comment D164-2.155
Comment noted. See response to Comment D113-2.98.

Response to Comment D164-3.40
Alternatives B and C would have greater construction-related impacts on the residential areas within Hemenway Valley (see FEIS Section 4.17). Following construction, both alternatives keep U.S. 93 traffic within Hemenway Valley. Social impacts of the construction of both alternatives are also discussed in Section 4.12 of Volume I of the FEIS.

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D164-4.70
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D164-1.85
Alternative B, which keeps traffic on the existing U.S. 93 Corridor but with a widened roadway, would provide an acceptable LOS at key links and intersections. The presence of a frontage road in Hemenway Valley would aid in access maintenance and improve safety by separating local traffic from through-town traffic. However, trucks would continue to travel through the commercial corridor with Alternative B.
Response to Comment D164-6.31
NDOT has a project in the 3-year Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to widen the two-lane segment of U.S. 95 from Laughlin Highway (State Route [SR] 163), which is west of Laughlin, to U.S. 93 west of Boulder City. This segment of U.S. 95 will be widened to a four-lane highway. Improvements to U.S. 95 will be a three-phase project. The first phase is from the northern limits of Searchlight to 29 km (18 miles) north. This phase was completed in the fall of 2003. The second phase will be from the northern end of the first phase, to the junction with U.S. 93 at Railroad Pass. Phase 2 will be developed to be compatible with the preferred alternative (Alternative D), and it is scheduled to be completed by late 2004. The third phase is from Searchlight to SR 163, 32 km (20 miles) to the south, with construction anticipated to begin in fall 2004, again depending on traffic, safety needs, and funding availability. It is anticipated Phase 3 will be constructed in late 2005 or 2006.
Response to Comment D165-2.156
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
COMMENT FORM
Boulder City U.S. 93 Corridor Study
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing
April 4, 2002

Please print

Name: Venita J Wilson
Address: P.O. Box 10448
Boulder City, NV 89006

Please add my name to your mailing list. Yes [ ] No [ x ]

1. Which alternative do you prefer most and why?

2. Which alternative do you prefer least and why?

Submit comments at the meeting or mail comments to Daryl Jones, P.E., Chief, Environmental Services Division, Nevada Department of Transportation, 1303 South Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89710.
Response to Comment D166-6.32
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. Alternative D is a southern bypass, and of the four alternatives considered in this project, trucks are furthest from Boulder City upon construction of it.

The potential for a route through Laughlin along U.S. 95 instead of using U.S. 93 was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass project (see the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS, Appendix B, for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project. A truck route along U.S. 95 does not address traffic congestion or safety concerns at Hoover Dam, and traffic modeling indicates that the route will not sufficiently alleviate congestion in Boulder City in the design year of 2027.
Response to Comment D167-1.86

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a bypass for through-town traffic to utilize that would minimize traffic through Boulder City.
Response to Comment D168-1.87
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a route for through-town traffic to utilize that would minimize traffic through Boulder City. Access would be accommodated to recreational areas, as well as Boulder City.

Response to Comment D168-1.88
Social impacts of Alternatives B and C are detailed in FEIS Section 4.12. The opinion of the bisecting effect of Alternative B has been noted in the evaluation of the alternatives.
Response to Comment D169-2.157
Support for Alternative B and comment noted.

Response to Comment D169-2.158
Position and comment concerning Alternative D noted.
COMMENT FORM
Boulder City U.S. 93 Corridor Study
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing
April 4, 2002

PLEASE PRINT
Name: JMW ZENGESS
Address: 704 Ave A.
B.C. 89005

Please add my name to your mailing list. Yes ☐ No ☐

1. Which alternative do you prefer most and why?


2. Which alternative do you prefer least and why?


Submit comments at the meeting or mail comments to Darryl James, Ph.D., Chief, Environmental Services Division, Nevada Department of Transportation, 2600 South Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89712
Response to Comment D170-5.31
The Notice of Availability of the DEIS was placed in the Federal Register on February 15, 2002, and the public hearing was held on April 4, 2002. Public hearings were held for this project in accordance with NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1506).
Response to Comment D171-1.89
Access for emergency vehicles will be addressed if a build alternative is identified as the preferred alternative, and the plan will be detailed in the FEIS.

Response to Comment D171-4.71
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D171-1.90
The widening of U.S. 93 is intended to alleviate the congestion on the roadway, and access points will be distributed in Hemenway Valley through use of a frontage road.

According to the Air Quality analysis in Section 4.2 of the FEIS, the impacts of all build alternatives on air quality are approximately the same.

Social impacts of Alternative C are detailed in FEIS Section 4.12. The opinion of the bisector effect of Alternative B has been noted in the evaluation of the alternatives.
Response to Comment D172-2.159
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment D172-4.72
Preference for Alternative D noted. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.
COMMENT FORM
Boulder City U.S. 93 Corridor Study
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing
April 4, 2002

PLEASE PRINT
Name: John P. Baker
Address: 4270 South Decatur, Suite 85
Las Vegas, NV 89103

Please add your name to your mailing list: Yes [ ] No [ ]

1. Which alternative do you prefer most and why?

[Signature]

2. Which alternative do you prefer least and why?

[Signature]
Response to Comment D173-3.41

Comment and recommendation for additional analysis noted.

A discussion of cumulative impacts in the vicinity of the project area, including the Wagon Wheel interchange mentioned in the comment, is located in FEIS Chapter 6.
Response to Comment D174-2.160
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Preference for Alternative B noted. Increased average traffic volume is expected for each build alternative, resulting in an increased potential for wildlife/vehicle collisions without mitigation. As discussed in DEIS Section 4.4, Alternative B is expected to affect approximately 327 acres of habitat.

Response to Comment D174-2.161
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Opposition to Alternative D noted.

Reductions in traffic volumes within the Boulder City would be expected to decrease with implementation of Alternative D, which reroutes traffic to the south. This reduction of traffic will reduce noise on existing U.S. 93 through residential areas. Noise analyses have demonstrated that the new highway bypass will not increase noise levels beyond the critical FHWA threshold for any residences in the southern portion of Boulder City. Refer to Section 4.3 of Volume I of the FEIS for further details on the noise analysis.
Response to Comment D174-1.91
Implementation of Alternative D would result in enhanced emergency service responsiveness within Boulder City due to a reduction of traffic congestion and delays. Alternative D would be designed and constructed to meet the latest highway performance standards. There is no reason to believe that its construction would result in a high volume of traffic-related incidents.

Response to Comment D174-2.162
Refer to DEIS Sections 4.3 and 4.10 for discussions of impacts to noise and visual resources, respectively.

Response to Comment D174-3.42
Comment noted.
Response to Comment D175-6.33
This route was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS, but it was eliminated in the early stages because of extremely high impacts to the LMNRA. The Hoover Dam Bypass EIS has been completed, and design is underway. The Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study project will tie into the western study limits of the Hoover Dam Bypass.

Response to Comment D175-3.43
Preference for Alternative C noted.

Response to Comment D175-2.163
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer to the DEIS for discussions of potential impacts to biology (Section 4.4), economics (Section 4.11), and noise (Section 4.3) resources.

Response to Comment D175-1.92
As noted in Section 4.11.1 of the FEIS, a study of the likely impacts of a southern bypass such as Alternative D on Boulder City’s local economy was conducted in March 2000. The study concluded, in part, that a potential exists for a 5 percent loss in total sales and a 4 percent loss in total employment in Boulder City from implementation of Alternative D. This negative impact, however, could be counteracted to some extent by other positive influences resulting from increased mobility and reduced truck traffic in town, as well as from construction of proposed golf course developments, ongoing redevelopment of the historic downtown area, and Boulder City’s proximity to the fast-growing areas of Henderson and Las Vegas.

As described in FEIS Section 4.3.1, noise-sensitive areas located along the existing U.S. 93 alignment would experience major reductions in traffic noise levels through implementation of Alternative D. Social impacts associated with each of the build alternatives are noted in FEIS Section 4.12.2. Alternative D would divert most non-local traffic away from developed areas in Boulder City, resulting in substantially decreased congestion, noise, and traffic safety impacts compared to existing conditions.
Response to Comment D175-6.34
The Hoover Dam Bypass project has completed its EIS, and design is underway. The location of the new bypass bridge will be 1,500 feet south of the dam. Congestion at the dam for through traffic was one of the goals established in the Purpose and Need of that project.

Response to Comment D175-4.73
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D175-3.44
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D175-6.35
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the EIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

A bridge crossing at Willow Beach was eliminated from consideration in the early stages of the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS predominantly due to very high impacts on the LMNRA.

NDOT has a project in the 3-year Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to widen the two-lane segment of U.S. 93 from Laughlin Highway (State Route [SR] 163), which is west of Laughlin, to U.S. 93 west of Boulder City. This segment of U.S. 93 will be widened to a four-lane highway. Improvements to U.S. 93 will be a three-phase project. The first phase is from the northern limits of Searchlight to 29 km (18 miles) north. This phase was completed in the fall of 2003. The second phase will be from the northern end of the first phase, to the junction with U.S. 93 at Railroad Pass. Phase 2 will be designed to be compatible with the preferred alternative (Alternative D), and it is scheduled to be completed by late 2004. The third phase is from Searchlight to SR 163; 32 km (20 miles) to the south, with construction anticipated to begin in fall 2004, again depending on traffic, safety needs, and funding availability. It is anticipated Phase 3 will be constructed in late 2005 or 2006.
Response to Comment D176-3.45
Preference for Alternative B or C noted.

Response to Comment D176-3.46
Rationale for opposition to Alternative D noted.
Response to Comment D176-6.36
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision. Alternative D is a southern bypass around Boulder City.

The Hoover Dam Bypass project EIS addresses traffic and safety problems at the U.S. 93 crossing of the Colorado River, and the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study EIS ties directly into this project. The Hoover Dam Bypass will be a bridge 1,500 feet south of the dam, and it is currently under design.

Response to Comment D176-3.47
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D176-3.48
Comment noted.

Response to Comment D176-3.49
Comment noted. All NDOT/FHWA projects adhere strictly to state and federal regulations for planning, design, and construction of new facilities.
Response to Comment D177-2.164
Preference for Alternative B noted.

Response to Comment D177-6.37
There is no Alternative E in the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study. Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

The Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study is a planning project considering traffic and safety impacts in a design year of 2027. The project is not an evaluation of present-day conditions.

The potential for a route through Laughlin along U.S. 95 instead of using U.S. 93 was considered in the Hoover Dam Bypass project (see the Hoover Dam Bypass EIS, Appendix B, for more information) and ruled out of consideration because it did not meet the Purpose and Need of that project. A truck route along U.S. 95 does not address traffic congestion or safety concerns at Hoover Dam, and traffic modeling indicates that the route will not sufficiently alleviate congestion in Boulder City in the design year of 2027.

Response to Comment D177-2.165
Opposition to Alternative D noted.
Response to Comment D177-3.50
Opposition to Alternative D noted. Lack of access along the Alternative D route is expected to minimize potential development in this area.
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BOULDER CITY/U.S. 93 CORRIDOR STUDY
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LAURIE WEBB AND ASSOCIATES  (722) 386-9322
Response to Comment E1-1.1
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative C would provide a separate freeway with controlled access and would not allow for pedestrian travel along it. As part of the mitigation effort (outlined in Section 4.14 of the FEIS) for any build alternative, pedestrian and bicyclists must be accommodated.

Alternative B would contain an arterial segment from Veterans Memorial Drive into Hemenway Wash at the River Mountains Trailhead. It is only in this segment where trucks would likely be traveling alongside bicyclists and pedestrians. Mitigation would be required to increase safety in this location as well.
E2-1.2
Response to Comment E2-1.2
The Roadway Capacity section of the Purpose and Need (FEIS Section 1.3.1) discusses this need.

E2-2.1
Response to Comment E2-2.1
Comment noted.

E2-2.2
Response to Comment E2-2.2
A description of the impacts to Section 4(f) properties can be found in Section 4.9 and Chapter 7 of the FEIS.
proposed Boulder Ridge Golf Course and Bootleg Canyon.

Also, that route again would deteriorate the
quality of life in Boulder City with the increase in
traffic.

Alternative D is to build a four-lane freeway
or beltway around the southern side of Boulder City.
This would approach the city from Railroad Pass going
south beyond NALC's Mead Substation. This route would
then eventually link up near the Hacienda Hotel Casino.

While not perfect, is the most positive
approach, I realize that this alternative would cost an
additional estimate of 125 million dollars. However,
this approach would have the least negative impact on
the city and its residents.

Yet another alternative at one time was
discussed. That was to widen US-95 from the
interconnection of US-93 south to connect with I-40 near
Needles, California. I recall that route was dismissed
as causing too much pollution due to the extra distance
that truck traffic would have to travel.

Also there was a discussion regarding the
different grades the truck would have to negotiate.
Since the tragic events of September 11 these same
trucks must now negotiate that route, that remains a
two-lane highway.

Response to Comment E2-2.3
Comment noted.

Response to Comment E2-6.1
Comment noted.
In light of that and with public safety in mind may I call your attention to the tremendous increase in traffic along US-95. Daily there is a literal parade of heavy traffic along this route. There are several businesses along this route that have serious issues with this traffic.

Since this route will not be widened to accommodate the increased traffic I have some suggestions that you may wish to consider.

First, approximately 10 miles south of US-93 interchange is the township of Nelson. The approach to Nelson has very well engineered and built turn lanes, providing easy and safe entrance and exit into that area. Two and one-half miles south of that is Eldorado Valley Drive. This is the access road to SRC’s Eldorado Substation, LAEWP’s, McCullough & Marketplace Substation and Reliant Energy’s Eldorado Generating station.

Each of those existing facilities have between 12 and 20 employees who must daily literally take their lives into their hands to enter or leave the property.

This does not take into consideration each facility also receives on a daily basis deliveries, temporary contract personnel and temporary assigned work crews.
It is my understanding that yet a second generating plant is planned for this location. During the construction of the Eldorado Generating Station, construction crew traffic, albeit temporary, numbered approximately 250 vehicles daily.

Also, it is my understanding the city has proposed an energy park to develop and showcase new technologies. This would, of course, increase the traffic on Eldorado Valley Drive on a more permanent level.

Therefore, while we are considering what route the bypass will take and how much funding it should receive and in light of the fact that there are no plans to widen the already overburdened US-95, why not consider a turn-out lane at Eldorado Valley Drive on US-95 and additional signage by the gravel pit turn-offs just south of US-93 interchange warning motorists of oncoming trucks?

Anyone who drives US-95 as I do daily can tell you horror stories of near misses and accidents, particularly on holiday weekends.

Recently, I have noticed an increase presence of Nevada Highway Patrol, Metro Police and Boulder City Police patrols on US-95. While I applaud their efforts, they cannot be at every potential trouble spot 24-7 and...
Response to Comment E2.1.3

It is a goal of the development of all three build alternatives to create a safer transportation corridor (see FEIS Purpose and Need, Chapter 1). Alternative D would accomplish this by diverting through-town traffic to a bypass, which would minimize traffic through Boulder City and increase safety.
Response to Comment E3-1.4
Social impacts of Alternatives B and C are detailed in FEIS Section 4.12. The opinion of the bisection effect of Alternative B has been noted in the evaluation of the alternatives.

The widening of the roadway for both alternatives increases the capacity of the facility, which would alleviate congestion to an acceptable LOS in the design year of 2027.

Response to Comment E3-2.4
Comment noted.
MS. POWELL: My name is Beverli Powell. I speak for my husband Jack for our next-door neighbor Barbara and Ron Schuster who were called out of town on a family emergency.

We all feel so strongly that the route chosen should be D because the thought of the 93 through the town as being part of the highway A and also the thought they would be transmitting nuclear waste coming right through the middle of Boulder City on any of the other routes would be disastrous.

People who are going to the dam will still go through town. They will stop. The truckers don't stop in Boulder City. They don't get any business from the truckers. All they do is cause traffic problems and it's just -- it would divide the city. It would be terrible.

That's how we feel. Thank you.
TRACY STRICKLAND, 1630 GEORGIA AVENUE

MR. STRICKLAND: My name is Tracy Strickland.

I'm a resident of Boulder City. I live at

1630 Georgia Avenue in the City of Boulder City. I am
opposed to alternative D. I'm including in my statement
so I don't wear out the court reporter all my letters as
four exhibits A, B, C and D. These letters were
generated by myself or my wife Linda Strickland and sent
to the Boulder City News and were incorporated as
letters to the editor.

They contain a more detailed basis for my
objection to alternative D and therefore I would like to
make them part of my record as my statement. I'm giving
them to the court reporter now so she can attach each
separate letter and marked them in the order. I've left
them in the order I want them marked and I believe
that's the chronological order in which they were
written.

A brief statement with respect to my option
are based on the following.

First is cost. According to the DBIS report
alternatives B and C cost 220 million dollars in 2002
dollars basis. Alternative D would cost 345 million,
which is a 125 million dollar excess as to the other
proposes. That comes out to approximately a 57 percent
increase.

Laurie Werner and Associates  (702) 396-9322

Response to Comment E5-3.1
Comment noted. Refer to response to Comment D30-3.5.
Response to Comment E5-1.5

If an alternative is constructed that does not use the existing U.S. 93 Corridor in some stretch of roadway, it is possible that the old roadway will be turned over to the City of Boulder City. The safety problems on existing U.S. 93, however, are at least in part due to the congestion and high-speed traffic traveling along it. A reduction in traffic would make for a safer facility, though improvements may still be deemed necessary. The degree and cost of the improvements is dependent upon the actual design of the new facility and the standards to which the improvements will be constructed.
The second major point I would like to make is that indicates that alternative D should not be selected. The NEIS report indicates that approximately 673 acres of land will be disturbed by building alternative D. It's a minimal impact on the environment of building alternatives B, or C. According to a statement made by Tom Greco back on September 26th of 2001, he indicated that the goal of this project was to have the least environmental damage that is reasonable and feasible. It appears that alternative D violates his goal. Though he's now retired, I would imagine that is still the same goal with respect to building this alternative or selecting one of the alternatives:

Additionally, Dr. Hardy, who is a council member, indicated that on September 26th of the year 2001, after the trucks had been rerouted, that is, they were no longer going through existing Highway 93, that still individuals in his area and his constituents were complaining of the noise of the traffic. So, consequently, there will still be noise on Highway 93 if alternative D is selected.

Alternative D now will increase noise to an area that had no noise, specifically the Lake Mead

Response to Comment E5-2.6
See response to Comment D13-2.11.

Response to Comment E5-1.6
Traffic projections indicate that only a portion of traffic (through-town or otherwise) will take a southern bypass around Boulder City if it is constructed. Therefore, traffic would still pass through Boulder City, though not in the quantities as is currently seen. Actual data is available in the Preliminary Engineering Report and Origin and Destination Study.

Response to Comment E5-2.7
See responses to Comments D28-2.31 and D115-2.104.
recreational area as pointed out in the DEIS report.

The third point I would like to address is
the economy as it would be affected by these various
alternatives.

Michael Lasko of CHEM HILL indicated on
October 16, year 2001, that out of the ten major
retailers that they spoke to and interviewed with
respect to different alternatives, eight of those ten
indicated that alternative D would have a negative
financial impact on their businesses and they favored
alternative B. Two out of those same ten indicated that
building alternative D would have severe financial
impact on their businesses.

So, consequently, the economy would be
affected at least by the ten largest retailers in town
and employers.

The DEIS report indicates that the Boulder
Dam Credit Union believes that if alternative D is
selected, that there will be a 50 percent reduction in
retail sales, which equates to 18 million dollars in
lost revenue to the city and its businesses.

The next point that I would like to address
is a number of individuals have indicated that question
No. 1 initiative but on the ballot in 1999 showed that
the citizens of Boulder City preferred the southern

Response to Comment E5-4.2
Comment noted. Economic impacts are considered in Section 4.11 of
the FEIS.

Response to Comment E5-3.2
Section 1.3.5 of the FEIS discusses this City Initiative, in which citizens
voted by 61.3 percent majority to accept a diverted highway containing
three characteristics. These characteristics would not be achieved by
routing traffic through Laughlin.

Alternative D responds to the City Initiative of 1999; however, the
initiative did not specifically identify Alternative D nor any of the
alternatives considered in this FEIS, which was initiated in
November 1999, after City voters approved the Initiative.
bypass. I believe that is a misleading statement.

Inasmuch as in 1999 there were 40 alternatives being
considered. It had gotten narrowed down to 16, but it
appear that most people believed when they were
discussing the southern bypass they were talking about
rerouting traffic through Searchlight and/or more
probably Laughlin.

It is my position that if a vote was to be
put to the voters today with the information contained
in the DEIS report, that is, more educated voters, that
outcome would be completely different than what occurred
in 1999 before any environmental impact report or
economic statement was provided regarding the selection
of the alternatives that are under consideration today,
which is B, C and D.

My last point that I would like to make
that’s not contained in my exhibits or attachments is
that Dr. Hardy on September 26th, the year 2001, showed
a video that was apparently prepared by either a state
agency or one of its contractors showing alternative D
as a computer generated rendition of what it would look
like.

It is my understanding with talking to Tom
Greco and Michael Lasko that that video which was

Response to Comment E5-3.3
Computer simulations of various points within each of the project build alternatives have been prepared and are included in the FEIS. They can be viewed on the project website, www.bouldercitystudy.com.
computer generated should not have been shown in public
since it was a work in progress.

Mr. Greco indicated at the time that it was
shown publicly in the city council chambers, though it
was not a city council meeting, that the -- the exchange
of that information was not following the process and
the rules with respect to dissemination of that
information. Be indicated it was not to be revealed to
the public because it was, quote, a work in progress,
and quote.

In summary, I believe the city should
re-evaluate its position with respect to supporting
alternative D. I think they should consider the future
ramifications that if alternative D is selected, on what
the financial impact would be to the local businesses as
well as the city with respect to lost revenue.

Finally, the greatest concern that they
should be considering is the inheritance of a highway
that's been designated as a dangerous roadway, that is,
existing Highway 93, with respect to the liability
issues that they will face and the cost of either
bringing it up to current state of the -- state of road
design and with respect to that liability.

Thank you.
MS. PERKINS: Virginia Perkins. I speak for my household. The two men couldn't come.

I personally know that unless somebody has posted something on the bulletin board at the Horseman's Association I would not have even known about this meeting and I think a lot of people don't know when these meetings are. So I think that a personal invitation to every person living in Boulder City should have been mailed to them.

Now, my first point is that I think that putting any highway in at this time is a security risk to us. I think it's a security risk to the dam. Cars only over the dam has not posed a security, but even a bypass at 1500 feet down the river is not good enough for me.

And what would happen if anything happened to Hoover Dam? No. 1, there would be a huge flood. All of southern California, Arizona and Boulder City would lose all their power, all their farming techniques. It would be a countless loss of lives.

And that's my first preference. is nothing near the dam whatsoever. I think they ought to widen the existing truck route they decided upon as of 9/11 and widen the bridge down in Laughlin and send the...
My second point is everyone I talked to
doesn't even want this highway. I will personally go
door to door to every resident in Boulder City with any
form that these people want with a yes or no if you want
this and I would guarantee that most residents would not
want this.

Most traffic that goes to the dam -- and the
reason for all the delays are the pedestrians and most
traffic that goes to the dam stays at the dam. They
don't go across into Arizona. That is just trucks and a
few people from Arizona.

If you have lived here long enough and if
you've crossed the dam, you find out that once you get
over the dam, after the sightseeing spots, the traffic
thins out immensely. So I don't see where a new bypass
is going to alleviate any traffic at the dam.

And if we do have to have -- you know, if the
powers that be, which I've been told the powers that be
have already decided, if we do have to have any kind of
Highway going through our city, which I don't understand
why we do, I think it should go through Hemenway Valley
because of the existing road there, over the Industrial
Road route behind Railroad Pass or in front of Railroad
Pass. However, the people in Hemenway Valley bought

Response to Comment E6-1.8
In an Origin and Destination Study conducted in March 2000 at
Veterans Memorial Drive, 24 percent of vehicles surveyed had a
destination of Arizona, 57 percent had a destination of Boulder City,
14 percent had a destination of Hoover Dam, and 5 percent had a
destination of Lake Mead.

Response to Comment E6-6.3
Comment noted.

Response to Comment E6-2.8
See responses to Comments D6-2.4 and D6-2.5.
Response to Comment E6-2.9
Alternative D would result in the largest area of habitat disturbance (679 acres) versus Alternatives A, B, and C. Impacts to desert wildlife and vegetation, archaeological resources, and Section 4(f) lands are discussed in Sections 4.4, 4.8, and Chapter 7 of the FEIS, respectively.

Response to Comment E6-6.4
Comment noted.
LINDA STRICKLAND, 1630 GEORGIA AVENUE

MS. STRICKLAND: My name is Linda Strickland.

I reside at 1630 Georgia Avenue. And I'm in support of alternative B.

There's only one primary issue that I wish to raise at this point since my husband has already given his statement, and that issue has to deal with the appearance of bias on behalf of the NDOT and those that have prepared the preliminary DEIS report.

In this regard there was a meeting that occurred on October 16th, 2001, at which point in time a man named Michael Lasko appeared and Mr. Lasko had retained the services of Dun & Bradstreet to go out and determine the ten largest employers in Boulder City and to determine whether or not those employers were in favor of alternative B, C or D.

At that point in time he returned to the meeting and he reported that eight out of the ten largest employers in Boulder City favored alternative B and two out of those same ten employers believed there would be severe financial impact if alternative D was the chosen alternative.

That information was not included in the DEIS report despite the fact that it was given at a DEIS meeting, and in discussing that with the people that are

LAURIE WEBB AND ASSOCIATES (702) 386-9322

Response to Comment E7-3.4
This comment does not address a specific section or information in the FEIS; therefore, no response is necessary.

Response to Comment E7-4.3
Comment noted. Economic impacts are considered in Section 4.11 of the FEIS.
present here today from DEIS we were told that that
information was included in an appendix to the DEIS
report, but that this appendix was not disseminated
along with the DEIS report.

So, in other words, those that have had the
opportunity to review the report have not necessarily
had an opportunity to review all of the information
including that which I've just indicated is included in
the appendix.

In addition, in reviewing the information
that has been given here today entitled 'Environmental
Considerations To Existing US-93 through Boulder City,'
it appears as though some of the things, economic impact
to the city, which are very important to our residents,
are being down played with respect to the impacts from
alternative D.

In this regard it has been reported and is a
part of the DEIS report that there is expected to be
severe impacts to the economy of Boulder City, including
reduced revenues, closure of 30 to 40 businesses, less
revenue, taxes, lower sales, and, of course, reduced
employment.

That is not reflected as an impact from the
southern alignment in this document Environmental
Considerations to Existing US-93 Through Boulder City.

Response to Comment E7-4.4
Comment noted. Economic impacts are considered in Section 4.11 of
the FEIS.
Instead all that is indicated is that there will be an impact from decreased Boulder City traffic volumes. So it appears as if some of the very negative things that will come about as a result of the southern alignment have not been addressed.

One further problem that is not addressed is with respect to noise levels. In this document, that I've referenced which is illustrated here, it indicates that there will be decreased noise levels in Boulder City and that the only increased noise level will be in the Lake Mead National Recreation Area.

The southern side of our town does not have any major highways in it and it is actually a very quiet area of town, and that whole side of town will be disturbed and will have a noise level in it that currently does not exist.

That is not at all reflected in this document which is being displayed to members of our public and which is now being touted as being the analysis of the environmental considerations of the southern alignment.

So it appears just from my cursory review of this document, as well as my review of the DEIS report, that some of the things that have been brought to the attention of NDOT and those that are doing this analysis have been downplayed, and perhaps it may be

Response to Comment E7-2.10
Refer to FEIS Sections 2.5 and 4.3 for a description of Alternative D and associated noise impacts. The FEIS evaluates all alternatives equally.
attributable to the political tout that is being now
weighed upon DIS people and NEXT by those in our
community who have some financial ability to sway other’s
opinions.
Response to Comment E8-4.5
Preference for Alternative D noted.

Response to Comment E8-1.9
The existing grade down Hemenway Wash is approximately 5.5 percent and lasts for 800 m. The need for improvement based on difficult operations by trucks is discussed in Chapter 1 of the FEIS, Purpose and Need.

Response to Comment E8-2.11
Comment noted.
Response to Comment E9-3.5
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Refer to response to Comment D30-3.5. Alternative D would have less existing road impacts during construction (see FEIS Section 4.17); however, a cost has not been attributed to these impacts.

Response to Comment E9-4.6
Comment noted.

Response to Comment E9-2.12
Comment noted.

Response to Comment E9-3.6
Refer to Chapter 4, Section 4.17 for a discussion of construction-related traffic delays.

Response to Comment E9-2.13
Refer to Section 2.6 and Chapter 4 for a description of Alternative D and associated impacts.
the sewer ponds, because that's all that's out in that
side of town. And if you put it on the other side of
that, I don't see who you could be affecting compared to
who you're going to affect coming up from the lake and
through town.
Response to Comment E10-4.7
Preference for Alternative A noted.

Response to Comment E10-3.7
Comment noted.

Response to Comment E10-1.10
Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a bypass for through-town traffic to take that would minimize traffic through Boulder City. Alternative C puts traffic away from the commercial corridor of Boulder City but rejoins the existing corridor at the River Mountains Trailhead in Hemenway Wash, which is within a residential area.
MR. BUCK: I first reviewed the environmental impact figures on this project probably 15, 20 years ago. I'm sure during those years the cost of the project has more than doubled. So I say let's pick the cheapest route and get it done.

Response to Comment E10-3.8
Comment noted.
MR. DOYLE: I think it would be a crime if alternative D is selected because it looks like an appeasement to the affluent and rich people who live in the Hemetway Valley.

I mean I'm aware that they have hired the ex-governor of the state of Nevada and have raised hundreds of thousands of dollars to take the existing road and move it from their back yard to the other side of town to other people's back yard. They're going to increase the value of their property at the expense of the Nevada taxpayers at a time when our state government is hard pressed to balance its budget.

I hope a decision is made based upon the impact to the environment, the future economic viability of Boulder City, and good, rational evaluation and analysis.

If on the other hand money and political influence wins out, this will certainly be a case for 60 Minutes, Mr. Bill O'Reilly and any national forum that is interested in pork-belly politics and political influence peddling.

That's all I have to say.

Response to Comment E11-2.14
Comment noted.

Response to Comment E11-4.8
Comment noted. Decisions are made considering social and economic impacts associated with the alternatives.
LORETTA C. HALLENDARSON, 499 LAKE HAVASU LANE

Ms. Hallemanderson: It has been such an eye opener for me this evening to see all the presentation and everything else, and I have finally decided which way I'm going to vote.

I'm going for proposal D, which is greater for us, the residents of Boulder City, and I live on Lake Havasu Lane here on top of the hill, and now that the trucks have been diverted, it is so peaceful and we would want to remain -- we want it to remain that way.

Laurie Webb and Associates (702) 386-9322
Response to Comment E13-6.5
Comment noted.

Response to Comment E13-1.11
Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a bypass for through-town traffic to take that would minimize traffic through Boulder City. This alternative would likely divert through-town truck traffic away from the city.

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment E13-2.16
See response to Comment C2-2.2.
never be an accident involving nuclear material

shipment, we don't want them anywhere near us or
traversing our national recreation areas.

In the event that the logic and common sense
do not prevail and you insist on destroying Black Canyon
and Sugar Loaf Mountain, then we would reluctantly
endorse option D, the southern bypass route around
Boulder City.

It's obvious that the trucking industry has
tried everything in their power to push for a bridge at
Sugar Loaf Mountain, but they are not the ones that
would have to live with the resulting noise and air
pollution on a day-to-day basis.

Since their motivation stems from greed,
we're convinced they really don't care what happens to
Boulder City and Black Canyon. We're appealing to you
to exercise logic and common sense and choose the
widening of Highway 95 south as the final solution.

Senator Harry Reid indicated that he is not
opposed to having trucks go through Searchlight where he
has a residence. One year ago this month Senator Reid
was quoted in two different newspapers as saying: My
home is in Searchlight and we don't feel any concern
over vehicles coming through.

We propose that you grant Senator Reid his

Response to Comment E13-6.6
Comment noted.
wish on a permanent basis.

Respectfully, Ken and Alberta Isaacson,
Boulder City, Nevada.

Laurie Webb and Associates (702) 386-9322
Ms. Therrien: What I want on record is plan C, the map, that is displayed here is grossly inaccurate. It goes back prior to 1997. It shows absolutely no homes that have been built and people are living in along US-91 below St. Jude Ranch and Lake Mountain. They show absolutely no home structures or subdivisions, and there are probably at least three or four subdivisions right along there, including the Spanish Steps condominium projects.

Now, I resent the fact that they are misleading the public about the level of families, the level of number of families that are living along that route. This comes directly through residential communities with young people, with new families and retired citizens; and if they're going to put this forth as a proposed alternative, it should at least be accurate and not incorrect.

Also I'm against it and I'm dead set against it and we'll fight it with everybody and every way I can legally and through political channels.

That's it.
MR. PISEM: My opinion is that keep it on the 95 because it's being developed in the first place starting in July. If they use the southern route and the bridge, that will cause development at the first off ramp that goes to this town. It will ruin the view.

And, you know, south of here, I don't think we need the bridge. That's for a politician to put his name on it.

Since the cheapest way is the 95, the logistics are better, through Laughlin, small town, Searchlight, it might add 30 to 40 miles, and they say the switch backs through Laughlin and on the Arizona side of the river, but that can be handled by the big trucks.

Once they finish four laneing through Cather's Landing on the Arizona side, those big trucks can handle it. It's not a major problem, I don't think. I've driven big trucks through that area. When they finish the Arizona side, it will be okay.

Just protect a one-of-a-kind town like this.

If they put a bridge through and heavy traffic around it, it will ruin this town. That's all I can say.
MR. STEVENSON: We've lived in Boulder City for about 15 years total. We have three businesses in town and feel the only alternative is route D. Even though it may have some impact on us on the business side, the quality of life in Boulder City is our number one concern, and that's why we live here, and returning the highway so close to so many residences and so close to the center of town would be really disruptive to the environment that the people live in town. I honestly feel that in the long run our businesses will be better off by not having a traffic jam in town, by having a better environment for people to visit in as well as live in, and just strongly against B or C.

I guess that's it.
MR. SYLER: I think this whole process, particularly this hearing tonight, is a mockery.

Exercise to make us think that we're going to have a voice in what NDOT and the federal government does.

What they're offering us here is four options on how to commit suicide as a community and we're here to voice our opinion on which we think would be the least painful way.
MS. MORRIS: My comment is primarily they say if we have the route D that would bypass all the business and the commercial stores in town would suffer. I could appreciate and understand their viewpoint.

However, I notice there has been a lot of traffic the last couple weeks going to the dam. These cars, I had a day off and I kind of watched some of these cars and followed them. If one in 20 stopped downtown, that was pretty good. Most of them just drove straight through towards the dam on 93.

What I'm saying is we should advertise more where we have a sign that says: Welcome to our Town Boulder City.

I don't mean anything garish like a billboard, but maybe see the famous hotel where Howard Hughes stayed, see where Shirley Temple stayed. If you put out some of these celebrity names, and also Clark Gable I believe was one of them, this will get your tourists.

You know, they remember these stars and they say I want to go to the place where they went.

So that's what we need. If you want people to go to Old Town, see the history of it, you have to advertise that to the tourist on the highway is a nice
That's the end of my comment.
Response to Comment E19-1.12
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a bypass for through-town traffic to take that would minimize traffic through Boulder City. The decrease in traffic, coupled with other necessary mitigation, would provide increased safety in problem areas. Additionally, the alternative would allow for a more "local" circulation of traffic within Boulder City than currently exists.

The design development of Alternatives B and C also promotes local circulation, with improvements to existing side roads and the construction of a frontage road. Alternative C does provide a smaller "bypass" of just the commercial corridor between Veterans Memorial Drive and Buchanan Boulevard, which would improve local circulation as well. However, the overall circulation requirements of Alternatives B and C would be more complex than the traffic reduction inherent in Alternative D.

This information can be found in the analysis of design drawings within the Preliminary Engineering Report.
By using the southern alignment my experience tells me that removing that traffic that now must go through Boulder City, even if they don’t want to stop and having a hamburger or fill their car with gas, shop at a local business, divert to the southern bypass, then immediately improves the local traffic flow to keep it as local traffic.

Those out-of-town vehicles coming out of Arizona or coming from the Las Vegas Valley traveling towards Boulder City that want to conduct business within the community will make an effort to leave the highway system, freeway, if you will, and they will buy hamburgers, fill their car with gas, visit a store, eat, etcetera.

Those vehicles, especially commercial, that obviously have no desire to stop, look, stroll, conduct business would just as soon bypass a community because it’s faster for them to make their commute than to have to be encumbered by the extreme volume of traffic that currently exists and will only grow for the next 10, 20, 30 years.

In closing, it is simple. My experience tells me local people should use local streets. Given the opportunity that NDOT now has to fix a problem that’s only growing, NDOT can remove the out-of-town

Laurie Webb and Associates  (702) 386-9322
BOULDER CITY/U.S. 93 CORRIDOR STUDY  04/04/02

1 traffic and bypass Boulder City, therefore, enabling the
2 local streets to be elevated to a safer flow,
3 accommodating local residents and those out-of-town
4 residents that desire to conduct business here.
5 And, of course, in addition you're going to
6 have improved noise factors, pollution factors, and
7 vehicular accidents will be less if you divert the
8 majority of the congestion away from the city as opposed
9 to putting it on local roads.
10 Thank you for your time.

LACRINE WEBB AND ASSOCIATES  (702) 386-9322

Response to Comment E19-2.19
See response to Comment C2-2.2.
Response to Comment E20-1.13
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

The Economic Impacts section of the FEIS (4.11) discusses potential impacts of each of the alternatives on the commercial corridor of Boulder City. It cannot be certain that Alternative B would have the least impact on businesses, as the widening of the roadway would encroach into existing entries, and limited access could lower desires to enter the businesses with increased traffic.

Of the build alternatives, Alternative B would likely be the least expensive to construct. Environmental impacts are evaluated in Chapter 4 of the FEIS and are a major factor in identifying the preferred alternative.

In the initial screening of 16 alternatives, an alignment for the southern bypass south of the Mead Substation (further south than Alternative D) was eliminated because it did not provide additional positive features with respect to noise and visual impacts, and it provided negative qualities of an additional mile of roadway and drainage impacts (see FEIS Chapter 2, Section 2.4).

A noise impact analysis (FEIS Section 4.3) indicated that there would be no added benefit to the level of noise reduction for receptors along Georgia Avenue if Alternative D were moved further south.
MS. LAZAR: I would like to put on the record that I am in favor of the southern route D in preference to the other routes available. However, the maps here were not drawn to scale, nor was the legend given a scale, so that it's very difficult to be able to visualize exactly how each of the routes is going to be constructed in this location to the environment around them.

I asked the gentlemen about the southern route, which is D, and he said that it was point eight tenths of a mile from the intersection of Buchanan and Georgia.

Now, point eight tenths of a mile is a very, very short distance and puts it very close to the sewage plant. The sewage plant area has an approximate three-mile asphalt road meant for the trucks that service the plant, the state trucks that go in there and do whatever they do.

And that particular asphalt road is used by hikers. It's used by joggers. It's used by people like myself who walk my two dogs every day there for two miles. It's used by the BMX people. They have now their own area right off the asphalt for BMX bikes and a lot of people walk there because it's desert.
The scenery is beautiful. You have the mountains. You have the guys coming down with their parachuting. So it's a lovely area to be. Once in a while it smells a bit, but you put up with that.

And I just wanted to make the powers that be aware of the fact that there is a recreational area, that there are folks on their bicycles down there as well, and that perhaps they may consider, if they choose the southern route, extending it a bit farther out in the desert because there is plenty of room there and that will give us more safety.

I'm not concerned so much with getting into the area. I am concerned with getting out when it's only point eight tenths of a mile to the nearest intersection. And on behalf of city workers and state workers and trucks that will have come to in and out in that egress and ingress pattern, it may become a very dangerous situation for kids, for the adults and for workers and their trucks.

The fact that the southern route is so close to the airport, we have had incidents of false crashes, and it would be a shame if a truck was involved in a crash with an airplane because he didn't have enough -- because the route was too close to the approach to the airport, bearing in mind that this airport has no air

Response to Comment E21-1.14
Alternative D was placed in a position that is not within the approach of aircraft landing at the Boulder City Airport. It is the opinion of the engineering team that the potential for a collision between an aircraft and a vehicle on the new facility, should Alternative D be constructed, is minimal and not great enough to relocate the alignment further south.
Controller system, that each pilot looks after himself
and for those who may be in the area.
So that may, too, prove to be a safety hazard, and a bit more consideration to the distance between the airport and the intentional -- the airport and the intended road maybe should be taken into consideration.

If I didn't have the sunburn, I would be a whole lot more vocal.
Response to Comment E22-3.9
Section 2.5 of the FEIS discusses the process by which the three build alternatives studied in greater detail were determined. The Northern Alternative was eliminated from consideration due to very poor safety and design ratings and high environmental impacts. Additionally, the very high construction costs of a 2.1-mile tunnel rendered construction of the alternative impracticable.

Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Response to Comment E22-1.15
In the initial screening of 16 alternatives, an alignment for the southern bypass south of the Mead Substation (further south than Alternative D) was eliminated because it did not provide additional positive features with respect to noise and visual impacts, and it provided negative qualities of an additional mile of roadway and drainage impacts (see FEIS Chapter 2, Section 2.4).
Response to Comment E23-3.10

Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a bypass for through-town traffic (including tourist traffic) to take that would minimize traffic through Boulder City. The decrease in traffic, coupled with other necessary mitigation, would provide increased safety in problem areas.

The conceptual plan for Alternative D contains interchanges at Railroad Pass, U.S. 95, and the eastern study limit, plus only an emergency vehicle access ramp at Buchanan Boulevard.
Response to Comment E24-2.21
Comment noted.

Response to Comment E24-1.16
Construction Impacts of each of the build alternatives will be considered in the determination of the preferred alternative. See FEIS Section 4.17.

Response to Comment E24-2.22
Response to Comment E25-2.23
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

As discussed in Section 2.5 of the FEIS, Alternative B would be constructed within existing U.S. 93 right-of-way. Impacts associated with this alternative are discussed in Chapter 4.

Response to Comment E25-2.24
A description of the impacts to Section 4(f) properties can be found in Section 4.9 and Chapter 7 of the DEIS.

Response to Comment E25-1.17
In an Origin and Destination Study conducted in March 2000 at Veterans Memorial Drive, 43 percent of vehicles surveyed had a destination of Lake Mead, Hoover Dam, or Arizona, while 57 percent had a destination of Boulder City.

Even with theoretically only 43 percent of the vehicles being diverted, the traffic analysis performed as part of this project does support acceptable congestion levels at critical links within the study limits for Alternative D in the design year of 2027. This is detailed in the Preliminary Engineering Report and Traffic Analysis Report.
pattern, would not be used of be affected by alternative D.

So alternative D doesn't really address the significant traffic problem.

Alternative D also impacts and substantially affects the quietness, rural nature of the residence along Georgia on the southern edge of the city. I happen to live there and that is very much of a negative impact for myself. It impacts my peaceful use and enjoyment of my property.

I understand that it may be within federal decibel levels, so is my Dodge diesel truck, and my neighbors don't care for that.

The alternatives between -- three alternatives, I don't see anything that any alternative particularly has materially over another alternative.

I'm referring to B, C or D. And so in light of the fact that alternative D costs an additional $25 million dollars or approximately 60 percent more than all the other alternatives, that would not seem to be a feasible or viable project.

So I'm left to conclude that alternative B is the only reasonable alternative.

The city council and government in Boulder City will go down to their dying breath insisting on

Response to Comment E25-2.25
A noise impact analysis was performed for all of the alternatives (Section 4.3 of FEIS). It was determined that Alternative D would result in no adverse noise effects. See response to Comment D80-2.70. Comment noted.

Response to Comment E25-3.11
Comment noted.
Alternative D. My belief is when they're faced with no build or whatever other alternative that is chosen, that eventually they'll come around to some reasonableness.

Thank you.
Response to Comment E26-3.12

The Hoover Dam Bypass project was initiated as a means of modifying the route of U.S. 93 over Hoover Dam to alleviate congestion and increase safety. The location of the bypass bridge is not a part of the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study, and no response is required.

The eastern study limit is located in the vicinity of the Hacienda Hotel and Casino and coincides with the western study limit of the Hoover Dam Bypass. The conceptual plan for each build alternative would accommodate a connection to the Hoover Dam Bypass.

The conceptual plan for Alternative D contains interchanges at Railroad Pass, U.S. 95, and the eastern study limit with an emergency-services-only access at Buchanan Boulevard. NDOT determined that traffic circulation does not warrant an additional ramp at Buchanan Boulevard or other locations within Boulder City.
Response to Comment E27-2.26
See responses to Comments D35-2.34, D83-2.72, D99-2.85, and D101-2.87.

Response to Comment E27-1.18
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

Alternative D was developed with the intent of providing a bypass for through-town traffic to take, which would minimize traffic through Boulder City. Access would be maintained to recreational areas, as well as Boulder City.
MR. BROADBENT: First of all, I would like to say I'm not opposed to the B alternative providing the interchanges at both ends don't put the casinos that are there out of business and providing they can build it in a reasonable length of time.

It's my understanding that the interchanges as proposed for the B alternative are such that the traffic would be pushed around the Hacienda and Railroad and would probably lead to those people going out of business. And I don't think that's the right thing to do.

The second thing is that all of the studies that I've seen of money that's available to build this bypass, the three hundred and some odd million dollars, show that there is no money programmed in either RTC, Clark County or the NDOT projections for projects that will be built in the next 15, 20 years. They're not in it anywhere. And if that's the case, any release of an RIS right now would mean that you would have to do some kind of conforming RIS 10 or 15 years from now before you could ever build it.

It would be my judgment that if they can't build this for 20 or 30 years and the fact that we're going to have the bridge across the Colorado River built...
By 2006, 2007, that with the traffic that's going to be in Boulder City, the best thing they could do to spend 75 or a hundred million dollars would be to build three or four interchanges, a couple of them in the wash or the area in the area of the wash and two -- two at both ends of the city, and that would provide access to anybody who wants to get from one side of the city to the other.

And they may be too depressed that the existing road a little bit, but, you know, the traffic is going to be so bad in 30 years that if we can't build this thing in 10 years, they better do something immediately, and I don't see an intermediate answer to this that they ought to be looking at if there is no money in any budget to do this for that length of time.

That's about all I got to say.
Response to Comment E29-2.27

Project-related materials and the DEIS were (and continue to be) available for public review at the Boulder City library. The Notice of Availability of the DEIS was placed in the Federal Register on March 15, 2002, and the public hearing was held on April 4, 2002. Public hearings were held for this project in accordance with NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1506). Close of the public comment period was May 10, 2002, which provided the public 56 days to provide comments; NEPA regulations provide for a minimum 45-day public comment period.
And I -- posting things on the web is a new relatively new operation that people are doing to meet NEPA, and I'm not even sure if it will hold up in court as meeting the CE 2 regulations.

I guess if I was to make one comment on the corridor tonight I think Boulder City should choose to keep this new development in already developed areas, so I prefer alignment C and not D.

I think in my initial scanning of the RIS long-term land use planning has not been considered, nor the reasonably foreseeable impacts that will occur if the open land is developed in corridor D.

Thanks.

Response to Comment E29-4.12
Preferences for Alternatives C and D noted.

Response to Comment E29-2.28
Impacts to future land uses are discussed in Section 4.9 of the FEIS. See response to Comment D156-2.153.
Response to Comment E30-2.29
Comment noted.

DAVE STRUSE and ANN STRUSE, 1285 TAMARISK LANE

MR. STRUSE: I just want to let the state of Nevada know that option D is the only option for this town so we don't destroy it.

MS. STRUSE: I also feel route D is the only alternative for Boulder City without destroying our cute quaint town.

(Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.)
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LETTER TO THE EDITOR:

It is the duty of our elected officials and our local and state government to take all necessary steps to ensure our safety and well-being. When our elected officials and local and state government become aware of a dangerous condition affecting the safety of our community, legally such awareness constitutes "notice" and can subject our local and state governmental entities as well as our elected officials to litigation if and when an accident is caused by this known dangerous condition.

With this in mind, one of the paramount but less publicized issues present in the debate over Alternatives B, C, and D (i.e. the southern bypass issue) is the current unsafe condition of Highway 95. In this regard, information presented at the Community Working Group ("CWG") meetings reveals that engineers with NDOT have been directed to solve traffic issues related to our current Highway 95. Specifically, a history of crashes along US 93 through Boulder City documents that this stretch of highway is extremely dangerous. Crash statistics show that at Lakeshore Drive the crash rate is 2 times higher than the state average. To no one's surprise, crash statistics also show that the crash rate at Railroad Pass is 5 times greater than the state average.

The data reveals that 16% of all vehicles passing through the Railroad Pass area take the turn off at Highway 95 and head for Laughlin, thereby encountering only the dangerous Railroad Pass area. 30% of those who live to pass through both the Railroad Pass and Lakeshore Drive areas keep going with the ultimate destination of Arizona. More importantly, however, is that 80% of those people traveling on those two treacherous stretches of Highway 95 have the ultimate destination of Boulder City; in other words, the majority of those who are subjected to these treacherous stretches of highway live and/or work in our community. Also, let us not forget that there is also a remaining 16% of traffic that passes through our town in order to visit Lake Mead and/or Hoover Dam; we are also subjecting those to these dangerous stretches of highway.

Building the southern bypass will not alleviate those dangerous highway conditions which NDOT is supposed to advise. Alternative B, however, which is a widening and modification of existing Highway 95, will alleviate these safety concerns.

According to NDOT, Alternative B, which includes the improvement of existing Highway 95, proposes a new highway interchange at Railroad Pass, a 200' widening of Highway 95 (it is currently 60' wide) and it will be widened to 100', 2 travel lanes in each direction along with a frontage road, and a raised median separating opposing lanes of traffic. Clearly, these proposed modifications will remedy the current unsafe and hazardous conditions present in our Boulder City stretch of Highway 95.

If the southern bypass is the selected Alternative, the treacherous sections of Highway 95 will continue to threaten the safety of all of our family and friends. Under such a scenario, our local and state government, as well as our elected officials, should prepare for an onslaught of civil lawsuits brought by those who have been injured or who have lost loved ones due to the dangerous conditions existing on Highway 95. As a part of this battle, these lawsuits will challenge the safety of our community and the designs of the project.

Response to Comment E31-1.19
Comment noted. The statistics stated in this comment are all correct, as presented in Section 1.3.3 (Safety) of the Purpose and Need of the FEIS and in the Origin and Destination Study (March 2000).

Response to Comment E31-1.20
It is a goal of the development of all build alternatives to create a safer transportation corridor (see FEIS, Chapter 1). Alternative D would accomplish this by diverting through-town traffic to a bypass, which would minimize traffic through Boulder City and increase safety. Additionally, a new interchange would be constructed at Railroad Pass.

The statistics provided in the comment with respect to the design intentions of Alternative B are correct. The intent of the design is to alleviate congestion while separating, as best as possible, the local and through traffic while maintaining access to businesses and residential areas.

Response to Comment E31-1.21
See responses to Comments E31-1.19 and E31-1.20. Additionally, as the preferred alternative, the development of Alternative D will require an overall plan and design that will satisfy the goals put forth in the Purpose and Need (FEIS Chapter 1).
of those lawsuits those elected officials who support the southern bypass alternative will undoubtedly have to articulate sound and rational reasoning as to why, in the face of overwhelming crash statistics, they did not take action to remedy the dangers existing on Highway 93 and otherwise ensure the safety and well-being of those living in, visiting, or travelling through our community. As lawyers living in our community, we would love to be involved in the interrogation.

TRACY AND LINDA STRICKLAND
1630 Georgia Ave
Boulder City, Nevada
293-7698
LETTER TO THE EDITOR:

On September 22nd I attended a meeting of the Boulder City Bypass Coalition, held at city hall. This "coalition" is a well-financed, organized politically influential machine. This meeting was the latest in a series of attempts, to influence those who are studying the viable options available for the routing of traffic across the Nevada-Arizona border. In this endeavor, a City Councilmember represented to those in attendance that six of Boulder City support the southern bypass (identified as Alternative D). In support of this far-fetched assertion, Councilmember, as many others, relied on a 1999 initiative referencing a southern bypass route.

Exposing this often repeated proposition to the bright Nevada sun illustrates how this contentment is baseless and misleading. In 1999 Question 1, in confusing, unintelligible and vague language (a hallmark of Boulder City initiatives), asked Boulder City residents "yes" or "no" to direct the city council to give their consent to the state for a southern bypass. (Sounds confusing?) At the time the voters were asked to vote on this question there were approximately 16 southern routes under consideration. It appears from numerous letters to the editor that a number of people that voted at that time believed that a southern bypass included the possibility of traffic being diverted to Laughlin or through Searchlight. Most believed that the route would be considerable distance to the south of Georgia Ave.

Additionally, Question 1 never specifically mentioned any of the alternatives available involving existing highway 93. More importantly, Question 1 neither mentioned that the proposed southern bypass would include an exit on Buchanan Street nor any other specifics regarding the issues relating to air quality or destruction of our desert.

Currently the only southern route that is being considered is identified as Alternative D. Alternative D provides, among other specifics not addressed in question 1, a highway exit on Buchanan Street for the use of semi-trucks and commercial trucks to enter Boulder City. Obviously, the voters in 1999 were never informed that commercial trucking would disturb the peace and quiet at the Veterans Cemetery, the residential area bordering Buchanan Street and Georgia Street, the Boulder City Hospital, our golf courses (and our new golf course) and the Homestead Retirement home. Also, back in 1999 the residents undoubtedly never envisioned heavy traffic passing by the areas we have set aside for our children, namely the baseball diamond, the soccer field and the skate board park.

Additionally, fewer than 50% of the registered voters responded to question number 1. (2,970 voted in favor of this ill-defined multi-purposes southern bypass route and 1,895 voted against it.) Consequently, it is this type of shrill rhetoric of some of our elected officials that cast doubt on the objectivity of what is in the best interests of our town. If the above-referenced misuse of the "coalition" system is not enough to cast doubt aside, then the next proposal by one of elected officials surely will. In this regard, it appears that the "coalition", as well as some of our elected

Response to Comment E32-5.2
Comment noted.

Response to Comment E32-2.30
A description of Alternative D can be found in Section 2.6 of the FEIS. No ramp would be constructed at Buchanan Boulevard with this alternative; however, an emergency access would be provided for emergency services vehicles.

Response to Comment E32-3.15
This comment does not refer to a specific section of the FEIS.
officials, are attempting to speed up the construction of the southern bypass in order to achieve their goal before we have an opportunity to truly examine the alternatives. In this regard, at the September 26th meeting one Councilmemeber proposed a "build to plan" proposal. Under this unusual approach, the southern bypass would be completed before the Federal Government completes the bridge across the Colorado River just south of Hoover Dam. This rush to build the southern bypass sounds incredibly like the 1999 rush to have Question 1 placed on the ballot before the voters become fully educated about the destructive impact the southern bypass would have on Boulder City.

At this September 26th meeting, Mr. Tom Green of NDOT indicated that the environmental impact concerning the 3 proposed routes (Alternatives B, C, and D) currently under consideration, will be completed and the results published in November of this year. He indicated that the reports will be extremely detailed with respect to the environmental impact of each Alternative. In that regard, Alternative B which involved the use of a substantial amount of existing Highway 93, will undoubtedly cause the least damage to the environment of Boulder City. Alternative C, which creates some re-routing north of Highway 93 before Buchanan Street, and re-work of Highway 93 through Shadow Valley, will cause a little more damage to the environment to Boulder City than Alternative B. Nevertheless, Alternatives C and D will cause substantially less damage to our environment than Alternative D.

Consistent with his Initial assessment of the environmental impact of Alternatives B and C, is the substantially higher (approximately $60 million higher) cost to build Alternative D due to the fact that Alternative D involves the same destruction and despoliation of virgin tracks of desert habitat by construction of the new highway through the southern portion of Boulder City.

Once the environmental impact report is completed and available to the citizens of Boulder City, then and only then will a vote on all the proposed Alternatives have some merit. Hopefully our political leaders will have the courage to allow informed citizens to vote on the 3 Alternatives that has only just now become clearly defined, detailed, and illustrated, complete with the environmental impact that they will have on our community. If a new vote on the 3 Alternatives is not allowed, the politicians, and those who masterminded the timing of Question 1 on the ballot, will be allowed to achieve their goal of cramming down our throats an Alternative that will forever cause damage to our community.

TRACY STRICKLAND
1630 Georgia Ave.
Boulder City
720-7629

Response to Comment E32-2.31
The impacts of construction and operation of the build alternatives (B, C, and D) vary, as described in Chapters 4 and 5 of the FEIS.

The Alternative D alignment would traverse open space that supports wildlife and plant species, and includes the following uses: Mead substation, transmission lines and associated service roads, a rifle range, a landfill, NPS trails, and backcountry roads.
LETTER TO THE EDITOR:

We follow with great interest the letters written concerning the new Canalway route. We wish to voice our opposition to the proposal calling for the southern bypass.

We own a home on Georgia Avenue. At night hours of the day it is so quiet that we can hear the wings of a bird as it soars above our home. Though we purchased our house with full knowledge that we must deal with the occasional “fright” from a golfer, traffic on Georgia Ave. and the sound of a plane landing at or taking off from the airport, we found those inconveniences to be minor in comparison to living on the side of town where Highway 93 passes through. When we purchased our home there was no indication that a full scale highway would soon be built less than a mile from the front of our residence. Indeed, with the exception of the airport, our side of town has always been the residential side. We made a trade-off; we have no view of the lake, but no highway either.

The construction of the Canalway through the south side of town is a ridiculous proposition compared to the modification of the existing Highway 93 through Homewood Valley. Based on the MDOT Corridor Study map, it appears that the Canalway bypass through the south side of town will result in the need for construction of at least 11 miles of highway through our desert on the side of town which is residential in nature. Compare the southern route with the proposed modification of current Highway 93, which would result in the construction of about 5 new miles of highway above the industrial area of our town, and a modification of about 3 miles of current Highway 93. Therefore, we are looking at about 11 additional miles of construction with the southern route.

I also take into consideration the fact that sound generally rises. By placing the Canalway route above the industrial area of town, the highway would be at an elevated elevation than the majority of the town, and consequently less noise pollution. In comparison, the proposed southern bypass is located lower than the rest of town, and therefore those residences on the south end of town will now be bombarded with noise pollution that will be unabated. Of course, needlessly to say that the construction of 11 miles of highway in the fine dirt and sand which comprises our desert will create a dust bowl like the likes which we have not seen.

And services for the highway? The proposed southern bypass will undoubtedly eventually offer gas stations and convenience stores for the weary traveler. If these highway support services are not built, one can anticipate a highway off ramp at or around Batchanay which will route traffic through our residential area, past our peaceful Veterans Cemetery, and past our golf courses. Compare this scenario with the scenario presented by modification of the current Highway 93 - since the new highway would actually cross a portion of the existing Highway 93 just before the entrance to town, gas stations and convenience stores already serve the highway.

Based on the MDOT map, the modification of current Highway 93 will result in very little disturbance to the residents of Homewood Village. It should also be noted that those residents purchased their homes with the existence of a 3 lane highway already in place.

Response to Comment E33-2.32
Alternative D, the Southern Alternative, has been selected as the preferred alternative. Section 2.6 of Volume I of the FEIS discusses the rationale for this decision.

A noise impact analysis was performed for all of the alternatives (Section 4.3 of the FEIS). It was determined that Alternative D would result in no adverse noise effects.

Response to Comment E33-3.16
The Preliminary Engineering Report states that the length of Alternative D (Southern) is approximately 15 miles, whereas Alternative C (the modification of existing Highway 93 mentioned in the comment) is approximately 10.6 miles. Of the 10.6 miles, approximately half would be constructed north and south of existing U.S. 93 in relatively undeveloped areas.

Response to Comment E33-2.33
A noise impact analysis was performed for all of the alternatives (Section 4.3 of the FEIS). It was determined that Alternative D would result in no adverse noise effects. FEIS Section 4.2.2 describes mitigation measures, based on Department of Air Quality Management (DAQM) BMPs, which will be implemented for purposes of decreasing potential dust emission impacts.

Response to Comment E33-4.13
Comment noted. Land Use impacts are considered in Section 4.9 and Economic impacts are in Section 4.11 of the FEIS. Section 4.11 also includes operational impacts of each of the alternatives.
place. It seems entirely illogical that we, as a City, would desire to tear up virgin desert and build a highway where none ever existed, rather than widen an already existing highway.

No one has yet discussed the fact that residents who have homes all along the southern side of town will undoubtedly suffer a reduction in property value upon commencement of construction of the southern bypass. Perhaps an inverse condemnation class action filed by the residents against the City would be the best avenue to determine whether monetary compensation is in order for those whose view, peace and quiet, and clean air have been compromised due to construction of a highway where none ever existed.

TRACY and LYNDA STRICKLAND
1630 Georgia Ave.
Boulder City, Nevada 89005
293-7898
LETTER TO THE EDITOR:

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was recently released for public review. It analyses the environmental and economic costs of the 3 alternatives to improve existing I-95.

In the letter by Dr. Harrill (BC News 3/28/02) it is clear that those who support the southern bypass (Alt. D) and comprise the Boulder City Bypass Coalition (aka the "Get the existing highway out of my backyard") are allowing their personal agendas to overshadow what is best for BC. In this regard, it is obvious to anyone who reads the DEIS report that the most economical and environmentally friendly alternative is the improvement of existing Highway 93 (Alt. "B"). Any logical reading of the report leads to the conclusion that Alt. D poses the greatest financial hardship and environmental impact on BC and our surrounding environs.

The report illustrates that Alt. D is the most costly in terms of construction and financial impact on the businesses of BC. Construction costs for Alt. D are estimated to cost, in 2002 dollars, $125 million more to build than Alt. B or C. The report references that the selection of Alt. D will most likely result in a $5 reduction in tourism expenditures, an $18 million reduction in sales and a reduction of 200 BC jobs, resulting in a closure of 30-40 BC businesses. (DEIS at pg. 4-101). 8 out of 10 of the largest BC employers state that Alt. D is the least preferred choice, and 2 out of these same employers believe Alt. D will cause severe consequences for our local economy. Our city council and city manager have long recognised that Alt. D will have dire financial consequences for the local economy. As reported in BC News (5/17/02), city manager John Sullivan stated that if Alt. D is approved, "then how we bring people in for the existing businesses? That's more people being diverted from Boulder City."

The city is contemplating, in the event of Alt. D approval, to hire an "events coordinator" to bring tourists back into BC. It is ironic that we will have to spend money to bring back tourists, and at the same time will have less business sales receipts to support this additional cost.

The financial devastation of Alt. D is dwarfed by its dire environmental impact. DEIS identifies the numerous polluting and negative impacts on the environment: Alt. D will cause a substantial increase in noise levels in portions of the Lake Mead area that did not previously exist (DEIS at pg. B-15); Alt. D will disturb 679 acres of habitat for the desert tortoise and impact the biophysical area, causing the greatest disturbance to wildlife of all the other proposed alternatives. Alt. D will have a greater long term impact than Alt. B or C on the waters of the Colorado River/Lake Mead because it covers a larger area with wider wash crossings and requires more fill, thereby impacting these waters 3 times greater than the other 2 alternatives (DEIS at pg. B-20); it would also create the most dust (DEIS at pg. B-57).

The DEIS report makes it clear that Alt. B is the most economically and environmentally sound proposal for those that live and work in Boulder City. Let's just hope that the facts and circumstances of this study are not outweighed by the politically connected and financially influential members of the Coalition.

Response to Comment E34-4.14
Preference for Alternative B noted. Comments regarding Alternative D noted.

Response to Comment E34-2.34
Comment noted.
Response to Comment F1-4.1
Comments noted. Refer to response to Comment F1-2.1, in this volume of the FEIS.

Response to Comment F1-2.1
The proposed alignment for Alternative D would require use of the northernmost portion of the rifle range lease area, which is over 500 acres in size. The current orientation of the target practice areas is northeast and east. While sufficient open space land exists to accommodate a freeway and a rifle range, adjustments to the boundaries of the rifle range lease area and its target practice areas may be necessary if the preferred alternative (Alternative D) becomes the selected alternative by FHWA. Boulder City owns the land that is affected by Alternative D and leased for the rifle range.
F. COMMENTS RECEIVED BEFORE DEIS RELEASE AND RESPONSES

Dear Sir:

It has come to my attention that one of the proposed routes for the freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada, would result in the closure of the shooting range in Boulder City run by the Boulder Rifle & Pistol Club. I am vehemently opposed to this for the following reasons:

1. There are currently over 300 members of this club, plus hundreds of nonmembers who routinely use this range as a safe, structured area to shoot. Closure of this range would result in many of these people shooting in undesignated desert areas were accidents and injury could occur. The (e.g., ATV riders, rock-hunters, hikers, etc.). In fact, this is currently the only shooting range in Southern Nevada providing an area open to the general public.

2. This range is a site for formal competitive shooting and the only range capable of hosting, and currently being used for, numerous NRA approved shooting matches, including the Nevada State Regional Championship, and the Nevada State Service Rifle Championship. The most recent State Service Rifle Championship held in October 2001, had competitors not just from Nevada, but also Arizona, California, Utah, Wyoming, and even Kentucky. Furthermore, this range is one of the few in the country capable of hosting NRA approved 1000-yard matches.

3. Local law enforcement and police groups use this range for firearms training and shooting. Additionally, the "All-Cow" rearmament unit (a team composed of the top shooters in the various state National Guards throughout the country) has started to use this range as part of its training and competition.

4. Various courses and public offerings are made through this range, which are aimed at promoting and teaching firearm safety, and are usually offered at no cost to the general public. Typical classes such as the "Home Gun Safety Class", "Ladies Day at the Range", Hunter's Safety in Days and weeks of group participation, are examples of previous offerings made to the public through the use of this range.

5. This range has recreational and historical values that cannot be replaced. Typical functions, to Police Departments and Gun Shops throughout Southern Nevada, about a safe place to shoot, that is open to the public, will result in a recommendation to visit the range in Boulder City. The Boulder Rifle and Pistol Range will celebrate its 70th anniversary in the year 2003.

Because of the above, my support for any type of freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada, is for one where the shooting range in Boulder City is left open, operational and intact.

Name (print): Michael R. Beary
Signature: Michael R. Beary
Date: 1/20/01
Address: 961 Del Sol Drive, Boulder City, NV 89005 Phone: (702) 292-5190

Please re-route the whole damn road through Laughlin. Doing anything else.

Thank you.
Dear Sir,

It has come to my attention that one of the proposed routes for the freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada, would result in the closure of the shooting range in Boulder City run by the Boulder Rifle & Pistol Club. I am vehemently opposed to this for the following reasons:

1. There are currently over 300 members of this club, plus hundreds of nonmembers who routinely use this range as a safe, structured area to shoot. Closure of this range would result in many of these people shooting in undesignated desert areas where accidents and injury could occur to others (i.e. ATV riders, dirt-bikers, hikers, etc.). In fact, this is currently the only shooting range in southern Nevada providing an area open to the general public.

2. This range is a site for formal competitive shooting and the only range capable of hosting, and currently used for, numerous NRA-approved shooting matches, including the Nevada State Regional Championship, and the Nevada State Service Rifle Championship. The most recent State Service Rifle Championship held in October 2001 had competitors not just from Nevada, but also Arizona, California, Utah, Wyoming, and even Kentucky. Furthermore, this range is one of the few in the country capable of hosting NRA-approved 1000-yard matches.

3. Local law enforcement and police groups use this range for firearms training and shooting. Additionally, the "All Guard" marksmanship unit, which is composed of the top shooters in the various state national guard units throughout the country, has started to use this range as part of its training and competition.

4. Various courses and public offerings are made through this range, which are aimed at promoting and teaching firearm safety, and are usually offered at no cost to the general public. Typical classes include the "Home Firearm Safety Class," "Ladies Day at the Range," Hunter's Night in Pahrump, and Youth group's participation, which are examples of previous offerings made to the public through the use of this range.

5. This range has recreational and historical values that cannot be replaced. Typically incentives to Police Departments and Gun Shops throughout Southern Nevada, about a safe place to shoot that is open to the public, we return in a non-manufactured to visit the range in Boulder City. The Boulder Rifle and Pistol Range will celebrate its 70th anniversary in the year 2003.

Because of the above, my support for the use of a freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada, is for one where the shooting range in Boulder City is left open, operational and intact.

Name (print) Tom Hancock Signature: Tom Hancock Date: 11-28-01
Address: 1340 Wyoming St, Boulder City, NV 89005 Phone: 760-273-9571

Please Help
Dear Sir,

It has come to my attention that one of the proposed routes for the freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada would result in the closure of the shooting range in Boulder City run by the Boulder City Rifle & Pistol Club. I am adamantly opposed to this for the following reasons:

1. This range was developed for a safe place to shoot in the Las Vegas Valley. It has many members and nonmembers that use this range to shoot the many disciplines that are offered at this range. This facility is the only one in the Las Vegas area that is open to the public and accepting membership. Closure of this range would result in many of these people turning to the desert where many accidents and injury have occurred in the past. People would then have to break the law because there is a county and state ordinance prohibiting shooting in an undesignated area designated as a shooting range.

2. As Competition Director for NSRPA, we hold many of our formal National shooting competition at the only range capable of hosting NRA approved shooting matches, especially at 1000 yards. These bring competitors from all over the country to shoot in these events. The State Service Rifle Championships was held in October 2003. Other competitions include the Nevada State Regional Championship and the Regional Silhouette Shooting Championship. These events also help the Clark County economy.

3. The Boulder City Range is also used by local and state law enforcement agencies, along with the National Guard, to teach their officers and recruits firearms training.

4. The Boulder City Range also offers many courses in "Firearm Safety, Home Defense, Refuse to be a Victim, and Concealed Weapons." Courses are also offered to teach shooters to become a "NRA Certified Instructor in Rifle, Pistol, Shotgun, Home Defense & Range & Firearms Safety." They also help the Department of Wildlife by holding "Hunter Safety Course" throughout the year. The officers and instructors of this Club help to inform the general public and children about gun safety and the proper use of firearms, by speaking at events whenever called upon.

5. I am also the NSRPA Junior Shooting Coordinator for Southern Nevada. The Boulder City Rifle & Pistol Club is working with me, the instructors along with their instructors to develop a valuable program for our junior shooters and kids that are wanting to be in a recognized shooting program for the Junior Olympics.

Because of the above reasons, I hope you will consider one of the other two routes for this bypass. The Boulder City Rifle & Pistol Club and the Boulder City Range are a very important part of our shooting sports community and are the only range open to the public for all shooting disciplines. This range has been here since 1973, and are planning many new developments for the range to improve range safety and provide more area to house other shooting disciplines.

Sincerely,
Dolores McNamara

[Signature]
Dear Sir,

It has come to my attention that one of the proposed routes for the freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada would result in the closure of the shooting range in Boulder City run by the Boulder Rifle & Pistol Club. I am vehemently opposed to this for the following reasons:

1. There are currently over 300 members of this club, plus hundreds of nonmembers who routinely use this range as a safe, structured area to shoot. Closure of this range would result in many of these people shooting in undesignated desert areas where accidents and injury could occur to others (i.e. ATV riders, dirt-bikers, hikers, etc.). In fact, this is currently the only shooting range in southern Nevada providing an area open to the general public.

2. This range is a site for formal competitive shooting and the only range capable of hosting, as successfully been done for, numerous NRA approved shooting matches, including the Nevada State Regional Championship, and the Nevada State Service Rifle Championship. The most recent State Service Rifle Championship held in October 2004 had competitors not just from Nevada, but also Arizona, California, Utah, Wyoming, and even Kentucky. Furthermore, this range is one of the few in the country capable of hosting NRA approved 1000-yard matches.

3. Local law enforcement and police groups use this range for live fire training and shooting. Additionally, the “Al Guard” marksmanship unit, a team composed of the top shooters in the various state National Guards throughout the country, has started to use this range as part of its training and competition.

4. Various courses and public offerings are made through this range, which are aimed at promoting and teaching firearm safety, and are usually offered at no cost to the general public. Typical classes such as the “Home Firearms Safety Class”, “Ladies Day at the Range”, Hunter’s School in Davis and Youth group’s participation, are examples of previous offerings made to the public through the use of this range.

5. This range has recreational and historical values that cannot be replaced. Typical inquirers to Police Departments and Gun Shops throughout Southern Nevada, about a safe place to shoot, this range open to the public, still result in recommendations to visit the range in Boulder City. The Boulder Rifle and Pistol Range will celebrate its 70th anniversary in the year 2000.

Because of the above, your support for any type of freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada is for one where the shooting range in Boulder City is left open, operational and intact.

Name (print) [Name]
Signature [Signature]
Address 2300 CENTER RD, P.O. BOX 108290, CLARK 89025 Phone [Phone]
November 28, 2001

Mr. James A. Ochsner
State of Nevada
Department of Transportation
1293 So. Stewart St.
Carson City, Nevada 89712

Dear Mr. Ochsner,

It is my understanding that one of the proposed routes for the freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada, would result in the closure of the shooting range in Boulder City run by the Boulder Rifle & Pistol Club. I am on record with you as being vehemently opposed to this for the following reasons:

1. There are currently over 300 members of this club (I am included in this membership) plus hundreds of nonmembers who routinely use this range as a safe, structured area to shoot. Closure of this range would result in many of these people shooting in undeveloped desert areas where accidents and injury could occur to others (e.g., ATV riders, dirt-bikers, hikers, etc.). In fact, this is the only shooting range in Southern Nevada providing an area open to the general public.

2. This range is a site for formal competitive shooting and the only range capable of hosting, and currently being used for, numerous NRA approved shooting matches, including the Nevada State Rimfire Championship and the Nevada State Service Rifle Championship. The most recent State Service Rifle Championship held in October 2001, had competitors not just from Nevada, but also Arizona, California, Utah, Wyoming, and even Kentucky. Furthermore, this range is one of the few in the country capable of hosting NRA approved 1000-yard matches.

3. Local law enforcement and police groups use this range for firearms training and shooting. Additionally, the "All Guard" marksmanship unit, a team composed of the top shooters in the various state National Guards throughout the country, has started to use this range as part of its training and competition. I am a Korean War Veteran and was in the Army Reserve when competing in one of these competitive events at the Boulder range as early as 1960. I still use this range and pleasurable range on a regular basis to retain my shooting skills. (See the attached photo.)

4. Various courses and public offerings are made through this range, which are aimed at promoting and teaching firearm safety and are usually offered at no cost to the general public. Typical classes such as the "Home Firearms Safety Class", "Ladies Day at the Range", Hunter's Night in Deys and Youth group's participation, are examples of previous offerings made to the public through the use of this range.

5. This range has recreational and historical values that cannot be replaced. Typical inquiries from Police Departments and Gun Shows throughout Southern Nevada, about a safe place to shoot, that is open to the public, will result in a recommendation to visit the range in Boulder City. The Boulder Rifle and Pistol Range will celebrate its 70th anniversary in the year 2023.

Because of the above, my support for any type of freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada, is for one where the shooting range in Boulder City is left intact, operational, and intact.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. William D. Sorensen
250 Independence Way
Boulder City, NV 89005-4207
Phone (702) 293-4504

RECEIVED

NOV 2 9 2001

Project Manager

0201
Dear Sir:  

There being advance for more time that...

1. There are currently over 300 members of this club, plus hundreds of nonmembers who routinely use this range as a safe, structured area to shoot. Closure of this range would result in the loss of this facility for all shooting activities.

2. This range is a site for formal competitive shooting and shooting matches, including the Nevada State Regional Championship, and the Nevada State Service Rifle Championship. The most recent Nevada Service Rifle Championship held in October 2001, had competitors from Nevada, but also from Arizona, California, Utah, Wyoming, and even Kentucky.

Local law enforcement and police groups use this range for firearms training and shooting. Additionally, the "All Guard" marksmanship unit, a team composed of the top shooters in the various state National Guard units throughout the country, has started to use this range as part of their training and competition.

4. Various courses and public offerings are made through this range, which are aimed at promoting and teaching firearm safety, and are usually offered at no cost to the general public. Typical classes such as the "Home Firearm Safety Class," "Ladies Day at the Range," Hunter's Night in Nevada, and Youth camp's participation, are a few examples of previous offerings made to the public through the use of this range.

5. This range has recreational and historical values that cannot be replaced. Typical examples include Police Departments and Gun Shops throughout Southern Nevada, about a safe place to shoot, that is open to the public, but rest in a recommendation to visit the range in Boulder City. The Boulder Rifle and Pistol Range will celebrate its 70th anniversary in the year 2003.

Because of the above, my support for any type of freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada, is for one where the shooting range in Boulder City is left open, operational and intact.

Name (print)  
Signature Date

Address Phone

I have an in-lieu replacement of the existing range is made to ensure continued opportunity for public recreational shooting, including formal competitive events.

...V used!
Dear Sir,

It has come to my attention that one of the most popular shooting ranges in the Boulder City, Nevada, would result in the closure of the Boulder Rifle & Pistol Club. I am vehemently opposed to this closure.

1. There are currently over 300 members of this club, plus hundreds of nonmembers who routinely use this range as a safe, structured area to shoot. Closure of this range would result in many of these people shooting in unsanctioned desert areas where accidents and injury could occur to others (i.e. ATV riders, dirt-bikers, hikers, etc.). In fact, this is currently the only shooting range in Southern Nevada providing an area open to the general public.

2. This range is a site for formal competitive shooting and the only range capable of hosting the Nevada State Regional Championship and the Nevada State Service Rifle Championship. The most recent Service Rifle Championship held in October 2001, had competitors not just from Nevada, but also Arizona, California, Utah, Wyoming, and even Kentucky. Furthermore, the accuracy of the few in the county capable of hosting NRA approved 1000-yard matches.

3. Local law enforcement and police groups use this range for firearms training and shooting. Additionally, the "All Guard" marksmanship unit, a team composed of the top shooters in various state National Guard units throughout the country, has started to use this range as part of its training and competition.

4. Various courses and public offerings are made through this range, which are aimed at promoting and teaching firearm safety, and are usually offered at no cost to the general public. Typical classes such as the "Home Firearm Safety Class," "Ladies Day at the Range," Hunter's Shoot, and Dave and Youth group's participation, are examples of previous offerings made to the public through the use of this range.

5. This range has recreational and historical values that cannot be replaced. Typical inquiries, to Police Departments and Gun Shops throughout Southern Nevada, about a safe place to shoot that is open to the public, will result in a recommendation to visit the range in Boulder City. The Boulder Rifle and Pistol Range will celebrate its 70th anniversary in the year 2003.

Name (print) George A. Wilson
Signature...
Date 12/31/01
Address 13/9 Apache Rd, Boulder City, NV
Phone 702-243-0547
Dear Sir,

It has come to my attention that one of the proposed routes for the freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada, would result in the closure of the shooting range in Boulder City run by the Boulder Rifle & Pistol Club. I am vehemently opposed to this for the following reasons:

1. There are currently over 300 members of this club, plus hundreds of nonmembers who routinely use this range as a safe, structured area to shoot. Closure of this range would result in many of these people shooting in undesignated desert areas where accidents and injury could occur to others (i.e. ATV riders, dirt-bikers, hikers, etc.). In fact, this is currently the only shooting range in Boulder City, Nevada, providing an area open to the general public.

2. This range is a site for formal competitive shooting and the only range capable of hosting events, and currently hosting several NFA (National Rifle Association) approved shooting matches, including the Nevada State Regional Championship, and the Nevada State Service Rifle Championship. The most recent State Service Rifle Championship held in October 2001, had competitors not just from Nevada, but also Arizona, California, Utah, Wyoming, and even Kentucky. Furthermore, this range is one of the few in the county capable of hosting NRA approved 1000-yard matches.

3. Local law enforcement and peace groups use this range for firearms training and shooting. Additionally, the "Air Guard" marksmanship unit, a team composed of the top shooters in the various state National Guards throughout the country, has started to use this range as part of its training and competition.

4. Various courses and public offerings are made through this range, which is aimed at promoting and teaching firearm safety, and are usually offered at no cost to the general public. Typical classes such as the "Home Firearms Safety Class" "Ladies Day at the Range" Hunter's Bow in Dave and Youth group's participation, are examples of previous offerings made to the public through the use of this range.

5. This range has recreational and historical value that cannot be replicated. Typical inquiries, to Police Departments and Gun Shops throughout Southern Nevada, about a safe place to shoot, that is open to the public, will result in a recommendation to visit the range in Boulder City. The Boulder Rifle and Pistol Range will celebrate its 75th anniversary in the year 2003.

Because of the above, I respectfully request that any type of freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada, be designed to avoid the shooting range run by the Boulder Rifle & Pistol Club.

Name (print) 
Address 
Phone 
Date 
Signature 
Handwritten Date 

Best Regards

[Signature]
Dear Sir,

It has come to my attention that one of the proposed routes for the freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada, would result in the closure of the shooting range in Boulder City run by the Boulder Rifle & Pistol Club. I am vehemently opposed to this for the following reasons:

1. There are currently over 300 members of this club, plus hundreds of nonmembers who frequently use this range as a safe, structured area to shoot. Closure of this range would result in many of these people shooting in undesignated desert areas where accidents and injury could occur to others (i.e., ATV riders, dirt-bikers, hikers, etc.). In fact, this is currently the only shooting range in southern Nevada providing an area open to the general public.

2. This range is a site for formal competitive shooting and the only range capable of hosting, and currently being used for, numerous NFA approved shooting matches, including the Nevada State Regional Championship, and the Nevada State Service Rifle Championship. The most recent Service Rifle Championship held in October 2001, had competitors not just from Nevada, but also Arizona, California, Utah, Wyoming, and even Kentucky. Furthermore, this range is one of the few in the county capable of hosting NFA approved 1000-yard matches.

3. Local law enforcement and police groups use this range for firearms training and shooting. Additionally, the "All Guard" marksmanship unit, a team composed of the top shooters in the various state National Guards throughout the country, has started to use this range as part of its training and competition.

4. Various courses and public offerings are made through this range, which are aimed at promoting and teaching firearm safety, and are usually offered at no cost to the general public. Typical classes include the "Home Firearm Safety Class," "Ladies Day at the Range," Hunter's Night in Days and Youth group's participation, are examples of previous offerings made to the public through the use of this range.

5. This range has recreational and historical values that cannot be replaced. Typical inquires to Police Departments and Gun Shops throughout Southern Nevada, about a safe place to shoot, that is open to the public, we refer to the request to visit the range in Boulder City. The Boulder Rifle and Pistol Range will celebrate its 70th anniversary in the year 2003.

Because of the above, I urge careful review of the route for the freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada, as for one where the shooting range in Boulder City is left open, operational and intact.

[Name (print)]
[Signature]
[Address]
[Phone]

Date: 12-26-01

In addition, I have noted full-time events, winter in Boulder City area.
F. COMMENTS RECEIVED BEFORE DEIS RELEASE AND RESPONSES

Dear Sir:

It has come to my attention that one of the proposed routes for the freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada, would result in the closure of the shooting range in Boulder City run by the Boulder Rifle & Pistol Club. I am vehemently opposed to this for the following reasons:

1. There are currently over 300 members of this club, plus hundreds of nonmembers who routinely use this range as a safe, structured area to shoot. Closure of this range would result in many of these people shooting in undesignated desert areas where accidents and injury could occur to others (i.e. ATV riders, dirt-bikers, hikers, etc.). In fact, this is currently the only shooting range in Southern Nevada providing an area open to the general public.

2. This range is a site for formal competitive shooting and the only range capable of hosting, and currently being used for, numerous NRA sponsored shooting matches, including the Nevada State Regional Championship, and the Nevada State Service Rifle Championship held in October 2001, has competitors not just from Nevada, but also Arizona, California, Utah, Wyoming, and even Kentucky. Furthermore, this range is one of the few in the country capable of hosting NRA approved 1000-yard matches.

3. Local law enforcement and police groups use this range for firearms training and small arms marksmanship. Additionally, the "All Guards" marksmanship unit, a team composed of the top shooters in the various state National Guards throughout the country, has started to use this range as part of its training and competition.

4. Various courses and public offerings are made through this range, which are aimed at promoting and securing firearm safety, and are usually offered at no cost to the general public. Typical classes such as the "Home Firearm Safety Class," "Ladies Day at the Range," Father's Day in Days and Youth group participation are examples of previous offers made to the public through the use of this range.

5. This range has recreational and historical values that cannot be replaced. Typical inquiries, in Police Departments and Gun Shops throughout Southern Nevada, about a safe place to shoot, that is open to the public, will result in a recommendation to visit the range in Boulder City. The Boulder Rifle and Pistol Range will celebrate its 70th anniversary in the year 2003.

Because of the above, my support for any type of freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada, is for one where the shooting range in Boulder City is left open, operational and intact.

Name (print)  
Signature  
Address  
Date  

As people need a safe place to shoot, in view of this, they use the desert. Having a controlled range will inevitably cut down on accidents from casual plinking in the desert.
Response to Comment F2-4.2

Comment noted.

I have been informed that one of the proposed routes for the freeway bypass around Boulder City, Nevada, will result in the closure of the shooting range that the Boulder Rifle & Pistol Club currently runs in Boulder City. I understand this a bad idea for the following reasons:

1. Closing this range will displace the 300 club members and countless hundreds of non-members for whom this is the only structured place for them to shoot in southern Nevada. There being NO other public outdoor ranges available, many will move their own ranges, wherever they find "suitable" backdrops. I do not believe this will please the law enforcement agencies of southern Nevada.

2. This range is used for formal competition shooting by a number of different organizations for several different matches, including (but limited to) the Nevada State Regional Championship and the Nevada State Rifle Championship. This is one of the few ranges in the entire country with the facilities for 1000-yard matches.

3. In addition to civilian users, local law enforcement and police departments use the range for training, as does the "All Guard" marksmanship unit, comprised of the top shooters from the various state and National Guard units.

4. The facility is also used by both the Interior Rifle & Pistol Club and the National Rifle Association to conduct safety and shooting courses open to the public. Admittedly, some of these classes can be moved to commercial indoor ranges, but some cannot.

Please use your influence to ensure that whatever bypass route is chosen does not adversely impact the Boulder City rifle range.
December 10, 2001

Tom Greco, P. E.
State of Nevada
Department of Transportation
220 S. Stewart Street
Carson City, Nevada 89712

Dear Sir,

The enclosed letters of protest are in reference to the proposed routing of State Highway 93, in the area South of Boulder City, Nevada. This routing, which is currently under review as a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and is referred to as the Southern Bypass, would cause the Boulder Rifle and Pistol Club, Inc., its members, associates and the general public to lose the use of the rifle and pistol range located along this proposed corridor.

My purpose for sending these letters to you is to make you aware of the strong opposition to any routing of Highway 93 which would cause the loss of this shooting range, which has been in existence for more than 50 years.

You may receive other letters mailed by interested individuals, but these enclosed letters are only the ones collected by the Boulder Rifle and Pistol Club, Inc. Copies of these letters have been made and forwarded to Senator Harry Reid and to Senator Jon Porter, in the hope that this issue will come to their attention before the DEIS is finalized. If there are any questions I can answer or if I can be of any assistance in providing information or answering questions, please contact me at 702-294-2484.

Sincerely,

Harry W. Heirren, treasurer
Boulder Rifle & Pistol Club, Inc

Cc: Senator Harry Reid

Senator Anti-Poll
Response to Comment F4-2.2
Comment and preference noted.

November 29, 2001

Robert Jones
552 Lyon Drive
Henderson, NV 89074

Tom Greco, P.E.
State of Nevada,
Department of Transportation
1263 So. Stewart St.
Carson City, Nevada 89712

Dear Mr. Greco,

I strongly support any freeway route or bypass plan that will preserve the Boulder City shooting range for the reasons in the attached letter. I use the Range about twice a month and estimate that well more than 10,000 different people use the Range every year. A really good number is difficult to obtain since part of the Range is free to the general public and most users are not counted in any way. I personally never see anyone that I recognize from earlier visits on most Saturdays. I would conservatively estimate that on Saturdays alone an average of 160 people are at the Range some time during the day. The Boulder Rifle & Pistol Club Membership only represent a small number of dedicated people who are willing to devote some of their time to keeping the range clean up and making improvements.

As the Las Vegas area grows the use of the range has skyrocketed. You only need to visit the range on a Saturday morning to see the truth in that. Many who come to the range use the public area that the club maintains that is completely free. This area is provided free of charge to the public by the Boulder Rifle & Pistol Club to prevent people from shooting in an unsafe area. There is no other outdoor range where long range shooting is possible in the area that is open to the general public. Closure will result in people shooting in unsafe areas. As an N.R.A. instructor I am very concerned about this possibility. Any future opening of expensive private shooting clubs will not replace the Boulder range. Only one open free to the public can do that.

Sincerely,

Robert Jones
From: Lasko, Michael
Sent: September 26, 2001 5:04 PM
To: UNCO, Tom J./EXT
Subject: RE: Stop the trucks across the Dam

Got it Tom.

Thanks.

---Original Message-----
From: Greco, Tom J.
Sent: September 26, 2001 8:28 AM
To: Lasko, Michael/UNCO
Subject: FW: Stop the trucks across the Dam

Michael, here's a copy of an project email, I put your email address in the return message, but messed it up. Please let me know if it worked or missed you.

Tom Greco PE
NDOT Project Manager
775-688-7317
tgreco@nd.state.nv.us

---Original Message-----
From: Greco, Tom J.
Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2001 8:24 AM
To: Jporter@asmt.state.nv.us; broman@asmt.state.nv.us; codesta@cc.clark.m.us; Greco, Tom J.; mlasko@ch2mhill.com
Cc: Shively, berkley@mail.house.gov; jporter@asmt.state.nv.us; broman@asmt.state.nv.us; codesta@co.clark.m.us; Greco, Tom J.; mlasko@ch2mhill.com
Subject: RE: Stop the trucks across the Dam

Dear Richard and Marge Phegley,

Thank you for sharing your concerns about Boulder City and the Corridor Study.

Your input will now be a part of the record and will be considered by the Project Management Team when making recommendations.

We will also add you to our Project mailing list if you are not currently on it.

Information may be gathered at the project website www.bouldercitystudy.com

A newsletter will be forthcoming in the near future, and the draft EID will be available in November of this year, with a public meeting to follow in December.

If you have any further questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you again for your interest in this important Study.

05/14/2002
Response to Comment F5-6.1

Comment noted.

Since the unfortunate day of 9/11/01, truck traffic has been halted across the Dam. We wish to voice our opinion that it should be halted permanently and made to continue to go through Laughlin. If it has become a safety issue with the Government since that date we wonder have always been one. Although it might cause the truckers more time, it must be safer for everyone else concerned. It also should reduce the length of the trip for passenger cars both ways as they don't have to crew behind a truck go up the grade. It also makes our traffic in Boulder City less hazardous and congested. One could only wonder if anything might have happened or could happen in the future had one of the trucks caught on fire on the Dam instead of at the intersection of Buchanan and Nevada Highways it did recently. This concern is not a new one. We have always felt this way. We also wonder if trucks could be required to use the right hand lane only when not passing or making a left turn. We appreciate your support in this issue. Thank you -

Richard and Marge Phetley, Boulder City Residents

05/14/2002
Response to Comment F6-1.1

Comment noted.

F. COMMENTS RECEIVED BEFORE DEIS RELEASE AND RESPONSES
Additional traffic control by step lites which would increase congestion & noise levels would be eliminated.

2. Aesthetics: Sound barriers would not be required in the proximity of residential areas to attenuate noise. This would benefit area residence & increase tourist traffic aesthetics along the way to Hoover Dam.

3. Air Quality: Diesel trucks increase particulate contamination & carbon monoxide levels for above tourist vehicles.

4. Property Values: Noise levels, local access problem, traffic flow & speed limits would lower property values.

5. Noise Levels: Increased truck traffic increases noise levels to a point that sound attenuation would be required by adjacent residences.

6. Safety: Direct street access to Highway 93 in the Boulder City corridor is a major safety concern now. Trucks compound the problem with slow moving traffic vehicles. Double & Triple trailers hauling heavy loads further increase safety concerns. Without setback service drives to corridor, business establishments the system is currently equated to 'an accident waiting for a place to happen'.

7. Social & Economic Considerations: Reducing truck traffic away from Hoover Dam will enhance an inflow of tourist traffic.

Response to Comment F6-2.3
Comments noted.

Response to Comment F6-4.4
Comment noted.

Response to Comment F6-2.4
Comment noted.

Response to Comment F6-1.2
Comment noted.

Response to Comment F6-4.5
Comment noted.
This will stimulate local business. Non local truckers contribute little to the economic base of Boulder City.

8. Hazardous Waste: Spills are possible with congested truck traffic as a result of car/truck accidents. Nuclear waste trucked to the Yucca Mountain repository will increase over the coming years. Unfortunately the route must cross the river at some point based of NAF1A agreements. A non congested direct crossing point is highly desirable.

Sincerely
Alfred H & Norma R. Radetzky

Response to Comment F6-2.5
Comment noted.
This page intentionally left blank.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A1        | 1.1  | State of Nevada Department of Cultural Affairs, Division of Museums and History, Nevada State Railroad Museum/Boulder City | 4/9/02  | Alternative D is preferred. Alternative D has the least amount of impact to existing homes, businesses, other facilities, and most of all, the state-owned Boulder Branch Railroad line between Railroad Pass and Boulder City. Plans for on- and off-ramps to Boulder City from the new bypass (in the area of Railroad Pass) are sufficient and should provide good uncongested traffic flow for tourist and visitors.  

It is still the position of the Department of Cultural Affairs and the Division of Museums and History to see railroad service re-established to the rest of the Boulder Branch Line in Henderson and Las Vegas, by reopening the railroad crossing at Railroad Pass.  

After reviewing the DEIS, I am satisfied with the information provided in regards to NDOT’s plans to separate the existing railroad tracks (at Railroad Pass) from the new highway grade by constructing a new railroad overpass. Plans and information provided during the open house in regards to the grade separation and Railroad Bridge were very informative and beneficial as well. CH2M HILL provided some excellent visual effects of the railroad bridge and bypass project. |
Summary of Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A2        | 2.1  | United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) | 5/10/02  | **Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit Requirements:**
The DEIS states that the project may qualify for either a Nationwide Permit or an Individual Permit (Clean Water Act Section 404) from the Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for discharge of fill into Waters of the United States (U.S.) (DEIS page 4-47). Because of the cumulative project impacts to Waters of the U.S., it is EPA’s position that this project warrants an Individual Permit. Nationwide Permits for linear transportation projects are limited to those projects with 0.5 acre of impacts or less (33 CFR Section 330B14(a)(1)). Since all of the Build alternatives impact greater than 0.5 acres of Waters of the U.S., an Individual Permit is expected to be required for this project.

The DEIS currently notes that Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines require that the permit applicant (Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] and NDOT) demonstrate that the permitted project represents the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA) and that the permit application would require EPA’s review and concurrence (DEIS page 4-48). EPA is interested in working with FHWA, NDOT, USACE, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to ensure that the Preferred Alternative identified under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is the LEDPA under the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. In EPA’s November 1, 2001, memo on the Wetlands Impacts Technical Study, we recommended that FHWA and NDOT involve EPA, USACE, and USFWS early in the process of identifying the LEDPA. EPA did not receive a response from either FHWA or NDOT.

Recommendation:
- EPA continues to recommend that FHWA and NDOT engage the Resource Agencies in the identification of the LEDPA before the publication of the FEIS, as outlined in the NEPA/Clean Water Act Section 404 Integration Process for Surface Transportation Projects Memorandum of Understanding (NEPA/404 MOU). This early coordination can work to streamline the proposed project and avoid delays in the permitting process.

2.2

**Impacts Minimization and Mitigation:**
The DEIS quantifies impacts to Waters of the U.S. (Table 4-16, page 4-46). It would be appropriate and useful for the DEIS to also include a description of the steps that have been taken with each of the alternatives to avoid and minimize impacts to water resources. In areas where impacts cannot be avoided, compensatory mitigation will likely be required. EPA is willing and available to work with FHWA, NDOT, and USACE to determine the appropriate scope of that mitigation.

Recommendation:
- Include a description of the steps that have been taken with each of the alternatives to avoid and minimize impacts to water resources.
- As part of the coordinated process listed above to identify the LEDPA, EPA recommends that FHWA and NDOT work with EPA and USACE to develop a conceptual mitigation plan for impacts to water resources, as outlined in the NEPA/404 MOU.
### TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.3        |      |           |      | Best Management Practices (BMPs) Monitoring Program:  
The DEIS states that a program will be implemented to monitor the effectiveness of the BMPs utilized in this project (DEIS, page 4-33).  
Recommendation:  
• Because mitigation monitoring tends to be a weak area in environmental protection, please describe the BMP monitoring program that will be implemented for this project. |
| 2.4        |      |           |      | Indirect Effects  
Indirect effects are “caused by the action and are later in time and farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth-inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density, or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems” (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1508.8). EPA is particularly concerned about the potential indirect effects of Alternative D.  
EPA notes that the DEIS discusses the restrictive growth control and zoning ordinances of Boulder City (DEIS, pages 3-88 and 6-20). However, the Alternative D alignment has the potential to effect both the timing and location of future development in Boulder City. Land uses adjacent to Alternative D include “undesignated land uses” (DEIS page 3-88). In addition, Buchanan Boulevard, a major north-south arterial, intersects with Alternative D in an undeveloped area south of Boulder City. A major new freeway bisecting this undeveloped area with an opportunity for an interchange at an existing arterial road sets up conditions that can influence both the timing and location of development, even in a growth-control community.  
Recommendations:  
• Describe the potential for Alternative D to accelerate the timing and influence the location of development in Boulder City, especially in light of the fact that areas in south Boulder City are currently unplanned.  
• Describe the potential for a future interchange at Buchanan Boulevard.  
• If indirect effects are anticipated from development associated with Alternative D, describe the environmental impacts of that development.  
• An update of the Boulder City Master Plan is scheduled for mid to late 2002. Include this updated information in the FEIS if available.  
• The DEIS states that Alternative C would provide increased accessibility to Hemenway Wash (DEIS page 4-66). Similar to the discussion of indirect effects related to Alternative D, clarify whether this “increased accessibility” will effect the timing and location of development in Hemenway Wash. If so, describe the associated environmental impacts of this development. |
**TABLE 2-1-2**  
Summary of Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cumulative Impacts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The DEIS thoroughly discusses past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions in the project study area. The DEIS also identifies potential cumulative impacts, such as impacts to biological resources, air quality, and water resources. Although these cumulative impacts are identified, the DEIS does not propose possible mitigation or responsible entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Council on Environmental Quality’s <em>Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ’s National Environmental Policy Act Regulations</em>, states that it is appropriate to identify all relevant and reasonable mitigation measures, even if they are outside the jurisdiction of the lead agency. This will serve to alert agencies or officials who can implement these extra measures, and will encourage them to do so (<em>Forty Most Asked Questions</em>, 19b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• When cumulative impacts occur, mitigation should be proposed. Clearly state the lead agency’s mitigation responsibilities and the mitigation responsibilities of other entities. The FEIS should include all relevant, reasonable mitigation measures, even if they are outside the jurisdiction of the lead agency or cooperating agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Air Quality – Construction Impacts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The DEIS lists a number of excellent construction mitigation measures for air quality. However, given the negative health effects of particular matter less than 10 microns (PM$_{10}$), and the magnitude of this project, we recommend including the following mitigation measures, as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendations:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify sensitive receptor locations in the project area, such as schools, hospitals, parks, and athletic centers. Schedule construction to avoid and minimize impact to sensitive receptor populations, including children, the elderly, inform, and athletes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce the use of diesel-powered equipment. Include mitigation measures that detail how diesel emissions will be minimized for each phase of project construction, especially in sensitive receptor locations. For example, require contractors to keep the equipment fine-tuned, avoid idling, and use alternative fueled vehicles when feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recycled Materials, Materials Reuse, and Recycling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Section 60002 requires federal, state, local agencies, and their contractors, that use appropriated federal funds to purchase EPA-designated recycled materials, including EPA-designated transportation, construction, and landscaping products. In addition, EPA supports deconstruction and materials reuse in projects where existing structures are removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendations:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Commit to materials reuse, where appropriate and feasible, and include a commitment to the Buy-Recycled requirements. For further details, please see EPA’s web site at <a href="http://www.epa.gov/cpg">http://www.epa.gov/cpg</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.8       |      |           |         | Invasive Species  
Executive Order (EO) 13112 on Invasive Species calls for the restoration of native plant and tree species. To the extent that this project will entail new landscaping, the EIS should describe how the project will meet the requirements of EO 13112 by using native species. |
| A3 2.9    |      | State of Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources Division of Wildlife (NDOW) | 5/10/02 | In consideration of the build alternatives found in the DEIS, we concur that Alternative B will have the least associated impacts. In view of Alternative C, primary concerns center on impacts to wildlife populations and habitat in the southeast portion of the River Mountains north and west of Canyon and Industrial Roads. Lastly, Alternative D will incur the greatest irreversible impacts to wildlife inhabiting the slopes and mountainous terrain in the west Eldorado Mountains. |
| 2.10      |      |           |         | Portions of the DEIS greatly concern us relative to appreciation of the magnitude and significance that anticipated impacts will have on wildlife resources in consideration of local, regional, short-term, and long-term scales. |
Bighorn Sheep
Bighorn sheep are intensively managed in Nevada. Bighorn conservation is difficult in large part because the species requires large areas and is susceptible to disease-induced die-offs. A confounding factor is that regional population sizes are generally small, less than 100 individuals. The present estimate of desert bighorn in Nevada is 5,300. In view of the many small herds, a meaningful safeguard the Division has adopted in overall efforts to conserve bighorn is to maintain the few remaining large populations. Periodic population surveys are used to monitor population trend. Efforts to repatriate historic bighorn habitat were largely successful in the latter half of the 1900s using strategically placed water developments often followed up by trapping and transplant operations. These efforts were successful only when sufficient land base was available and land-use conflicts were negligible for self-sustaining populations. Hence, recommendations concerning bighorn habitat have been and are at the core of conservation discussions.

During the mid 1980s, Clark County supported the only three bighorn populations exceeding 300 individuals in Nevada, one of which was the Eldorado Mountains herd. Another three populations numbered in the range of 200 to 300. Today, only the Muddy Mountains herd in Clark County numbers more than 300 individuals in the state. Since 1985, the Eldorado Mountains herd has declined from an estimated 370 adults to the present number of 220 adults.

Concern for persistence of the Eldorado Mountains bighorn population stems from an already unacceptable level of mortality attributable to collisions with vehicles on U.S. 93. The Eldorado Mountains bighorn population has been on a downward trend since the latter half of the 1990s; roadway mortality involving ewes and lambs is the principal causative factor. The Division anticipates that augmentation of transportation routes in the project area will exacerbate an already serious situation.

We expect that the direct impacts consequential to any of the DEIS’ build alternatives coupled with the highly interrelated Hoover Dam Bypass project and existing U.S. 93 (Hacienda Hotel to Hoover Dam segment) will accelerate the existing threat to long-term viability of the bighorn sheep population inhabiting the Eldorado Mountains.

The continued viability of the Eldorado Mountains bighorn population is crucial in a broader context. Elsewhere in Clark County, historic bighorn movement corridors have become formidable barriers and hazards. For example, we previously commented on the situation at Railroad Pass precluding bighorn movement between the McCullough Range and River Mountains. Coincident to regional improvements in transportation routes have been changing patterns of localized and regional land uses. These fast-paced, landscape level changes in Clark County continue to challenge the Division’s ability to assure self-sustaining bighorn persistence in Clark County. An escalation in roadway mortalities and further habitat degradation and fragmentation as a result of the DEIS’ build alternatives and the Hoover Dam Bypass would pose irreversible impacts to the Eldorado population. Time frames for the Eldorado bighorn herd to reach its critical population threshold would be influenced by which alternatives were selected as final project designs for each of the respective transportation projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.11       |      |           |      | Bighorn Sheep
Bighorn sheep are intensively managed in Nevada. Bighorn conservation is difficult in large part because the species requires large areas and is susceptible to disease-induced die-offs. A confounding factor is that regional population sizes are generally small, less than 100 individuals. The present estimate of desert bighorn in Nevada is 5,300. In view of the many small herds, a meaningful safeguard the Division has adopted in overall efforts to conserve bighorn is to maintain the few remaining large populations. Periodic population surveys are used to monitor population trend. Efforts to repatriate historic bighorn habitat were largely successful in the latter half of the 1900s using strategically placed water developments often followed up by trapping and transplant operations. These efforts were successful only when sufficient land base was available and land-use conflicts were negligible for self-sustaining populations. Hence, recommendations concerning bighorn habitat have been and are at the core of conservation discussions. During the mid 1980s, Clark County supported the only three bighorn populations exceeding 300 individuals in Nevada, one of which was the Eldorado Mountains herd. Another three populations numbered in the range of 200 to 300. Today, only the Muddy Mountains herd in Clark County numbers more than 300 individuals in the state. Since 1985, the Eldorado Mountains herd has declined from an estimated 370 adults to the present number of 220 adults. Concern for persistence of the Eldorado Mountains bighorn population stems from an already unacceptable level of mortality attributable to collisions with vehicles on U.S. 93. The Eldorado Mountains bighorn population has been on a downward trend since the latter half of the 1990s; roadway mortality involving ewes and lambs is the principal causative factor. The Division anticipates that augmentation of transportation routes in the project area will exacerbate an already serious situation. We expect that the direct impacts consequential to any of the DEIS’ build alternatives coupled with the highly interrelated Hoover Dam Bypass project and existing U.S. 93 (Hacienda Hotel to Hoover Dam segment) will accelerate the existing threat to long-term viability of the bighorn sheep population inhabiting the Eldorado Mountains. The continued viability of the Eldorado Mountains bighorn population is crucial in a broader context. Elsewhere in Clark County, historic bighorn movement corridors have become formidable barriers and hazards. For example, we previously commented on the situation at Railroad Pass precluding bighorn movement between the McCullough Range and River Mountains. Coincident to regional improvements in transportation routes have been changing patterns of localized and regional land uses. These fast-paced, landscape level changes in Clark County continue to challenge the Division’s ability to assure self-sustaining bighorn persistence in Clark County. An escalation in roadway mortalities and further habitat degradation and fragmentation as a result of the DEIS’ build alternatives and the Hoover Dam Bypass would pose irreversible impacts to the Eldorado population. Time frames for the Eldorado bighorn herd to reach its critical population threshold would be influenced by which alternatives were selected as final project designs for each of the respective transportation projects. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Desert Tortoise</td>
<td></td>
<td>In addition to protection afforded under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and conservation concern stated in the DEIS, the desert tortoise is a State protected reptile and further classified as threatened per Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 501.110 and Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 503.080, 503.090, and 503.093. Collection, transportation, or killing is prohibited without prior written authorization from the Division. The process outlined in the DEIS relating to section 7 ESA consultation with the Service is adequate to meet Division needs. Regardless of findings in the Biological Assessment (BA) or Biological Opinion (BO), written authorization will be required from the state in addition to any other federal authorization should collection, removal, translocation, or similar activity be appropriate consequential to one of the build alternatives moving forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Banded Gila Monster</td>
<td></td>
<td>This species is rarely observed relative to other species and is the primary reason for its Protected classification by the State of Nevada. The U.S. Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has recognized this lizard as a sensitive species since 1978. The lizard is considered a species of concern by USFWS. Most recently, the Gila monster was designated as an Evaluation species under Clark County’s Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The designation was warranted because inadequate information exists to determine if mitigation facilitated by the MSHCP would demonstrably cover conservation actions necessary to insure the species’ persistence without protective intervention as provided under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). Found mainly below 5,000 feet elevation, its geographic distribution in Nevada approximates that of the desert tortoise. Habitat requirements center on desert wash, spring, and riparian habitats that interdigitate primarily with complex rocky landscapes of upland desert scrub. Hence, Gila monster habitat bridges and overlaps that of both the desert tortoise and chuckwalla. Gila monsters are secretive and difficult to locate, spending greater than 90 percent of their lives underground. They make use of deep crevices and caves of primarily rocky slopes for winter and summer refugia. When active, they frequent animal burrows and other shallow refugia on more gentle slopes. Foraging Gila monsters seek nestlings of ground or low-shrub nesting birds (e.g., doves, quail), rodents (e.g., mice, kangaroo rats), and lagomorphs (e.g., cottontail) which are found in highest concentration in higher productivity areas, such as along well vegetated wash courses of bajadas. Scant information exists for this lizard’s distribution and relative abundance in Nevada. The Division is investigating the species’ status and distribution, hence additional distribution, habitat, and biological information is of utmost interest. Recently compiled site localities further validate the species presence in the project area (e.g., the habitat delineation depicted in DEIS Figure 3-3 is accurate for the transportation corridor evaluation). Should a project alternative move forward, then Division requests the project proponent to assist in gathering additional information about gila monsters in Nevada (i.e., at minimum the Division will be notified whenever a gila monster is encountered during construction activities). We can provide protocol detailing the documentation procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Chuckwalla, Burrowing Owl, and Peregrine Falcon</td>
<td></td>
<td>The considerations outlined in the DEIS for minimizing and mitigating impacts should be adequate. Should the project move forward, we should be consulted, in addition to USFWS, regarding additional considerations for migratory birds and raptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Species Noted and Their Relationship to Clark County MSHCP</td>
<td></td>
<td>To our understanding, the Clark County MSHCP provides for incidental take of species where conservation actions for the same occurring in Clark County offset the need for protection under the federal ESA, even should such a listing be warranted elsewhere. Species for where adequate information and conservation measures are in place to allow incidental take are known as covered species. The MSHCP is an insurance policy against future listing under the federal ESA. It does not usurp other regulatory authority. Of the species in the DEIS provided special consideration, only the desert tortoise, chuckwalla, peregrine falcon, long-legged myotis, long-eared myotis, and silver-haired bat are covered species in the Clark County MSHCP. The DEIS could benefit by providing the list of species covered under the Clark County MSHCP and clarifying the benefits of the Clark County MSHCP, if any, have to the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study. Because the desert bighorn sheep and banded gila monster are not covered and are under the authority of the Division, we foresee the need to discuss additional mitigation for these species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Alternative D: Highway Crossing Structures and Fence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Further study of the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor in preparation for completion of the FEIS must involve coordination with the Division and other knowledgeable entities. A thorough analysis of Alternative D should include highway crossing structures for bighorn sheep and other wildlife. Crossing structures from the onset should be included in project design. Minimizing roadway mortalities and facilitating use of highway crossing structures will necessarily involve fencing the alignment. Input from the Division relative to fence placement and design specifications will aid in designing structure systems benefiting wildlife. Costs should be reflected in the total cost of the project, and not considered an add-on cost to be held at a minimum in the post-design phase. In accommodating bighorn sheep movements, FHWA and NDOT should be prepared to design, construct, and put in place various types of structures including but not limited to bridges, underpasses, overpasses, culverts, and cattle guards to minimize impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>Alternatives B and C: Highway Crossing Structures and Fence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bighorn sheep movements between the River Mountains and the Eldorado Mountains need to be considered in Alternatives B and C. The alignments should be fenced from Hemenway Valley/Wash to the east end of the project area. Design and placement of bighorn sheep crossing structures should be coordinated with the Division. In the Hemenway Valley/Wash area, FHWA and NDOT should be prepared to design and construct various types of structures including bridges, underpasses, overpasses, culverts, and cattle guards. Crossing structures and fencing should be reflected in the total costs of the projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Acreage Associated with Construction Impacts</td>
<td>5/23/02</td>
<td>Impacts are estimated between 327 and 679 acres depending on which of the build alternatives is selected. With respect to wildlife and habitat we respectfully disagree. The DEIS is correct in pointing out that raised rights-of-way will result in alteration of sheet flow hydrology consequential to precipitation. Culverts, water bars, and the roadway berm will redirect water from historical natural routes. The significance of this outcome is best exemplified in Alternative D. Vegetation downstream of the proposed route will be starved of water over the long term. Studies elsewhere have shown that local vegetative community productivity and diversity are likely to change over the long term. We anticipate that most wildlife associated with these impacted communities will not benefit, hence, lowering the area's overall habitat value and perhaps viability. It may be worthwhile to re-evaluate the downstream impacts and include such analyses in overall acreage estimates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>United States Department of the Interior</td>
<td>5/23/02</td>
<td>It is our understanding that the consultation process has not been completed. This is an important process including federal land managers who must fulfill these obligations. We note that there are a number of potential effects on archaeological, historical, and cultural resources. The Lake Mead National Recreation Area (LMNRA) staff is available to participate in the required consultation process, as scheduled by the State or FHWA. The outcome of this consultation needs to be presented and fully considered in the evaluation of alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of the Army</td>
<td>6/26/02</td>
<td>Late last year, CH2M HILL was provided with National Park Service (NPS) directives entitled Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis and Decision Making. A specific process was reviewed with CH2M HILL directing all parks to make determinations on whether external proposals, if implemented, could result in impairment to values or resources that they are established to protect. National parks are prohibited from allowing activities that will impair park values and resources. We understand that this analysis, relative to the Lake Mead National Recreation Area (LMNRA), has yet to be completed. It is understood that a draft will be provided to NPS in order to make an initial determination in the near future. Until these activities [Comments 2.19 and 2.20] are completed, we cannot conclude our determination as to which alternative may be preferred, nor that all prudent and reasonable measures to minimize harm to Section 4(f) resources have been employed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>Department of the Army</td>
<td>5/23/02</td>
<td>The isolated, intrastate, ephemeral drainages flowing to Eldorado Valley and the isolated wetlands maintained by the treatment plant effluent (primarily crossed by Alternative D) are not waters of the U.S. because they are not: 1) “Navigable Waters of the U.S.;” 2) interstate waters; 3) part of a tributary system to (1) or (2); 4) wetlands adjacent to any of the preceding; and 5) impoundments of any of the preceding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of the Army</td>
<td>6/26/02</td>
<td>We concur with your delineation of waters of the U.S. affected by the project except as noted above. These areas are regulated by this office under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of the Army</td>
<td>5/23/02</td>
<td>Activities involving discharges of dredged and fill material below the ordinary high water marks of these jurisdictional waters will require a Department of the Army permit. We suggest careful scrutiny of nationwide general permit number 14.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCO/DRD1140.DOC/ 042330014

G-9
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>United States Department of the Interior National Park Service (NPS)</td>
<td>7/22/02</td>
<td>NPS conducted an internal [impairment analysis] to determine whether or not the build alternatives would result in “impairment” to park resources. It did identify four resource categories where the anticipated impacts of Alternative D are considered “major” within LMNRA. These resource categories include land use, wildlife (bighorn sheep and desert tortoise), soundscape, and air quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>United States Department of the Interior National Park Service (NPS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NPS will pursue *all reasonable steps to minimize the harm: in compliance with Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966. We anticipate NDOT and FHWA will work collaboratively with NPS and other PMT agencies to see the resource values of LMNRA are properly protected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A3. IMPLEMENTATION AND CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>State of Nevada Department of Cultural Affairs, Division of Museums and History, Nevada State Railroad Museum/Boulder City</td>
<td>4/9/02</td>
<td>What the DEIS and the Public Hearing did not address are what NDOT intends to do in reference to the existing railroad crossing at Hwy. 93/95, Railroad Pass (discussion with Mr. Michael Lasko, CH2M HILL). After reviewing plans and information provided during the open house, all indications are that the existing highway (93/95) will become a two-lane road connecting with the Boulder Highway in Henderson. To successfully re-establish the state (Division of Museums and History) owned railroad to the rest of the Boulder Branch Line in Henderson/Las Vegas, it will be necessary to remove the existing asphalt. Also, modifications will need to be addressed to the existing automatic warning (currently not in use) devices to meet required safety protection for the new two-lane road between Railroad Pass and Henderson. I would request that this issue be addressed in the final version of the EIS for the Boulder City Corridor Study. Note: Of course this would not be an issue should NDOT decide to dead end the current highway at the Railroad Pass Hotel Casino. Therefore, I would request NDOT not create a frontage road connecting to Henderson. This would eliminate a major safety issue for both agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>City of Boulder City</td>
<td>5/23/02</td>
<td>At their regularly scheduled Council meeting of May 14, 2002, the City Council passed a resolution recommending that Alternative D be selected as the preferred alternative for the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study. Council does understand that for Alternative D there would be an interchange in the vicinity of Railroad Pass Hotel and Casino with the current designated U.S. 93 roadway, interchange at U.S. 95, and an interchange in the vicinity of the Hacienda Hotel and Casino or connection to the Hoover Dam Bypass project. Our City Council does understand that an interchange is not proposed on Alternative D for the Buchanan Boulevard extension and currently the City has no interest or plan for requesting a proposed interchange at this location. The City does believe that it is desirable to provide a means for emergency access to the Alternative D alignment in the vicinity of the Buchanan Boulevard extension. Emergency access for police and other emergency response personnel would improve response time by an estimated 10 minutes to the southern portion of the Alternative D alignment. The City would also agree that emergency response should include Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) personnel. Not only is the Mead substation a significant regional power facility but is also the City’s primary source of power. Access to the Mead substation was not possible during and after the storm of 1997. It is an estimated 11 miles of roadway between the planned interchange with U.S. 95 and planned interchange with the Hoover Dam Bypass project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Park Place Entertainment</td>
<td>5/17/02</td>
<td>Park Place Entertainment, a corporate citizen of Boulder City, is pleased to join with the members of the Boulder City Council and Boulder City residents in support of Alternative D, the Southern Bypass, as the preferred route in the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study. Park Place operates the Cascata golf course in Boulder City, which represents an investment of tens of millions of dollars and is generally regarded to rank among the 100 finest golf courses in the world. Operation of this facility contributes hundreds of thousands of dollars each year to the Boulder City treasury. The entrance to the course is at the intersection of U.S. 93/95. After thorough review of the highway alignments under consideration, we have come to the conclusion that the through-town alignments, Alternatives B and C, pose a serious threat to our current golf course operations in Boulder City. Only one alternative under consideration would alleviate Boulder City's growing traffic problems without having a negative impact on our operations: Alternative D. Further, Alternative D would correct a serious public safety problem at the U.S. 93/95 intersection. We strongly support the collective position of Boulder City Major Bob Ferraro and all the members of the Boulder City Council, as expressed publicly at their April 23, 2002, City Council meeting, that Route D merits selection as the preferred route in the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>AhaMakav Cultural Society Fort Mojave Indian Tribe</td>
<td>3/28/02</td>
<td>The AhaMakav Cultural Society, which is the Historic and Cultural Preservation Office of the Fort Mojave Tribe, has received and reviewed the subject document, and we cannot comment on the presence or absence of cultural resources in the area of potential effect (APE) of the proposed undertaking until we receive and review the appropriate cultural resource inventory (archaeological survey) reports. We in all likelihood will recommend that Alternative D be eliminated from consideration. We also disagree strongly with the artificial separation by FHWA of this undertaking from the Hoover Dam Bypass Project, in regard to interpretation of Section 106 of the National Preservation Act, and NEPA. We require for our review and comment, copies of: 1) A Cultural Resource Investigation of Proposed Routes for the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor, (Parts I and II), by Lynda M. Blair and Jeffrey Wedding of the Harry Reid Center for Environmental Studies, and 2) Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study Historic Structures Survey, Volumes 1&amp;2, by Associated Cultural Resource Experts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
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<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Boulder City Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The Boulder City Chamber of Commerce has completed an independent survey concerning the U.S. 93/Boulder City Corridor. The survey was conducted from a list of licenses provided by the city of all Boulder City businesses. Questions asked the Boulder City business community: 1) if they had received enough valid information from the chamber, the city, and other information organizations to make an informed decision, 2) how it would affect them as a business as well as residents, 3) and finally which route they preferred. The majority of respondents felt they were well informed and strongly supported Alternate D/the Southern route traveling south of town. As these and other traffic issues, impacted partially by the growth in the Las Vegas Valley, the tourist attractions of Las Vegas, we well as Lake Mead and our historic community, will continue to dominate us the next few years, we would like to join with the city in helping to solve these issues by first supporting Alternate D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Nancy Barlow</td>
<td>3/30/02</td>
<td>I vote for Alternative D. I have been very happy to not have all the big trucks through town for the past 6 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Dr. Daniel Benyshek</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Without additional highway development, any of the three proactive U.S. 93 corridor proposals will simply worsen the traffic bottleneck at Hoover Dam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Richard J. Bravo</td>
<td>5/9/02</td>
<td>Energy Use (Operational) Alternative B – 15,700 gallons of fuel used during a 2027 peak hour. Alternative C – 16,660 gallons of fuel used during a 2027 peak hour. Alternative D – 18,504 gallons of fuel used during a 2027 peak hour. The 15 percent to 18 percent higher fuel consumption under Alternative D is supposedly negated by delay time reduction and &quot;indirect and circulation benefits.&quot; These factors apply to all alternatives, and D is clearly the worst choice for energy consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Joe Cain for Mark Garrity</td>
<td>4/8/02</td>
<td>I don’t care what NDOT builds, so long as they widen the 18 inches of pavement between the 18-wheelers and a 20-foot drop into desert as I ride my bike down to Lake Mead. I just want a bike path.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Christina Casey</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>Alternative C will make it easier to get on and off the freeway. I am in favor of Alternative C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D as it will make it more difficult to go out into the desert.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Comments
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C26</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Christina Casey</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am in favor of Alternative C because it will preserve my access to the desert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Lindy Casey</td>
<td>5/9/02</td>
<td>The Southern Bypass (Alternative D) is NOT a route through Laughlin. It is a freeway that wraps around Boulder City to the south of town coming within 1 mile of populated areas of our community and cutting off or restricting our access to the desert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Lindy Casey</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am in favor of Alternative C because it includes a frontage road and ramps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it will restrict access to the desert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C31</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Lindy Casey</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am in favor of Alternative C because it keeps the bypass in the area of the current bypass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C33</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Lindy Casey</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am in favor of Alternative C because it will assist in controlling traffic that does enter Boulder City and then continues on to the lake or the dam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C34</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Jane Cheek</td>
<td>4/5/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the only route that will not cut Boulder City in half. It would provide a better corridor for existing and future demands along U.S. 93. It will reduce traffic problems in Boulder City and make it much safer. We have a rental on Birch Street, with one-way alley next to old Los Angeles Department of Water and Power building. When I came down Nevada Highway and passed the signal at Buchanan, cars were backed up from there to the stop sign at Wyoming. How is my new renter from New Jersey going to like that? Creeping along to get to his alley, and traffic will only get worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Nick Christensen</td>
<td>3/18/02</td>
<td>I am writing to express my strong support for Alternative C. Currently, the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) is working to make U.S. 93 a divided highway between Interstate 40 (I-40) and the outer limits of urban Phoenix, and I’m sure there are plans in the works (unofficially, if not officially) to improve the U.S. 93/I-40 interchange in Kingman. This leaves only the Boulder City stretch as the last segment of undivided road along the entire corridor. This must change. Alternative A is simply unacceptable, as stated clearly by level of service (LOS) statistics and projections in Table 1-2B [of the DEIS]. Alternative B is simply an upgraded version of Alternative A, not doing anything to solve the problem of putting traffic from an important regional highway on suburban surface streets. Alternative D disrupts far too much untouched environment and has unreasonable grades through the Black Mountains south of the Hacienda Hotel. Therefore, this leaves Alternative C, which not only improves the roadway to a road capable of handling regional traffic, but does not significantly degrade the quality of living that residents of Boulder City have come to love and expect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I suggest that the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) be consulted as part of this project to ensure that it is built to Interstate standards. While ADOT has made it quite clear that they have no intention of upgrading U.S. 93 to an Interstate highway, we in Nevada should at least do our part to make sure the work is done should the day come when the Phoenix-Las Vegas corridor is upgraded to Interstate status and at least work to extend Interstate 515 (I-515) into Arizona so that some of the work is done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C43</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>Patricia J. Culler</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I believe Alternative D makes the most sense. I live near the intersection of Nevada Highway and U.S. 93 in Boulder City. Since the tragedy of September 11, truck traffic has been diverted from crossing Hoover Dam. As a result, the decrease in the noise, air pollution, and traffic has been very noticeable. I can honestly say that the quality of my life in Boulder City has been greatly improved since the trucks and some traffic have been diverted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C44</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Thomas C. Culler, Jr.</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I believe Alternative D makes the most sense. I live near the intersection of Nevada Highway and U.S. 93 in Boulder City. Since the tragedy of September 11, truck traffic has been diverted from crossing Hoover Dam. As a result, the decrease in the noise, air pollution, and traffic has been very noticeable. I can honestly say that the quality of my life in Boulder City has been greatly improved since the trucks and some traffic have been diverted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C52</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>Caroline Dykstra</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it will restrict access to the desert. I am in favor of Alternative C because it will preserve the desert and my access to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C54</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Donald Gildner Mackie B. Gildner</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I believe Alternative D makes the most sense. I live near the intersection of Nevada Highway and U.S. 93 in Boulder City. Since the tragedy of September 11, truck traffic has been diverted from crossing Hoover Dam. As a result, the decrease in the noise, air pollution, and traffic has been very noticeable. I can honestly say that the quality of my life in Boulder City has been greatly improved since the trucks and some traffic have been diverted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C55</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Christine A. Goodwin</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>Yes, I agree that there is a traffic problem; however, detouring potential visitors away from the area would not be beneficial. I have looked into the different possibilities for a bypass, and I believe that Alternative C would be the most beneficial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C56</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Alfred L. Hartig</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I disagree of the whole concept at this time. Since the 9/11 attack on the Twin Towers in New York City, no trucks are permitted to cross the Hoover Dam. The traffic on U.S. 93 has diminished appraisably due to the detour of trucks headed to Kingman and points east and south. Until the bridge spanning the Colorado River that is planned and is in place, I think it is foolish to plan improvements to U.S. 93. I see no sense in planning a route dead ending at the casino on U.S. 93. Even though it is owned by the family of a federal senator. It certainly won't bring any more business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C59</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Esther Holland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I believe Alternative D makes the most sense. I live near the intersection of Nevada Highway and U.S. 93 in Boulder City. Since the tragedy of September 11, truck traffic has been diverted from crossing Hoover Dam. As a result, the decrease in the noise, air pollution, and traffic has been very noticeable. I can honestly say that the quality of my life in Boulder City has been greatly improved since the trucks and some traffic have been diverted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C61</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Korda</td>
<td>5/2/02</td>
<td>Please do not split our town in half. Designation D is the answer. Why destroy some people and businesses’ life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C65</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>Robert Merrell</td>
<td>4/24/02</td>
<td>Both Alternative B and Alternative C routes will result in bringing the trucks back into town. The construction of either of these alternatives will likewise cause disruption of our community for 5 years or longer. Alternative B is an improvement of existing U.S. 93 from Railroad Pass to Buchanan Boulevard with a 4-lane divided highway through Hemenway Valley. The section between Veterans Memorial Drive to Buchanan Boulevard will be a 7-lane arterial roadway with raised medians and/or left-turn lanes. A new stoplight will be added at Yucca Street. The average speeds are predicted to increase from 37 to 57 miles per hour (mph). Five businesses along this section will either have to move or close down, as the right-of-way to accommodate this alternative will require it. Alternative C will result in a 4-lane through-town freeway from Railroad Pass to the Dam, which will pass through the northern part of our city. Sound walls 8 to 14 feet will be necessary to mitigate the expected increase in noise from the trucks and increasing traffic predicted in years to come. This alternative will result in the loss of some of the hiking and biking trails of the River Mountains Loop Trail and leave an ugly scar along the base of the beautiful red mountain area with a large road that bisects our community in half.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C67</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Joe Miller</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am in favor of Alternative C because it will be easier to get on and off the freeway. Alternative D is the only choice that will keep the trucks and through traffic out of our city for good. It will not result in increased noise for any residential area in the city, including the southern part. Noise levels for the majority of the city are predicted to actually decrease with this alternative. Although there will be some economic impact on our city, the DEIS was unable to predict any long-term significant impact with this alternative. This choice does not result in the loss of businesses or residents presently established. Alternative D provides for the safest route around our community for hazardous material to be transported, and allows Boulder City to maintain the quiet unique town most of us have chosen to live here for. My family and I strongly support Alternative D as the one and only solution to the traffic problems that plague Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C69</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>Joe Miller</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it will make it harder for me to go out into the desert. I am for Alternative C because that’s where the road to the lake is and it should stay there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C81</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>Richard and Margaret Phegley</td>
<td>3/29/02</td>
<td>We believe that Alternative D should be built with only entrances and exits at Railroad Pass and the Hacienda Hotel. No other exits or entrances, such as Buchanan and Nevada Highway. It should also be sunken, if possible, to cut out the noise such as Interstate 215 (I-215) through Henderson. We do not want to see those ugly sound walls they put along I-215 through Henderson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C81</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>Richard and Margaret Phegley</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it will make it harder for me to go out into the desert.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C91</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>Mike and Debby Scholl</td>
<td>4/8/02</td>
<td>We are residents of our historical town of Boulder City. We have been, and still are absolutely appalled at the idea of running the corridor traffic directly through our town. If anyone directly involved in making any kind of decision actually lived in Boulder City, for any length of time, they would without a doubt be against having the corridor come directly through town. We are a peacefully quiet and clean community with pride and commitment to keeping it that way. Bringing more traffic, as well as noise and pollution from the large number of trucks that will pass through on the corridor, will definitely destroy what we value most. Please do not destroy the very reasons why many of us have chosen to live here. Alternative D should be the only plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C92</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>Mary Shope</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>The DEIS does NOT integrate data and the environmental assessment if and when Alternative D is approved and traffic continues through Boulder City on the existing highways. Therefore, the conclusions in Table ES-1 – Summary of Impacts and Mitigation – are inaccurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C93</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>Mike Sitton</td>
<td>No date</td>
<td>A letter in last week’s edition muddled the most important issues regarding the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study and arrived at conclusions that have no basis in fact. The writer suggested that Route D would result in a corridor lined with fast food establishments, gas stations, etc. This type of situation is exactly what Route D would avoid. A review of the DEIS shows clearly that Route D’s only ingress and egress points are at the extreme ends of the bypass far from the developed areas of the city. Route D, therefore, would foreclose any opportunity for pass-through drivers and truckers to exit in the middle of town. Lest there be any doubt, the study states clearly, on the very page cited in last week’s letter, that “because no access would be available along Alternative D, a shift in traffic-related commercial development would not be anticipated.” When the study explains why long-term adverse impacts are unlikely, nothing that uses of the “corridor” would change, it is talking about the existing corridor. What the study says is if the Southern Bypass were built, new types of businesses catering to locals and destination travelers would, over time, replace the traffic-related businesses along the present through town road. If U.S. 93 stays in the middle of town, increased traffic in the coming years would result in more and more freeway-related businesses popping up in town, rotting Boulder City’s ambiance from the inside out. Therefore, a closer look at the DEIS reveals that the through-town routes would have the exact result last week’s writer is trying to avoid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C95</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>Bill Smith</td>
<td>3/19/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the only reasonable alternative. At least 99 percent of the vehicles on this section of U.S. 93 have no interest in Boulder City. Alternative D does not impede traffic as does any of the other alternatives. At least 99 percent of the residents of Boulder City derive no benefit from traffic through town. Alternative D solves the traffic problem with virtually no adverse impact on Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C98</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>Ron and Mary Jane Therrien</td>
<td>4/3/02</td>
<td>We are residents of Bella Vista in Boulder City, and we want to express to you our strong support for Alternative D as the least disruptive and safest alternative for all residents of Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C102</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>John F. Wiles</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>The EIS does not address or consider the impacts of on/off-ramps. Each route should be considered and compared using likely on/off-ramp sites. If Alternative D is built, the likelihood of continued traffic along existing routes is not fully evaluated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C108</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>Ronald B. McAlister</td>
<td>4/29/02</td>
<td>Commercial trucking not only presents an extreme danger to the security of Hoover Dam now and in the future, but will destroy the pristine beauty of this National Recreational Area through both noise and increased air pollution. As you must be aware, Hoover Dam has two large intakes directly in front of the Dam. In a matter of minutes, with weapons that could have easily been setup inside a large truck, these intakes could be destroyed. If the intakes to Hoover Dam are destroyed, this would cut off electricity to a large portion of the Southwest U.S. It would take years to reconstruct the intakes and a major federal expenditure. Is this worth the risk?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Scott Lee Baranoff, M.D., F.A.C.S.</td>
<td>3/28/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is really the only salient choice for Boulder City. This is so, in that it would keep the traffic noise out of the residential parts of Boulder City and diminish noise pollution for the residents. This choice also does not result in the loss of businesses or residences, which may occur with the other alternatives. It is also the safest route around the city with the least chance of automobile accidents and the safest route to transport hazardous materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Dr. Daniel Benyshek</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the only alternative that appears to be able to protect the quality of life that so many Boulder City residents, such as myself, cherish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am concerned that Alternative D might disturb or limit access to sites in the Eldorado Mountains, which may be of cultural significance to the Las Vegas Band of Southern Paiute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Hal Berghel</td>
<td>5/2/02</td>
<td>Those who moved along U.S. 93 did so knowing full well that they were moving alongside a heavily used highway. Those of us who moved on the south side of Boulder City did so because they thought they were moving to the quiet desert environs. The “coalition” effort reminds me of the people who built homes in Playa del Rey under the takeoff path of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), and then later sued LAX over the noise pollution. It seemed lost on some that LAX was there before the homes. The same applies for the homes along U.S. 93. The fact that this “coalition” is throwing a lot of money at this effort makes me even more suspicious of the motives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Eldorado Valley remains pristine but for the inevitable power lines. The proposed southern route destroys the natural beauty of the Valley. This is not to mention the noise and dust pollution it will cause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Cokie Booth</td>
<td>No date</td>
<td>Alternative D does not send six lanes of traffic through town. It does not allow sound barriers and overpasses to destroy the view people have of the mountains and lake. It will allow the Hemenway Valley to remain open and spacious.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With Alternative D, no one would be disturbed, have to put up with noise pollution, dust pollution, or traffic tie-up. Hazardous truck accidents will not happen next to residential homes. We have had several accidents where large trucks with hazardous materials crashed in town and near homes. This will allow hazmat to contain a spill and not have to worry about the human aspect. This will also allow us residents to sleep easier if the trucks did not bring hazardous material past our homes daily. If nuclear waste does come to Nevada, I do not want it that close to my home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard J. Bravo 5/9/02</td>
<td>Fifteen separate areas of environmental impact were investigated in the DEIS. The negative impacts of Alternative D are clearly greater than those of B or C in 10 of these areas (Air Quality, Noise, Biology/Threatened Species, Water Resources, Wetlands/Waters of the U.S., Floodplains, Land Use/Section 4(f), Visual, Economic, and Energy Use). In the remaining five areas, the impact is either nearly the same for all alternatives or there is no significant effect on the environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Page 4-9 (of the DEIS) states that the homes on Georgia will have 41 dBA noise levels when Alternative D is operational. That is down from about 75 dBA on the freeway just 0.8 mile away. You may be right, but I could not find any justification in the DEIS. Also, the statement &quot;Such levels are below existing...levels&quot; is made. This implies that if we want a quieter neighborhood, all we need to do is go build a 65-mph highway about 0.8 mile away. If this statement is intentional, it needs some backup. The DEIS states that the &quot;B&quot; Hill/San Felipe residential area is 1.5 miles from U.S. 93/D. The horse corrals are much closer than that and could be exposed to excessive noise. There is always somebody in the corral area and many times there is quite a crowd. This area should be considered in the DEIS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.10       |      |           |        | Air Quality  
Alternative B – No problem.  
Alternative C – No problem.  
Alternative D – No problem; note: a carbon monoxide (CO) analysis at Buchanan and U.S. 93 seems meaningless for this alternative.  
The wind blows into the City mainly from the south. Alternative D puts traffic-caused air pollutants into the air south of the City where it will usually blow up into town. Both B and C put these pollutants into the air on the north side of the City. An example: The western part of Los Angeles is relatively smog-free because the prevailing wind is from the west. |
<table>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Alternative B – Mixed increases (some exceed NAC before mitigation) and some decreases. Alternative C – Some increases which approach NAC before mitigation with 8- to 14-foot barriers as for Alternative B. Alternative D – Decreased in developed Boulder City areas. B and C changes are insignificant when compared to full U.S. 93 traffic (with a river crossing on or by Hoover Dam). Alternative D makes a big noise increase in south and east developed areas (near Georgia and “B” or San Felipe Hill). There is virtually no road traffic noise in these areas, either now or when truck traffic is crossing the river at Hoover Dam. Alternative D was not evaluated in this study!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Biology/Threatened Species</td>
<td>Alternative B – 327 acres disturbed. Alternative C – 460 acres disturbed. Alternative D – 679 acres disturbed. This is an important reason not to use Alternative D. Of the 679 acres, more than 145 acres if high-density desert bighorn sheep territory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Water Resources/Stormwater Runoff</td>
<td>Alternative B – Short runoff time; D is better. Alternative C – Short runoff time; D is better. Alternative D – Longer runoff time to the receiving water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</table>
| 2.15       |      | Water Resources/Length of Steepest Grades |      | Alternative B – 4,100 feet at 5.7 percent  
 |            |      | Alternative C – 4,920 feet at 5.7 percent  
 |            |      | Alternative D – 13,780 feet at 6.0 percent  
 |            |      | Flatter and shorter grades were among the main reasons that FHWA selected the Sugarloaf Mountain alternative for the Hoover Dam Bypass. Alternative D is once again clearly the wrong choice. |
| 2.16       |      | Water Resources/Sediment Production |      | Alternative B – Low  
 |            |      | Alternative C – Low  
 |            |      | Alternative D – Highest  
 |            |      | Alternatives B and C both avoid the problems created by the Alternative D sediment. |
| 2.17       |      | Wetlands/Waters of the U.S. |      | Alternative B – A total of 3.19 acres are impacted.  
 |            |      | Alternative C – A total of 3.32 acres are impacted.  
 |            |      | Alternative D – A total of 13.47 acres are impacted.  
 |            |      | Obviously Alternative D is much harder on precious desert wetlands than are B and C. The DEIS again points out that the steeper grades in D create a bigger erosion problem. |
| 2.18       |      | Floodplains (Operational) |      | Alternative B – 10 acres are impacted.  
 |            |      | Alternative C – 5.9 acres are impacted.  
 |            |      | Alternative D – 4.1 acres are impacted.  
 |            |      | Alternative D requires less permanent mitigation than either B or C. |
| 2.19       |      | Cultural Resources, Archaeological Sites |      | Alternative B – 3 sites may be impacted.  
 |            |      | Alternative C – 6 sites may be impacted.  
 |            |      | Alternative D – 2 sites may be impacted.  
 |            |      | Alternative D is narrowly better. |
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use/Section 4(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B – 45 acres of LMNRA land is used. Five structures demolished. Impacts River Mountains Loop Trail. Electrical tower/line impacts are low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative C – 45 acres of LMNRA land is used. Impacts River Mountains Loop Trail. Potential golf courses affected. Electrical tower/line impacts are medium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative D – 85 acres of LMNRA land is used. Casino access is modified. Rifle range may be moved. Electrical tower/line impacts are high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The claim that Alternative D provides the highest level of support for bicycle routes makes no sense. Both C and D divert traffic from the streets used by bicycles and pedestrians. Also, there is no benefit in encouraging residential development. The people of Boulder City have changed the City Charter twice just to discourage such development. In spite of the DEIS “spin,” D is clearly the worst solution based on the use of our land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B – Laguna Lane residential views are impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative C – Laguna Lane residential and two historic structure views are impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative D – Only minimal impact on casino patron views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DEIS ignores one of the most beautiful views in this region. This is the view from any slightly elevated place in the City, across the Eldorado Valley to the south, east of U.S. 95. Alternative D severely impacts this view and no mitigation will help. Table 4-24 (of the DEIS) addresses only residential receptors. This inspiring view to the south is for everybody. Permanent scarring of this relatively pristine area is not in anyone’s best interests. Also, there is no apparent reason that the Laguna Lane view cannot be saved by putting Pacifica under the new U.S. 93, as is Lake Mountain Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B – Driveby-dependent businesses may lose revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative C – U.S. 93 businesses may see lower sales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative D – Short-term negative effect on City business is likely, long-term not likely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The urban arterial section of Alternative B allows relatively easy access to U.S. 93 businesses and the access to central City at Buchanan is actually improved. Alternative C provides access to these businesses and to central City at Canyon Road. Alternative D provides neither visibility of, nor access to, any of the City businesses. Any negative economic impact on the City will certainly be more severe with Alternative D than with either B or C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B – Five businesses removed, access affected by raised medians. Alternative C – Noise increases, views impacted. Alternative D – Less in-town traffic may decrease local business revenue. All three build alternatives reduce in-town traffic. Alternative D most of all. See preceding comments. This loss is not likely to be replaced by local customers. Locals do not go to Henderson because there is too much traffic in Boulder City, they go to find the products and services that they need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycles/Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B – Current unsafe conditions get worse in time and the Gold Strike Canyon Trailhead may be impacted. Alternative C – Greater impact than Alternative B and the Gold Strike Canyon Trailhead may be impacted. Alternative D – Current unsafe conditions get worse in time and the Gold Strike Canyon Trailhead may be impacted. Many NPS trails and backcountry roads are directly impacted. Alternative D causes a far greater backcountry impact than does either B or C. However, D is the only alternative that avoids relocating the Hemenway Wash drainage/trail facility. The Gold Strike Canyon Trailhead must be protected in any event. This canyon is absolutely unique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>Michael W. Brueske</td>
<td>4/10/02</td>
<td>I am writing to express my opposition to any alternative construction to U.S. Hwy. 93 that would bisect Boulder City and bring the heavy trucks and the associated noise, pollution, and safety concerns into my quiet little community. I am wholeheartedly against Alternatives A, B, and C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>Joe Cain for Boulder City News</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The Boulder City Chamber of Commerce, the Boulder City Bypass Committee and this newspaper [Boulder City News] have endorsed the idea of a southern bypass, a beltway if you will, as the best way to deal with increased traffic going through town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>Joe Cain for Bob Draney</td>
<td>4/8/02</td>
<td>Our Number 1 priority should be the 15,000 residents, not the businesses, not the desert tortoise, and not the bighorn sheep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>Joe Cain for Rod and Meg Fair</td>
<td>4/8/02</td>
<td>Despite getting about 20 percent of their business from drive-by traffic, they want the vehicle exhaust and dust pollution diverted south of town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>Joe Cain for Cokie Booth</td>
<td>4/8/02</td>
<td>Both of my businesses would benefit from a southern route that would take trucks and recreational vehicles out of the downtown area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>Joe Cain for Don Estes</td>
<td>4/8/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. I would lose my view of Lake Mead and part of my patio if either of the cheaper options are chosen. If they build up the valley, it’s over. They’re getting my patio. I’m shaking hands with the truckers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>Joe Cain</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>The choice has always been clear to me: Why subject ourselves and our families to trucks, noise, pollution, and congestion, when we have an opportunity to free ourselves of all these problems by building a southern bypass? When NDOT first began investigating the possibility of a southern bypass, it was one of the best things that could have ever happened to our city. The bypass provides us with a permanent solution to growing concerns about the impacts of traffic and safety threatening our town. The release of NDOT’s DEIS merely confirmed my strong support of route D. While route D has some adverse impacts on the environment, so do all of the other routes and alternatives. D’s impacts appear to be less significant than the others. In fact, this was the conclusion of NDOT’s project management team. The draft statement shows the management team ranked the southern bypass as the most environmentally desirable of the possible routes after evaluating 30 different environmental criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Darryl Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>Joe Cain</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>Route D has more environmental appeal than the other routes when it comes to noise, views, inconvenience during construction, impacts on recreation lands and safety issues, to name a few. In addition, Boulder City residents have worked hard to create and maintain an environment that is unique in southern Nevada. How many other towns have restricted growth, or created signs that say welcome to our clean, quiet and safe town? It is clear that Route D best serves these objectives of preserving our environment and quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chuck and Linda Lee Patterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>Darva Campbell</td>
<td>5/9/02</td>
<td>Anyone who has read the document recognizes that the southern bypass would preserve Boulder City’s environment much more than any other of the routes. Route D would get the highway and all of its noise, trucks, and pollution out of all of our backyards by moving the highway far from all developed areas of the city. While it is true that noise levels may increase in some desert areas, the DEIS states clearly that noise levels throughout all developed areas of Boulder City would decrease with Route D. Thus, Route D is the only route that would actually improve the quality of life for all residents. There are many reasons to improve the route north of Boulder City, and many more reasons to not add a route south of Boulder City. As a resident of Boulder City, I feel very strongly that the southern route would cause irreparable damage both to the desert and to our city, as well as not being as effective for travelers as a northern route would be. Conversely, a northern route would be advantageous to travelers (the drive is more pleasant, with views of Lake Mead instead of views of the landfill, and there is less danger from white outs), and would also provide advantages to Boulder City businesses. The last thing Boulder City residents want is a freeway south of town. A northern route, however, is desirable on many levels. I hope you will be careful in your deliberations. It is clear to me that the advantages of the northern route and the disadvantages of the southern route combine to make this an easy decision. Please be wise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2-1-2**

Summary of Comments
<table>
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<th>Letter No.</th>
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<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C24</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>Christina Casey</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it will ruin the view. When you drive over the pass, Boulder City sits as an oasis. To put in the new bypass would destroy that sense of escape. It would be ugly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am in favor of Alternative C because it will use an existing road, rather than making alterations to the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C25</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>Christina Casey</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it will have negative effects on the desert. It is beautiful land out there, and it shouldn’t be destroyed for a road when there are other alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>Christina Casey</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it will go through a tortoise reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>Lindy Casey</td>
<td>5/9/02</td>
<td>I am personally opposed to South Corridor (Alternative D). It is the most expensive and affects pristine desert, a National Park, sacred Native American ground, and historical sites. I believe that using the Boulder City bypass (Alternative C) is the preferred option since it will upgrade the existing highway including frontage roads, on-ramps, and off-ramps where needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C29</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>Lindy Casey</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it goes through the LMNRA, which has been preserved from development by a congressional order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C31</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>Lindy Casey</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it will affect pristine desert, historical sites, and a view that is priceless. The only people at the meeting in BC that were in favor of it were real estate agents (keeping the land in Hemenway worth a lot of money?) and people who lived in Hemenway. Also, I think any time a city government lobbies (using an ex-senator) for anything, they must be up to secret plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C33</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>Lindy Casey</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D. It will affect our view of Hemenway Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C34</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>Jane Cheek</td>
<td>4/5/02</td>
<td>What about those people that built those big expensive homes for a view of the lake? Their views may be gone with Alternative A, B, and/or C. Not only that, the noise and pollution would be unbearable, especially when the trucks are allowed back! If I’d put up that kind of money and had to sell at a lower price, think I’d think about suing the City of Boulder City, Clark County, and State of Nevada for false advertising and misrepresentation. I hope this isn’t a “Done Deal” like I feel the bridge over the river at Hoover Dam was. I lived on Federal Property at Katherine’s Cabinsites and know how the government goes about getting what it wants!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Nick Christensen</td>
<td>3/18/02</td>
<td>Aside from those concerns (see C3-1.14, C3-1.15, C3-3.10, C3-3.11, and C3-3.12), I see this project as a brilliant work on the part of CH2M HILL and NDOT. It addresses all concerns on the part of the community, businesses, and the traveling public. And it is quite clear to me that Alternative C serves not only the interests of the Boulder City community, but of the regional transportation network in general.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C36</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>Curtis F. Clark</td>
<td>3/30/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D. This route is almost entirely on undeveloped land inside the city limits. There is no way the cheapies at NDOT will adequately compensate Boulder City for the taking. The city land outside the freeway will be cut off and unavailable for future development. This is a federal highway, let the Feds (BLM) provide the required land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C37</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>Nicola Collins</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>Route D is totally unacceptable, the cost, going through Park land and virgin desert, destroying our air quality (the prevailing winds are from the southwest).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C43</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>Patricia J. Culler</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Other options for the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor would increase noise in Boulder City and the residential areas, increase pollution, and increase danger from the transportation of hazardous material, especially if the nuclear dump at Yucca Mountain is opened. Last year there was a hazardous fuel spill when a tanker truck turned over at the intersection of Nevada Highway and U.S. 93. It was a mess, inconvenient, and costly to clean up. The potential danger to health and property if it had been a truck full of nuclear waste is too terrible to think about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C44</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>Thomas C. Culler</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Other options for the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor would increase noise in Boulder City and the residential areas, increase pollution, and increase danger from the transportation of hazardous material, especially if the nuclear dump at Yucca Mountain is opened. Last year there was a hazardous fuel spill when a tanker truck turned over at the intersection of Nevada Highway and U.S. 93. It was a mess, inconvenient, and costly to clean up. The potential danger to health and property if it had been a truck full of nuclear waste is too terrible to think about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C46</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Peter de Beauchamp</td>
<td>5/9/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D for these reasons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) We already have an existing bypass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) There are clearly much greater negative natural habitat impacts from Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) This will block access and destroy the appeal for the desert recreational opportunities to the south of Boulder City adversely affecting the ambiance of the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) This will probably eliminate the Boulder City Rifle Range. This is a unique facility. I don’t know of another facility in the area with 1,000-yard ranges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) Alternative D would shift all of the pollution immediately down wind of the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6) It is fundamentally unfair to allow a well connected and influential minority who knowingly moved next to the existing bypass to relocate it next to people who chose otherwise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7) Alternative D has negative cultural impacts to the AmaHaKav tribe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8) Alternative D is tremendously more expensive than the other alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9) Alternative D will have a huge impact and relatively wild desert areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10) Destroying gorgeous views of the Eldorado Valley and the mountains beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11) Negative impacts on wildlife that is NOT impacted now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I prefer Alternative B or C. I find the present situation of sending the trucks through Laughlin to be the most satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C47</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>Jack L. Delp</td>
<td>5/5/02</td>
<td>I would like information to your consideration to placing the proposed Alignment D to the southerly side of WAPA’s Mead Substation. As a homeowner at 1801 Hilton Head Drive, Boulder City, I believe the consideration of noise levels to be expected at the present location of your Alignment D will reveal some level of noise to be expected at the lower end of present housing in Boulder City. I would like to advise the Sunday evening that equipment failure occurred at the Mead Substation by explosion of equipment the sound was readily noticed at my area. With this understanding of potential noise levels traveling south to north, I question what level of noise is considered acceptable by the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C48</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>Matt Di Teresa</td>
<td>5/5/02</td>
<td>You can count me as one more Boulder City resident who is definitely NOT in favor of Alternative D. It makes no sense environmentally, fiscally, or aesthetically to run the bypass around the outside of town through our beautiful desert and mountains when there is an existing highway that can be more easily and cheaply expanded and improved. Alternative B is the only way to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C49</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>Caroline Dykstra</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it will impair our view of Hemenway Valley. I am in favor of Alternative D (sic) because it will preserve the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C50</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>Caroline Dykstra</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it goes through the LMNRA, which has been preserved. It was not preserved for a freeway. I am in favor of Alternative C because it will utilize an already developed area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C53</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>David and Gisela Gere</td>
<td>3/31/02</td>
<td>My husband and I strongly support Alternative D, constructing a four-lane freeway routing traffic around Boulder City. In our opinion, this will preserve the current small-town atmosphere. That one of the main reasons why we moved to Boulder City last year rather than Henderson or Las Vegas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C54</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>Donald Gildner</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Other options for the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor would increase noise in Boulder City and the residential areas, increase pollution, and increase danger from the transportation of hazardous material, especially if the nuclear dump at Yucca Mountain is opened. Last year there was a hazardous fuel spill when a tanker truck turned over at the intersection of Nevada Highway and U.S. 93. It was a mess, inconvenient, and costly to clean up. The potential danger to health and property if it had been a truck full of nuclear waste is too terrible to think about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C55</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>Christine A. Goodwin</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>We need to appreciate what land we have NOT desecrated and enhance what we have. Please consider my personal request as a NO to a southern bypass, and a YES to the Boulder City bypass alternative (C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C58</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>Kevin and Nancy Hendricks</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>We strongly OPPOSE the bypass Alternative D. This route would disturb pristine desert, bighorn sheep habitat, and native American cultural resources. That would also destroy beautiful mountains in and adjacent to LMNRA. I believe that it would also encourage and accelerate future growth in the southern part of town. We strongly urge you to consider Alternative C as the proposed route.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C59</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>Esther Holland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Other options for the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor would increase noise in Boulder City and the residential areas, increase pollution, and increase danger from the transportation of hazardous material, especially if the nuclear dump at Yucca Mountain is opened. Last year there was a hazardous fuel spill when a tanker truck turned over at the intersection of Nevada Highway and U.S. 93. It was a mess, inconvenient, and costly to clean up. The potential danger to health and property if it had been a truck full of nuclear waste is too terrible to think about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C60</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>Ken and Elberta Isaacson</td>
<td>4/5/02</td>
<td>We are absolutely opposed to Alternatives B and C, which would bring more traffic along with the related noise and air pollution to Boulder City. They would divide and destroy Boulder City, and neither provide for future expansion. We feel that Alternative D is the only feasible option to pursue. At the April 4 public hearing in Boulder City regarding these issues, we were told in no uncertain terms that the bridge across the Colorado will be placed at Sugarloaf Mountain. If that is the case, then Alternative D is the only route around Boulder City that will work. Because Yucca Mountain is being forced upon us, and there is a strong possibility that shipments of nuclear waste will travel this route once it’s complete, the highway needs to be as far from populated areas as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C64</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>Joseph A. Mendenhall</td>
<td>3/30/02</td>
<td>We support Alternative D for Boulder City road construction since it is by far the least disruptive to the environment, both physical and human, of this city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C66</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>Joe Miller</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it goes through Lake Mead’s land and near Boy Scout Canyon where there are petroglyphs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C67</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>Joe Miller</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it will interfere with the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C74</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>Gertrude L. Paige</td>
<td>5/9/02</td>
<td>I personally object to the installment of South Corridor, Alternative D. I and my family are frequent visitors to the area and have family residing there. It would greatly interfere with our enjoyment of the national park, the beautiful surrounding desert landscape, and it would interfere with the present small-town environment. It would affect the natural ness of the area. Consider the townspeople – it’s their home and their desires should be accommodated! The best idea is to upgrade the present Boulder City Bypass – less expensive and happier Boulder City population!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>C76</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>Leslie Paige</td>
<td>5/7/02</td>
<td>I am absolutely against Alternative D for these reasons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. We already have an existing bypass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Negative impacts on natural habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Negative impacts on desert recreation to the south of Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Negative impacts on the Boulder City Rifle and Gun Club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Shifting pollution and noise to the neighborhoods located in the south side of Boulder City where people chose NOT to build next to a bypass/freeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Negative cultural impacts to the AmaHaKav tribe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Too expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Destroying pristine desert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Negative impacts on wildlife that is NOT impacted now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Of the four alternatives presented, I would prefer Alternatives B and C equally. My true preferred alternative would be Alternative E – send the traffic south through Laughlin. It seems to be working well now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C80</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>Joseph and Dominique Pfeiffer</td>
<td>5/9/02</td>
<td>My husband and I wish to give our support to route D. We moved to Boulder City with our three small children, for its clean, quiet, small-town atmosphere. We feel a 7-lane freeway through town would not be conducive to that lifestyle. We also feel tourists who wish to visit Lake Mead, Hoover Dam, and Boulder City will still do so, while the traffic and “Big Rigs” that just want to go through to Arizona could divert around the city. We didn’t have much choice on the bridge, we knew that the traffic on the dam needed to be alleviated, but I hope all public comments are really taken into great consideration when it comes to what the citizens of Boulder City want. We hope that NDOT wants to work with the people of Boulder City and give us what we love most about it, our small, quiet, clean town to stay the way it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C82</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>Ed and Judy Pitchford</td>
<td>3/31/02</td>
<td>We feel Alternative D is the best for Boulder City. It would preserve the small-town environment that attracted most of the residents to Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C83</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>Barbara Raulston</td>
<td>5/8/02</td>
<td>As a resident of Boulder City, I favor Alternative B for the Boulder City corridor route. I feel this alternative has the least impact on the environment, as it follows the route of an already existing highway. This existing highway was termed the “bypass” when it was built too, and residential development soon followed. We should not allow those who built/bought homes near an existing highway to dictate when and where to move it now that the time has come to improve it. No to Alternative D, Yes to Alternative B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C85</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>Barbara Raulston</td>
<td>5/8/02</td>
<td>I am a resident of Boulder City and I favor Alternative B, not Alternative D. I do not want a major highway going through the LMNRA. This area is growing at an alarming rate; we cannot allow the LMNRA to be compromised. It will only make it easier for it to happen again and again in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C86</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>Jason Reuther</td>
<td>4/25/02</td>
<td>We hope you decide not to build any route to the new bridge at Hoover Dam. We vote the NO BUILD option. The Southern route will affect those people who chose to live in the more quiet part of town. Let the truck traffic continue to Laughlin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C89</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>Martin S. Rihel</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>After further consideration and physically exploring Alternative D, I wish to voice my objections to that route and vote in favor of Alternative C. Considering the additional cost and disturbing so much additional desert land, I think Alternative C is the better choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C98</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>Ron and Mary Jane Therrien</td>
<td>4/3/02</td>
<td>We support Alternative D. Please consider the noise, air pollution, and adverse visual impact to us and others in Boulder City in making the selection of the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C99</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>Mary Jane Therrien</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>As a homeowner in the Bella Vista Subdivision of Boulder City, we strongly support Alternative D for the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor. This alternative is by far the least disruptive and safest for all residents of Boulder City. We are not only concerned with the noise, air pollution, and ugliness, but also the danger posed by the large number of trucks that will use this highway transporting all types of cargo, including nuclear waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C100</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>Dr. Michelle Tusan</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>As a resident of Boulder City, I am writing to express my strong support for Alternative D. All of the other projected routes seem to pose a serious threat to the present and future quality of life of residents in our city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C101</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>Chanteil Walter</td>
<td>5/9/02</td>
<td>I am a Boulder City resident, and I am completely opposed to Alternative D for the following reasons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) There are clearly much greater negative impacts to the natural environment from Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Alternative D would shift all of the population immediately down wind of the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) It is fundamentally unfair to allow a well connected and influential minority who knowingly moved next to the existing bypass to relocate it to a pristine, undisturbed area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Alternative D would lead to adverse impacts on cultural and natural resources, and would also have a huge impact on a relatively wild desert area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) Alternative D is ridiculously more expensive, both economically and ecologically, than the other alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6) It will damage the unhindered aesthetically pleasing view of the Eldorado Valley and mountains beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7) The wild desert area, in which this proposed route would mar, would most likely be built up in the near future, leading to more homes, businesses, and population growth, creating a metropolis with Henderson and Las Vegas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I prefer Alternative C, because it would remedy the current situation by providing a bypass, but it would also lead to minimal disturbance of the natural environment and historical integrity of the town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>C103</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>Jennifer Wood</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am strongly opposed to this proposal. It will be detrimental to Boulder City and the lands that surround it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C105</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>Frank E. Ensign</td>
<td>4/29/02</td>
<td>The attached article from the LVRJ (4-28-02) excellently depicts the reason most Boulder City residents object to Alternative C. At any one time, there are probably more bicycles, hikers, and bighorn sheep in the River Mountains area than at Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area. In other words, it is very popular. A freeway or truck route skirting the area will seriously harm the beautiful and enjoyable area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C107</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>Richard H. Bryan</td>
<td>5/8/02</td>
<td>The Boulder City Bypass Coalition strongly supports Alternative D, the Southern Bypass, and is greatly concerned about the negative impacts the through-town routes, Alternatives B and C, would have on Boulder City’s unique environment. It is the opinion of our Coalition and the vast majority of Boulder City residents with whom we have come in contact over the past months that the through-town routes would destroy the special ambience Boulder City has worked so hard to preserve. Eight- to 14-foot sound walls, noise increases, high-speed traffic through the middle of town, obstructed views of Lake Mead, and glare from highway lighting are just some of the negative impacts the DEIS shows would occur from the construction of the through-town routes. Alternative D, on the other hand, would result in net circulation benefits for the entire town, a reduction in noise throughout the developed areas of Boulder City and would best preserve the small-town ambiance Boulder City has worked so hard to protect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.79
Our Coalition has been pleased by the overwhelming support we have received from Boulder City residents and elected officials in support of Alternative D. To that end, I further request that you add some additional information to the public comment pertaining to a Boulder City Council meeting that took place on April 23, 2002, at which all members of the Boulder City Council stated their strong support for Alternative D.

Councilwoman Andrea Anderson said she “fully supports” Alternative D, citing the “devastating” impacts that the through-town routes would have on Boulder City. She further stated that Alternative D is the only route that would preserve the community.

Councilman Joe Hardy cited several reasons why he supports Alternative D, including the importance of protecting Boulder City’s quality of life and the impacts the other routes would have on pollution, noise, views, and safety. Councilman Hardy further stated that Alternative D would enhance public enjoyment of the LMNRA by creating a new scenic vista of the lake. He concluded by saying that he, along with the majority of Boulder City residents, “truly supports” Alternative D.

Councilman Mike Pacini also expressed his support for Alternative D, concluding, “When you look at what’s best for Boulder City overall, for high school seniors, or senior citizens, Alternative D is the only route that makes sense.”

Councilman Bryan Nix mentioned the 1999 Boulder City referendum on this issue, calling the results a “landslide” in favor of a southern bypass. He said the temporary elimination of truck traffic through town has resulted in improvements in noise, air quality, and congestion and that this could be maintained in the future by Alternative D. He said that after reading the DEIS and speaking with many residents, “there is no question...that Alternative D is the only option for Boulder City.” He concluded by saying Alternative D would have the least adverse impacts on Boulder City residents and businesses and Boulder City’s scenic views of Lake Mead.

Mayor Ferraro concluded the council remarks by saying all the members of the council have studied the issue very closely. He said he has spoken to “hundreds of people” and that there is “certainly a very strong opinion generated for Alternative D.” He said Alternative D is the only alternative that makes sense for Boulder City now and into the far future.” Major Ferraro noted that Boulder City has developed through “careful planning and a lot of input and we can’t dare destroy it by selecting an alternative that would run right straight through the middle of this community.” He said if a through-town route were selected, “we would lose what we have gained over the years.” The Mayor concluded by saying “there is nothing that would suggest to any of us that we should do anything other than support Alternative D” and that he “completely, 100 percent, supports Alternative D.”

These statements were a unanimous and unequivocal expression of support from the Boulder City Council, the elected officials with the most direct link to the citizens of Boulder City.
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Several other dignitaries attended the hearing in support of Alternative D and several other elected officials provided letters of support for Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Senator Harry Reid’s Regional Director, Jerry Reynolds, stated Senator Reid supports Alternative D because it will protect the quality of life in Boulder City. He said Senator Reid “has long been aware of the special nature of this community and the efforts of its leaders and citizens to preserve the quality of life” in Boulder City. He said Senator Reid “remains committed to Alternative D and the people of Boulder City” and their office is looking at the funding that will be required to make the project happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Dayton, Chief of Staff for Congressman Jim Gibbons, stated Congressman Gibbons is committed to working with Senator Reid in support of Alternative D and urged the Council’s support for Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clark County Commissioner Bruce Woodbury, chairman of the Clark County Regional Transportation Commission, wrote that Alternative D “is the only alternative which will improve the quality of life in Boulder [City], protect the legitimate interests of our business community and allow for an acceptable flow of interstate transportation and commerce.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Senator Jon Porter wrote: “The Southern Bypass is the only option that would allow Boulder City to escape the negative effects associated with this increased traffic.” He further wrote: “We have worked hard to protect Boulder City’s unique environment and the Southern Bypass is the only option that would preserve the city we love.” He concluded by urging the Boulder City Council to urge NDOT and FHWA to select Alternative D as the preferred route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Several members of the Boulder City Bypass Coalition and other community organizations spoke on behalf of Alternative D at the Council meeting. Chad Blair, representing the Boulder City Chamber of Commerce, stated that organization’s endorsement of Alternative D. He cited a Chamber of Commerce survey of all businesses in Boulder City in which more than three-quarters of businesses indicated their support for Alternative D. Tom Christ, representing St. Jude’s Ranch for Children, described at length the detrimental impacts that the through-town routes would have on St. Jude’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C108</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>Ronald B. McAlister</td>
<td>4/29/02</td>
<td>More and more smog is beginning to destroy the natural aesthetics of the area. It’s wrong that political and Union decisions made nearly 3,000 miles away, that obviously have not considered these consequences, are determining this important destiny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C109</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>Ronald P. Therrien</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>As a homeowner in the Bella Vista Subdivision of Boulder City, we strongly support Alternative D for the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor. This alternative is by far the least disruptive and safest for all residents of Boulder City. We are not only concerned with the noise, air pollution, and ugliness, but also the danger posed by the large number of trucks that will use this highway transporting all types of cargo, including nuclear waste.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C3. IMPLEMENTATION AND CONSTRUCTION

**C6** 3.1 Richard J. Bravo 5/9/02  
The cost of the project is not considered to be an environmental matter, but it is an important factor. The cost of Alternative D is so much higher than the other two build alternatives that enormous benefits would need to be attained in order to justify its selection. The DEIS clearly shows that there are no such benefits and that there are serious Alternative D environmental impacts which cannot be mitigated.

3.2 The availability of fill material is critical to this project. I could not find an analysis of the sources for fill in the DEIS. Alternative D is likely to require fill far in excess of that available from cuts. Alternatives B and C may also require some smaller amounts of externally supplied fill material.

3.3 Energy Use (Construction)
- Alternative B – 334 gallons of fuel per day (at 10 miles per gallon [mpg]); 548 gallons of fuel per day (at 5 mpg).
- Alternative C – 322 gallons of fuel per day (at 10 mpg); 523 gallons of fuel per day (at 5 mpg).
- Alternative D – 340 gallons of fuel per day (at 10 mpg); 560 gallons of fuel per day (at 5 mpg).

Alternative D obviously will require more fuel usage during construction.

3.4 Estimated Cost
- Alternative B – $220 million.
- Alternative C – $220 million.

$125,000,000 more for an inferior solution.

3.5 Construction Time Period
- Alternative B – 5 years over 11 years.
- Alternative C – 5 years over 11 years.
- Alternative D – 5 years over 11 years.

It does not seem logical that the much more complex Alternative D can be built in the same amount of time.

**C7** 3.6 Michael W. Brueske 4/10/02  
The additional costs associated with Alternative D would be more than offset by the continued serenity, prosperity, and high quality family lifestyle enjoyed by those who live in Boulder City.

**C25** 3.7 Christina Casey 5/10/02  
Alternative C will cost less. I am in favor of Alternative C.

**C27** 3.8 Christina Casey 5/10/02  
I am opposed to Alternative D because it will cost more money.
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C32</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Lindy Casey</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am in favor of Alternative C because it is less expensive. I am opposed to Alternative D because it is most expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Nick Christensen</td>
<td>3/18/02</td>
<td>Growth along the corridor must be planned for. This is the one concern I have with Alternative C. The viaduct through northern Hemenway Valley over existing U.S. 93 near Canyon Road should be wide enough to allow for expansion of the freeway to six lanes, if necessary. The growth of bedroom communities outside Las Vegas, such as Mesquite and Pahrump, have proven that in the future the need may be present for urban roads, even through rural areas. The bypass should be built with the idea that it’s possible, even if unlikely, that the U.S. 93 corridor through Mohave County will experience growth similar to what Mesquite and Pahrump have seen and may become an extension of urban Las Vegas once the Hoover Dam Bypass is complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I feel that the planned U.S. 93/95 split is under planned. As NDOT currently plans to widen U.S. 95 to a four-lane divided highway, I think it would be reasonable to prepare for smoother movements between the two roads, especially the southbound to southbound and northbound to northbound movements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In my opinion, this project should include I-515 to at least the U.S. 93/95 split (as identified in Table 2-4 Feature 2 [of the DEIS]), and widening the road to six lanes to that split. At the U.S. 93/95 split, the third lane southbound should exit to U.S. 95, and the third lane northbound should come from U.S. 95. The second lane of the northbound to northbound ramp should either merge with the through lanes of northbound I-515 or serve as an auxiliary lane until the Railroad Pass exit (see Figure 1 at the end of letter).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C36</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Curtis F. Clark</td>
<td>3/30/02</td>
<td>I would support a combination of Alternatives B and C. Nevada Highway three lanes southbound and one lane (local business) northbound. Industrial Road three lanes northbound and one lane (local business) southbound. The land is already dedicated to highway usage, the intersections are in place and need only to be upgraded. Widen Hemenway Hill (U.S. 93) to four lanes plus frontage roads, and the job is done at minimum time and expense. There is no reason to build a flyover interchange at U.S. 93/95. Traffic volume will significantly decrease when the restrictions over Hoover Dam are lifted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C45</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Myrna Danforth</td>
<td>5/1/02</td>
<td>I think it is criminal for federal/state/local politicians, government agencies, casino owners, and a small bunch of arrogant, self-serving and well-to-do locals to disregard what would be best for the majority of people in our town. Especially since everything I have read indicates that the state law makes it mandatory that the least expensive route be chosen; and that would be B or C. Not everyone here is in favor of Route D by a long shot, though that fact has not been indicated in our paper, in meetings of the council, and in all of the “exploratory” and “explanatory” special meetings as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C47</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Jack L. Delp</td>
<td>5/5/02</td>
<td>In view of the proposed location of Route D, it appears an overpass or below-grade structure will be required to meet access requirements for WAPA. It is understood there will be no interchange located at the Buchanan Road; is this correct? The location of the proposed Route D will have an effect to limit future growth of City facilities such as the airport and treatment facilities. It seems a look in to distant future would suggest a greater separation of the proposed bypass and city facilities is warranted. Because of the potential noise level, cost for access structure, and limitations to city growth, I would question why an alternate route south of WAPA Mead Complex would not be a more preferred location?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C51</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Caroline Dykstra</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it will be the most expensive. I am in favor of Alternative C because it is the least expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C68</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>Joe Miller</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am opposed to Alternative D because it costs more money. I am for Alternative C because it costs less money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C77</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Angela Pestana</td>
<td>4/10/02</td>
<td>Alternative B costs the least amount of taxpayers dollars and creates the least amount of environmental damage. It also keeps the air pollution in the Lake Mead Valley, which is bigger than the Eldorado Valley. Save the taxpayers money, choose Alternative B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C78</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>Joseph Pestana</td>
<td>4/10/02</td>
<td>I choose B. It costs the least taxpayers’ dollars and creates the least amount of environmental damage. It also keeps the air pollution in the Lake Mead Valley, which is bigger than the Eldorado Valley. Save the taxpayers money, choose route B. Route B is the only way to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C79</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>Joseph Pestana</td>
<td>4/10/02</td>
<td>Another reason to pick Alternative B is because it already exists. People along the route are already acclimated to vehicles. After all, they did purchase next to the highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C84</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>Barbara Raulston</td>
<td>5/8/02</td>
<td>As a resident of Boulder City, I feel I am being misrepresented by the Boulder City Corridor Committee. I do NOT favor Alternative D! I think that ALTERNATIVE B IS ALREADY A HIGHWAY. I feel the Committee is exerting undue influence on this process, and on the Project Management Team. The Boulder City Corridor Committee has requested, and has been granted one-on-one meetings with all representatives of the PMT. As an individual citizen who favors an alternative other than Alternative D, I would like a &quot;one-on-one&quot; meeting with all the members of the PMT also…or at the very least, more public hearings and more time for the less affluent and less politically connected citizens of Boulder City to be educated on this issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C96</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>Rob and Gretchen Steensen</td>
<td>4/15/02</td>
<td>We are alarmed that some residents of Boulder City are still ignoring the inevitable. Comments made at the U.S. 93 Corridor Study Public Hearing and items we have read in the paper suggest that some residents still believe the recent diversion of truck traffic through Laughlin is something that can be sustained over the long term and that the Hoover Dam bypass project and Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor project will simply vanish. We have kept close track of the developments surrounding our highway project. As much as we also would like to see a long-term diversion of traffic through Laughlin, we have neither seen, heard, nor read anything to suggest that this is possible. Harry Reid, the number two person in the U.S. Senate, has told Boulder City residents publicly that the Hoover Dam bridge project is not only moving forward, but is being sped up as a result of the events of September 11 and that support for this in Congress is widespread. Reports in the news have further confirmed this. The bridge project has been in the making for decades and many millions of dollars have been spent to get the project to a point where construction will begin shortly. In other words: it’s going to happen folks! In addition, NDOT and FHWA have expended a great deal of effort and expense on the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Project. They would not do this unless they were serious. Every indication points to the fact that both projects will be built. There is nothing to suggest that they won’t. As a result, those residents who think these projects will go away are in denial. The worst possible scenario is that this denial will result in no corridor project being built. If this were to happen, 5 or 6 years from now trucks will begin streaming across the new bridge. Instead of being diverted around the city along the Southern Bypass, they will come through the middle of our town on an inadequate road that will be more clogged than anything we have experienced in the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4. SOCIO-ECONOMICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Cokie Booth</td>
<td>No date</td>
<td>I would like to recommend Alternative D. It would not take anyone’s home away from them. It would not shut down and relocate any business. Small business should be treated the same as the casinos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Since 9/11, the trucks and motor homes have been routed around Boulder City and it has not affected business. We have a small business, and it has not been affected by the 9/11 reroute of trucks and campers. Our customers are actually happier and have made very positive comments. Most of our customers eat in the restaurants and stay at the local hotels when they come boating or fishing. It is actually easier for our clients to pull their boats from Industrial on to U.S. 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Richard J. Bravo</td>
<td>5/9/02</td>
<td>Parts of Alternative D pass through land under the control of the BLM. The Boulder City Charter prohibits gambling in the City. The BLM often auctions off sections of land, many times to casino companies for casino/hotel development purposes. Boulder City could not legally stop such a land sale and this could result in a gambling enterprise near the southern bypass highway. Of course, a casino could be built there now, but without the southern bypass, it does not make good business sense. This possibility should be dealt with in the FEIS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Michael W. Brueske</td>
<td>4/10/02</td>
<td>I realize that a few downtown business owners are concerned that diverting some traffic south of town would be harmful to their businesses. Cross country truckers and travelers that take the southern bypass probably wouldn’t stop and spend money Boulder City anyway with Las Vegas just 30 minutes further up the road. However, the vacationers on their way to Las Vegas or the LMNRA who are the most likely to utilize local Boulder City merchants would continue to take the existing Hoover Dam through Boulder City route, just as they are doing now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Christina Casey</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>Alternative C has my favor as it will be more encouraging for travelers to shop at Boulder City stores. I am in favor of Alternative C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Joe Cain for Ed Waymire</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. People who want to go to Lake Mead to fish will come to Boulder City. Those who want to go to Phoenix and Kingman will go past us on the bypass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Joe Cain for Chad Blair</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>Alternative D will have the least negative impact on property values and the least negative impacts on business. Alternative D takes away the traffic we don’t want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Joe Cain for Rod and Meg Fair</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>The letter in last week’s edition [Boulder City News] predicting doom and gloom for Boulder City businesses if route “D” were selected as the new route for U.S. 93 was misleading and took numerous items in the DEIS out of context. A complete reading of the entire DEIS would reveal that long-term negative impacts of the southern bypass are extremely unlikely. Last week’s letter neglected to mention the statements in the DEIS that all routes would have some negative impacts on businesses; that long-term negative economic impacts are unlikely; that decreased congestion as a result of route D may result in increased local patronage of businesses; and that route D would reduce delay times and provide overall circulation benefits to Boulder City. All routes would have some negative impact on businesses in Boulder City. As business owners, we do not believe Boulder City would suffer a measurable economic downturn as a result of route D. Fortunately, the vast majority of Boulder City business owners already recognize this. The Boulder City Chamber of Commerce conducted a survey showing more than three-quarters of business owners support the southern bypass. Boulder City is not what you would call a typical “highway town” dependent on pass-through traffic. As a bedroom community to the Las Vegas area, which will continue to grow, we are not a town whose economic health is dependent on those who stop here to buy gas. Lake Mead would not move if the truck bypass were built. Hoover Dam would not move if the southern bypass were built.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most people who visit and spend money here will continue to visit if route D is built. Our visitors come to Boulder City because of the magnificent Hoover Dam, the beautiful LMNRA, and clean, green Boulder City. The type of visitors we want in our city would appreciate this environment instead of the highway town ambiance that exists in places where a major highway splits through the core of a small town. Since visitors will enjoy it here more as a result of less traffic, trucks, noise, and pollution, the southern bypass would be good for business in the long run. We all need to consider what we want our town to look like in 10, 15, or even 20 years. If Alternative D becomes the new route, the core of our city will forever be preserved as the quiet green place we all know and love. If another route is chosen, be prepared to watch a growing number of trucks pass through each year, bringing noise, pollution, congestion, and God forbid, a hazardous spill. The choice is profoundly clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C29</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Lindy Casey</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am in favor of Alternative C because it will still encourage visitors to enter Boulder City via off-ramp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C62</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Korda</td>
<td>5/2/02</td>
<td>Route D is the only answer. It may cost more money, but it won’t destroy people’s and businesses’ life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C66</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Joe Miller</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I am in favor of Alternative C because I think it will still get people to come to our stores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C70</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>G D Newbould</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>I am worried, and somewhat ashamed, by the group opposing Alternatives B and C. They are concerned only about their property values and to demonstrate that once again they can do whatever they want in Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C71</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Gerald D. Newbould</td>
<td>5/7/02</td>
<td>I was a full professor of economics at age 31. I am now retired living in Boulder City. I am not directly affected (e.g., value of home) by any of the proposals. I have tried to look carefully at the pros and cons of Alternatives A through D by using the internet. I concentrated on trying to find the impact on communities that have experienced through routes (B and C) and bypasses (D). On balance, it would seem clearly that the best alternative would be to improve the existing U.S. 93. (I cannot differentiate between Alternatives B and C by studying other towns.) A bypass would seem to be a slow downhill economic slide for much of Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C73</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Wendy O’Sullivan</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I don’t believe the businesses in Boulder City will be hurt if Alternative D is adopted. The tourist will still drive over the Dam and through the city. It will, however, keep the trucks from coming through town. This will make it easier for our tourist to drive through town and enjoy the sites without the dangers of all the trucks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>C93</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>Mike Sitton</td>
<td>No date</td>
<td>My reading of the DEIS is that the only point it makes regarding Boulder City’s control over land is that the future growth of the City’s economy will be much more impacted by the City’s land use decisions than the construction of the southern bypass. That means Boulder City’s proximity to growth areas and its tourist attractions mean that Boulder City has the luxury of deciding whether it wants to grow and how it wants to grow. I personally would rather have our mayor and council – who are locally elected – make these decisions, than be stuck with a through-town route that will leave us little choice of what kind of growth we will have. The Southern Bypass is by far the superior choice for Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C96</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>Rob and Gretchen Steensen</td>
<td>4/15/02</td>
<td>We own two businesses directly affected by Boulder’s local economy and believe that Boulder will be a much better place to live and visit without the highway or traffic jam through town. Would Sedona be a better place to visit with a super highway running through its center? The clear choice, supported by an overwhelming majority of residents and the findings in the draft environmental study, is that Route D is by far the superior alternative. We all need to rally behind Route D, as the other alternatives are simply unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C108</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>Ronald B. McAlister</td>
<td>4/29/02</td>
<td>It’s a well known marketing fact that tourist from throughout the U.S. and abroad come visit Hoover Dam and pass through Boulder City to and from the Grand Canyon and Las Vegas in large numbers. This number will continue to increase, but again, without the trucks, this increase can be easily handled with the existing highway system. The tourist traffic is also a good source of business for Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Richard J. Bravo</td>
<td>5/9/02</td>
<td>The evidence presented in the DEIS makes it clear that Alternative D is the worst of the three build choices. It is much worse for the environment, it costs a great deal more, it will take longer to build, and it fails to provide any significant advantages over Alternative C. Alternative B emerges as mildly superior to D. I urge you to discard Alternative D and to select Alternative C as the solution for the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C37</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Nicola Collins</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I favor route A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C38</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Ramon Collins</td>
<td>5/5/02</td>
<td>Believe me, the City Council carnival of April 23rd does not reflect the opinions and concerns of Old Town, Boulder City. Ex-senator Bryan and his wealthy Hemenway Valley cohorts do NOT represent us. People in Old Town wanted to unite with the Hemenway Valley hot tub fanatics and go for Bypass A, no dam bridge. When HV heard from Senator Reid that the bridge is inevitable, they panicked and want the freeway placed in Boulder City’s natural ventilator, south of town. Old Town doesn’t have the political power and wealth of HV (the same thing), but we do have the courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C39</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Ramon Collins</td>
<td>5/9/02</td>
<td>I’m for Alternative A. No build – no bridge, no bypass. My next choices were B or C because they make sense and are the best alternative routes for Old Town, Boulder City. But the greedy-guts in Hemorrhoid Valley got scared off by a “done deal.” There was no such animal. To protect their inflated property and its precious views, they took a dive and double-crossed Old Town. Then the millionaires got together and hired a run-down, morally bankrupt ex-Senator – well-versed in political cheap tricks – and it’s been easy pickings. I think, by law, NDOT is required to pick the most expeditious, least expensive route. That’s either Alternatives B or C. Now that the wallets are out, there is no law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C40</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Ray Collins</td>
<td>5/1/02</td>
<td>Last Tuesday’s (April 23) City Council meeting, as seen on BCTV, was an arrogant, rehearsed and well financed political charade. Y’mean NOT ONE person in Boulder City is against Bypass Alternative D? Do you want to see Old Town destroyed, forever, by wealth, greed, and opportunism? I think NDOT is required, by Nevada law, to choose the most expeditious and least expensive route. That’s “B” or “C”, the present truck route 93, through Hemorrhoid Valley. Las Vegas lawyer Bob Faiss knows more about state law than I do. Is that why he put his NEW million-dollar mansion, with a Lake Mead view, on the market this winter? His house will also have a lovely view of the new freeway. Is he the first rat to leave the sinking ship? The only way for citizens of Old Town to save Boulder City is a class-action lawsuit to force NDOT and CH2M to follow the law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C41</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Ray Collins</td>
<td>5/3/02</td>
<td>“D” is for DUMB. S’funny – during the last Council meeting (BCTV – April 23) the whole dam town was for Bypass Alternative D – at least all the bought-and-paid-for hot tub sycophants from Hemorrhoid Valley were for D. With a quaking voice, Mayor Ferraro told the trained apes in the audience he felt if B or C, the legal alternatives, were adopted it would split Our Town in two. The truth is, the town was split when the Council gave away land to the Albertsons’ shopping mall. Now our dear friends from Greedy Gulch don’t have to have a thing to do with Old Town – why should they care if we choke to death while they’re enjoying their views of the lake? Old Town needs to initiate a class-action lawsuit to let the courts decide what’s right instead of relying on the opinion of ex-Senator Bryan and his newfound rich pals. Alternatives B or C might make our wealthy neighbors think twice the next time they buy expensive property on a truck route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C42</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Mark D. Cook</td>
<td>4/27/02</td>
<td>I’ve reviewed the various routes proposed for Boulder City and wish to inform you that the New Through Town Alignment looks great to me…best of them all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C72</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Mike and Marcia Novello</td>
<td>4/2/02</td>
<td>We are residents of Boulder City, Nevada, and wish to add our voices in unequivocal support of the construction on the southern truck bypass (Alternative D) to accommodate traffic on the proposed new bridge below Hoover Dam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-1-2
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C75</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Lawrence and Diane Paige</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>As a resident of Boulder City, I want to endorse Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C88</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>S. Louise Reuther</td>
<td>5/9/02</td>
<td>I hope that you will count me in for the NO BUILD option for the route to the new bridge on the Colorado near Hoover Dam. I don’t like the other routes. I like the northern route you eliminated that didn’t even come into the Eldorado Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C94</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>Michael Sitton</td>
<td>5/5/02</td>
<td>Use Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C97</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Suthmm@aol.com">Suthmm@aol.com</a></td>
<td>5/6/02</td>
<td>Plan C or B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C106</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Richard W. and Mary Y. Allesee</td>
<td>3/31/02</td>
<td>We wish to take this means to reiterate our support, as expressed in our September 4, 2001, letter to Mr. Tom Greco, for Alternative D, the Southern Alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C108</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>Ronald B. McAlister</td>
<td>4/29/02</td>
<td>Route D is the only route which would protect, preserve, and best serve Boulder City and this beautiful land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. COMMENT SHEETS RECEIVED DURING OR AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING

#### D1. ACCESSIBILITY, OPERATIONS, AND SAFETY

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Robert Anaclerio</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. At each end of this corridor, traffic could be routed to best suit the motorist with proper signs (gas-food-motels). This is the most sensible route to keep the volume of autos going in the direction and destination they have in mind. Volume of autos will increase in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B solves nothing – heavy congestion – cross traffic – most likely impossible – one fender bender and the whole thing becomes a parking lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Andrea Anderson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I would like to see the highway located south of WAPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Jan Anderson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it gets the freeway out of town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Cynthia Bandy</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B does the most to disrupt the quality of life for Boulder City citizens and produces the most congestion for the commercial vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Karen Bartholomew</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Any route that uses U.S. 93 is not acceptable. It is already a noisy, unsafe condition and will become worse. The school bus and anyone crossing U.S. 93 at Pacifica is putting themselves and our children in great risk!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Robert V. Barton</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative C gets traffic out of main thoroughfare but leaves it in area presently disturbed with high traffic levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Boris A. Bernstein</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>An exit should be provided at the Buchanan (future) and the bypass crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>J. M. and C. V. Blackwell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>A frontage road and on/off-ramps will be needed at or between Dump Road and extension of Georgia/Buchanan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>William Blockley</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers none of the single alternatives. Keep Alternative A as it is. Add a “truck route” only by passing the city, possibly Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Joe Bowyer</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Why do we have to connect to Ensign’s Casino?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D24</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Ken Byler</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers none of the alternatives because we’re being asked to pick the least bad option out of a total of four bad options. If this highway project is really for a corridor between Phoenix and Las Vegas, use U.S. 95 to Blythe, Interstate 10 (I-10) to Phoenix. Right-of-way is already there plus 133 miles of interstate already bought and paid for. Don’t need to build bridges, off-ramps, etc. But this is a make work project for NDOT. Leave things as they are instead of giving Boulder City the choice of which way we want to die as a community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Priscilla Calvert</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The large number of businesses located along Alternative C would have to relocate due to access issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Grace H. Caporusso</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the route to use since it would be a “truck route.” This would limit the truck traffic through town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It has been so peaceful and clean since that unfortunate day in September when the trucks and trailers were detoured from Hoover Dam. Our town should be clean and peaceful from now on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D27</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>Noel Caporusso</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative C will destroy Boulder City. This will bring more truck traffic through Boulder City – pollution, noise, fumes, and possible accidents. CANAMEX traffic – trucks running between Mexico and Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Fred M. Cheek</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D would provide a better corridor for existing and future traffic demands along U.S. 93, would reduce traffic problems in Boulder City, and would be much safer. I have a rental on Buchanan with one-way alley, and I couldn’t get to it because traffic backed up from stop light on Buchanan to stop sign at Wyoming! How will my new renters like this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D33</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>Gary Compton</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B would make travel safer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative D does not solve the traffic problem caused by Boulder City residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Something needs to be done to make our road (U.S. 93) safer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D35</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Joyce D. Cook</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I prefer Alternative D because it takes the traffic away from town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D41</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>William S. Davis</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D below the D.O.E. Substation – regarding the 1 contour layouts of the possible choice – regarding under or overpass at east of airport will give Boulder City access to “all” the new area south and southeast.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-1-2
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D43</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Ralph and Sara Denton</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. We have lived in Boulder City since 1959. We have watched the trucks pass through town, even before the present bypass was built, and they poison our air, congest the roads so regular tourists are threatened, and never stop to shop; therefore, no revenue for the town. It proves, now that they are diverted through Laughlin, that you can travel into and around Boulder City without smelling the fumes or listening to the noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Once the town grew to the mountains on the north and homes were built there, it will be impossible for the town to service that part of the community without more fire stations and schools on that side of town. Because with a constant flow of trucks, it is going to be impossible to cross over safely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D48</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>Ferne Dismuke</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it keeps through traffic, trucks, utility vehicles, and dust out of town. At West Junction, put a huge sign, such as: Welcome Boulder City Home of Hospitality Good Food and Lodging Shopping and Be Pampered! Bed and Breakfast Visitors Information at the Boulder Dam Hotel on Arizona Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Leo Doyle</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C because it preserves existing traffic flow while improving access to shopping areas from town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D53</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>Johanna Eltrich</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. I live in Hemenway Valley and U.S. 93 is already very bad with too much traffic. If any other route is taken, it would divide our city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D62</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>Dolores Gabay</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D affects less people and has least amount of impact. This plan makes the most sense – may be long way around, but who cares. Trucks have been driving longer distances since 9/11, so let’s continue to leave it that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B makes it difficult getting in and out of Lake Mountain Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D65</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>Caryn Gifford</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. I am a parent of two precious teenagers – one is a new driver and the other soon to be. It scares me to death to think of them dodging heavy traffic and semi-trucks to get to their favorite fast food restaurants and video stores. The same goes for the elderly. We cannot have the trucks right through this small, beautiful town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D68</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>William L. Grant</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>No access off or on Alternative D is provided at Buchanan Boulevard. This is not desirable. Off- and on-ramps need to be provided at Buchanan Boulevard, which is a four-lane divided highway going right into Boulder City and access to the hospital.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-1-2
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D69</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>Manfred and Margot Guenther</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The volume of traffic if either Alternative B or C were chosen would be catastrophic for residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D75</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>Harry W. Helfrich</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B would be my last choice. I don’t want the traffic on the existing highway coming into town from Las Vegas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D77</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>James Hughes</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C the least because he doesn’t think all the extra lanes are needed down U.S. 93 and all of the overpasses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D79</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>C. Jayne</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Keep the trucks as far away from the city as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D81</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>Edward H. Jensen</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D to eliminate the increased traffic flow through Boulder City. I live in Hemenway Valley and many times I have a difficult time turning onto Pacifica Drive off of U.S. 93. Most Sundays there is a backup of vehicles heading to Arizona in Hemenway Valley. The stoppage can be all the way back to Lake Mountain Road. That’s in 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D82</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>Teresa M. Jensen</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because downtown Boulder City is too small to handle the proposed and actual increase in traffic, even with wider highways. We moved here in 1989 and have already noticed a major impact of congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D85</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>M. Kay</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>With Alternatives B and C, real concern “fear” regarding increased traffic over years, especially the threat of nuclear waste coming our way – “Stop Yucca”!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D86</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>Stephen Kay</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. All other routes create excessive traffic through the main part of town and part of the best residential areas. Also, city, town, and village bypasses have proved their worth – long-distance travelers can avoid the delays and frustrations of driving through towns, and townspeople avoid or reduce traffic-density problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D87</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>Alternatives A, B, and C concentrate too much unnecessary traffic (truck or through town) through the Hemenway Valley and the current Nevada Highway. Through traffic (Las Vegas to Kingman and beyond) will not benefit the merchants just because of this proposed location.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D89</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>L. Kevorkian</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because future expansion (widening, etc.) will be simpler in a less populous area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D91</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Kittleson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the best of the four choices you gave us. It appears to have the least amount of negative impact to our town. Go around the existing town and the town will naturally follow the new corridor. Do not try to force a change in the existing developed or partially developed areas of Boulder City. Alternative D is the only logical route of the four.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D92</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>Jane Lasiewicki</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. It’s hard enough now getting out on U.S. 93 if you live on either side of the highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D93</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>Prefers Alternatives B and C the least because they will tear apart the town and are dangerous traveling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D94</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>John D. Lasiewicki</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because he has seen more cars in Boulder City since the trucks are not allowed across the Dam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D95</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>Peter Linzmaier</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative A the least. Traffic will increase and cause more noise, pollution, and congestion. Traffic would not be accommodated in 20 years or less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D98</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>Jacqueline Lytal</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternatives B and C the least because of the dangerous conditions it creates for people living in Boulder City. We can hardly get out of our street now onto Highway 93.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D99</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>Norman Lytal</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Traffic now on U.S. 93 going down the hill from Albertson’s is terrible – many accidents. Streets north of U.S. 93 are congested and very difficult for residents to get on U.S. 93 to leave area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D100</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>James R. Markham</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because the highway should not go through area where people live. All high-speed traffic should be as far away from people as possible for health and noise and safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D101</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>Darryl Martin</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D, as far as possible from town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D103</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Darrell McGarvey</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. It will route trucks and other through traffic around Boulder City while routing Lake Mead and Hoover Dam tourists into Boulder City. Boulder City will be quieter and safer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D104</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>Diane McMakim and Roger Legare</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives A and B are poor choices. They will not handle increased traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D107</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>Robert Merrell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D decreases the amount of unwanted truck and through traffic that does not significantly contribute to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative D makes the travel for local residents easier in town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B does not serve the purpose of travel/traffic and safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D108</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>Scott Meyer</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D the least. This will have to have an interchange at Buchanan for emergency vehicle response to accidents. Once the interchange is built, and since it is on county and/or BLM land, we in Boulder City face the very likely prospect of a casino at or near the interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D115</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>Marlene Morwick</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Traffic going to the lake at this time is unsafe on U.S. 93. Trucks going through an area with homes on both sides at speeds of 60+ is just so???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D119</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>Gloria Nelson (Wootten)</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D to keep the trucks out of Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D121</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>Damon Ohlerking</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it bypasses the city while making it possible for visitors to access the city and its region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternative B the least because it bisects the city and does it in a very aggressive, noxious manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D122</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>Charles Oligschlaeger</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D – to remove truck and through-Arizona traffic from Boulder City. Take the Southern Alignment as far south as possible and extend it as far east as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D125</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>Virginia Perkins and Jeff Dalby</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D least. I've lived in places that put highways in. It destroys because traffic increases. It always increases with a new highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D127</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>Ronald Perry</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D will decrease traffic through Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D130</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>Jack and Vanessa Peterson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D will alleviate the traffic through town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative D will avoid unnecessary bypass traffic at Buchanan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternatives B and C will increase traffic problems through Hemenway Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D131</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>Linda Lee Peterson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D will preserve the town’s atmosphere and safety. There is no responsible reason to place high-speed truck and vehicular traffic that close to businesses and residences when it can be routed safety around the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternatives B and C will destroy the town by dividing it and increase the noise, pollution and endanger residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D132</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>Ricardo Pontillo</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I am against Alternative D primarily because it will box Boulder City in and will be surrounded by main highways. Most importantly, it will place a major highway in my front yard. This is unacceptable. Many more residents will be directly impacted if this alternative is adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D136</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>Barbara Raulston</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives B and C maintain the current traffic patterns the most instead of destroying new desert land south of town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D137</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>Vaughn Reuther</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I would prefer Alternative A because I feel that all three of the other alternatives would have an unacceptable impact on some portion of Boulder City’s residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I had felt that Alternative D would be an acceptable solution to the problem when I had heard that it was being planned to run south of the Mead Substation. Now I see that it is being planned to run north of the Mead Substation, and I feel that this alignment would have an unacceptable impact on the residents in that area of town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D143</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>Dolores Selson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D for its convenience. During construction there would be no detours and no business loss. There would be no inconvenience of dissected city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D144</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>Harold Selson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D for its convenience. During construction there would be no detours and no business loss. There would be no inconvenience of dissected city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B would bring traffic congestion through town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>D146</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>Tracy Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C because it achieves the goal of providing a safer means of traffic in Boulder City without having a negative impact on our local economy and negative environmental impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I also have grave concerns about the future of Highway 93 if Alternative D is selected. Highway 93 will remain a dangerous roadway if there are no improvements made to it. Consequently, only Alternative B or C address the safety concerns of Highway 93.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D156</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>Bob Triolo</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D to save the city and the community. We need to keep unwanted truck traffic from passing through the city. My concern now is the city has not done anything until recently and hopefully it is not too late. The second concern is now the effect Yucca Mountain has on the traffic flow and truck traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D157</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>Pamela Triolo</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>A small town should not have to deal with freeway exits to facilitate trucks traveling from Mexico to Canada. We shouldn’t be sacrificed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D160</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>Carl Trygstad</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The highway and traffic have outgrown Boulder City. The best alternative is to route through traffic around the city. Convert the existing highway to a city street and give state rights-of-way to the south of the city. Alternative D is the only one that seems reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternatives B and C the least. The access in and out of my neighborhood is absurd and totally ridiculous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D161</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>Steve Tuggle</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. I am a 27-year veteran of LVMPD traffic. As a supervisor, I deal with enforcement, engineering, and education when it comes to traffic problems. I have lived in Boulder City 1 year, and since 9/11, the change in traffic flows and congestion has improved on Hwy. 93. Egress/ingress on side streets is much safer. But traffic remains heavy on Hwy. 93. The southern bypass will improve traffic flow, congestion, and safety on Hwy. 93 for local residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternatives A, B, and C the least because continuing to use Hwy. 93 as the only arterial through Boulder City cannot provide a safe environment for vehicles 10, 20, 30 years from now. “Local” streets should be for “local” traffic. “Tourist” traffic should be routed away from local streets. As southern Nevada continues to grow, so does the amount of traffic. My career experience tells me that local traffic trying to egress/ingress on Hwy. 93 and Nevada Highway is reaching dangerous levels. If a person does business at a shop on Nevada Highway, that person sometimes has to wait 2 to 4 minutes (or more) just trying to exit a driveway to enter Nevada Highway to travel either north or south. Cars wanting to turn left run the turn [unreadable]. [Unreadable] into a drive are placed in peril all the time because of heavy traffic flows. Diverting out-of-town through the southern bypass will make Nevada Highway and Highway 93 safer roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The infrastructure in Boulder City cannot continue to handle increased traffic flows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The southern bypass option is the correct choice for 2003 and on into 2010, 2020, and 2030.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D162</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>Joseph P. Wagner</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B will probably have less long grades.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>D164</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>Mrs. Billie Waymire</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>We can’t have the trucks and heavy traffic through town. It is very unsafe for us to go to town now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D167</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Virginia Wines</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it does not make sense to keep running all the trucks and traffic through the center of town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D168</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>Maudie Wohlbrandt</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D will give us a route for the trucks, and the tourists can still access the LMNRA and Boulder City for services if they like, and we will welcome them!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternative B the least. The trucks would split Boulder City in two, and we had that before 9/11, so we know how bad that can be. The danger aspect is way too high to even consider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D171</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>Lettie Zimmerman</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D, although access for emergency vehicles needs to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t believe Alternative B will solve congestion. It will add pollution and will split the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D174</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>Mary Hinson</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>We would see a decrease in emergency services due to the high volume of traffic-related incidents with Alternative D. This road would be comparable to U.S. 95. The only difference would be that Boulder PD and fire would have to respond with no help from Clark County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D175</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>Rebecca L. Mahaney</td>
<td>5/13/02</td>
<td>My concerns are for Boulder City. Will putting the highway away from town render our city high and dry? Do we want to continually put up with the pollution, congestion, and accident danger by keeping U.S. 93 where it is?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D2. ENVIRONMENTAL

| D3         | 2.1  | Andrea Anderson            | 4/4/02   | Prefers Alternative D because it is the only alternative that does not destroy our quality of life and small-town environment.          |
| D4         | 2.2  | Bruce W. Anderson          | 4/4/02   | Alternative D is by far the best and most reasonable route. It will have the least impact on our total overall quality of life that we currently enjoy. |
|            | 2.3  |                            |          | Prefers Alternatives A and B the least. Either doing nothing or Alternative B would have the biggest impact on the quality of life. These would most certainly divide Boulder City in half. |
| D6         | 2.4  | Robert Ashley              | 4/4/02   | Alternative D keeps heavy truck traffic out of town. If traffic continues, eventually there will be a hazardous material spill. This cannot be allowed to happen. |
| D7         | 2.5  | Cynthia Bandy              | 4/4/02   | Alternative D accommodates both commerce and Boulder City’s "quality of life" factors the best.                                       |
| D9         | 2.7  | William W. Barnes          | 4/4/02   | Prefers Alternative D because southern routing of heavy truck traffic will have a marked impact toward improving the environment in Boulder City. |
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Karen Bartholomew</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the most preferred because it will impact the residents of Boulder City the least. Considering noise, pollution, and general traffic puts Alternative D to be the best!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Judith A. Barton</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative C disturbs the least amount of desert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Robert V. Barton</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D goes through presently undisturbed area bringing high noise levels to a side of Boulder City presently without these high noise levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Kenneth L. Bell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D will add increased air pollution to the whole town. Eighty percent of our prevailing winds are the southwest and west. This will sweep all air across the whole town. This route will open up much new areas for new construction of businesses and homes. This will just add to more pollution that will sweep up and through the existing town. This route will impact much more wildlife habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Boris A. Bernstein</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. It will take traffic and noise out of the residential area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Robert Bickel</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D has less noise, less pollution, less traffic through Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Charlene Blackwell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B is the least preferred – too much truck traffic through town and residential areas, noise pollution, smog pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Marge Blockley</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives B, C, and D adversely affects someone – or the environment/LMNRA – and is lots more costly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Delwin D. and Eloise Blue</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the only acceptable proposal. Alternatives B and C would only tear up the town for 3 or 4 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D25</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>Priscilla Calvert</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. It will decrease noise levels and air pollution to Boulder City residents. Many are seniors who have retired here to escape these issues. The lovely view of the lake would be preserved. An almost nonpopulated area would be most affected by the truck traffic. Takes traffic away from areas our children utilize (decrease danger).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D27</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Noel Caporusso</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Future trucks carrying radioactive waste to Yucca Mountain. Highways are unattractive. Views of Lake Mead will be obstructed with Alternative C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boulder City does not need the noise and dirt pollution with the major construction of Alternative C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The thought of Alternative C bringing an increase in truck traffic on U.S. 93 is a nightmare. Alternative C will destroy the peace and tranquility of Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The southern bypass – designated truck route – would not affect automobile traffic en route to Boulder City. No trucks on U.S. 93 means less traffic, less accidents, no truck pollution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>D28</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>Ken and Suzanne Carpenter</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>People have moved to Boulder City because it is clean, safe, and quiet. Alternatives A, B, and C will not fit any of these things that Boulder City is famous for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Fred M. Cheek</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the only route that will not cut Boulder City in half. Hemenway Valley residents do not want the noise of a big highway right next to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D32</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sound barriers would destroy neighborliness and small-town atmosphere. Consider the inputs of residents seriously – not just window dressing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D33</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>Gary Compton</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B is the least environmentally damaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D34</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>Diane Conrad</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternatives A and D because I want things to stay the same. Boulder City is quiet and beautiful. People who want tourist and etc. need to approach the issue in a different kind of marketing plan than to rely on existing traffic. We need a marketing plan for buses, if that’s what Boulder City wants, not a highway right through town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D35</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it provides less traffic and noise. Less chances for traffic accidents. It provides for better deal for the truck traffic. Better deal for Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D36</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>Donald K. Cooper</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Should be able to build Alternative B with the least disturbance to the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D37</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>Curtis Cornelius</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the least impacting to the environmental conditions of the Boulder City residential areas. Alternative B is the least acceptable because it is so directly impacting to the existing and future residential areas of Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D38</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>Ray Crooks</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it provides less traffic and noise. Less chances for traffic accidents. It provides for better deal for the truck traffic. Better deal for Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D39</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>Andrew Davlin, Jr.</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Second preference is for Alternative D because it has least impact to Boulder City, our way of life, least noise, least diesel exhaust and nitric oxide and least visual impact, and no trucks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D40</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>Ralph and Sara Denton</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Does not prefer Alternatives A, B, or C because of the impact on the town. Once they build sound barriers like they have on I-215, you are driving through a tunnel and cannot see the scenery. It would take away the view of the lake, which is Boulder City’s greatest asset, until you are right upon it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D41</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The two most valuable considerations, air quality and noise, are by far improved with Alternative D. It we lose on Yucca Mountain, and the trucks roll through with nuclear waste, how can we, in good conscience, not try to protect the people in Boulder City from a wreck carrying that waste?</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>D44</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>Roxanne Dey</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I think your contractor did a wonderful job with the computer animation and maps. I came here with one opinion, and after seeing the information, I changed my mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D46</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>Aileen Dike</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. We have a unique city here, so why disturb it? Taking traffic away from town will only improve it. Too many homes will be lost going through Hemenway Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stay out of Hemenway Valley. Following U.S. 93 through town increases pollution, noise, more accidents, loss of homes, and water runoff from concrete surface carries more pollution to lake. Admittedly, our rainfall on average isn't much, but a storm such as we had in '97 would be considerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D47</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>Fred and Joyce DiManno</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the only alternative that will continue to keep the majority of commercial trucks, noise, and pollution out of the center of town. It also provides the safest route for transport of hazardous materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B will bring truck traffic, noise, and pollution back into the city, cut the community in half, increase speed limits, transport of hazardous materials through town, and will force closure or relocation of at least five businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D49</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>Angela Doyle</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C because it is better for the environment. It will be millions of dollars cheaper. The road was already made with the intention of going to the bridge when it was first made. We do not need a new one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D51</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>Robert Draney</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. It has the least impact to 15,000 Boulder City residents. It reduces noise and pollution. It does not divide the city with a freeway. It does not create serious construction problems for the nearby residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D54</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>Frank E. Ensign</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D won’t impact Boulder City quality of life and historical significance with air, noise, traffic, light, and view pollution like Alternatives B or C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative C would be equivalent to building a freeway through the middle of Zion National Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D55</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Don and LaVonne Estes</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. This is the only route that leaves some semblance of the essence of Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D57</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>Meg Fair</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. Any of the other routes will compromise the quality of life here. The pollution, traffic congestion, and safety of our citizens will be affected by any of the other alternatives. Alternative D has the least impact on people and the sensitive environment of the LMNRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The least attractive is Alternative A. To do nothing would be a huge mistake. Traffic flow is already a huge problem, as well as pollution and safety. It is detrimental to the downtown businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D58</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>Rod Fair</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. I feel that any other route would only divide Boulder City up, which would lessen our quality of life. I’m concerned about trucks carrying hazardous waste moving through our town and the accident that might occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>D59</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>Bob Faisst</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Route D is the only route that will enhance the quality of life of our community by taking noise, pollution, congestion, and danger away from our homes and commercial center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boulder City and the approach to Lake Mead are treasures that belong to the general public, not just the citizens of the community. Any route other than Alternative D erodes the quality of those treasures for residents and visitors alike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D61</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>James Froseth</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because there would be improved air, reduced congestion, and improved safety in Boulder City for pedestrians and bikers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D62</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>Dolores Gabay</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I am sure the decision has already been made and you are not listening to the people who will be affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We need bike paths irrespective of route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D67</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>Linda Goodman</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Do not disturb Boulder City and our chosen way of life with the harmful threat of creating a bigger highway in Boulder City, and to the Lake, and to cross the Dam. We don’t want pollution, traffic, noise, obstruction of lake views, and unsafe trucks or other drivers. It has been quieter since September 11, 2001, and we do feel safer. Air quality has been improved as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D68</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>William L. Grant</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D with some reservations. Proximity to Boulder Rifle Range would cause closure of the range. This is not desirable. The highway needs to move further north (or west) to allow the rifle range to remain open in its current position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is inconceivable to me how the DEIS can take into account the preservation, or at least consideration, of items such as recreational bicycle routes and equestrian parking areas, which are seldom used, but completely failed to consider the Boulder Rifle &amp; Pistol Range, which is used by the public every single day! If the rifle range is not considered as an historical artifact (seeing that it has been in existence since the 1930s), it should at least be considered as a valuable recreation resource. In fact, it is the only shooting area open to the general public without charge in all of Clark County. It is estimated that relocation of the rifle range would cost in excess of $500,000 for just the earthwork alone, not counting the cost of relocating the structures, walls, target butts, and storage areas currently in use on the range. It is my understanding that the proposed shooting complex in North Las Vegas is several years away for operation (if not decades) and will cost a lot more than a change in routing of this bypass. Boulder City’s plan of building a range in the Eldorado Valley is also a long way off and does not take into account the relocation of facilities at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D69</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>Manfred and Margot Guenther</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. It would be the least disruptive option and the alternative with the least amount of negative impact on the lives of Boulder City residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-1-2
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D71</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>Albert K. Hamel</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D will keep the trucks out of Boulder City, less noise and pollution. The cost may be more than Alternative B, but I believe it will work out better in the long run.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B may be cheaper, but will end up looking like I-215 and I-515 in Henderson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D71</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The DEIS goes into a lot of detail on Alternative D as to bike paths, equestrian trails, and parking but says nothing about Boulder Rifle and Pistol Club range. This range has been in existence for over 65 years. If the road goes through, as the draft says, the range will have to close. The cost of moving the range would be in excess of $750,000. The earthwork, including interior roads and range facilities, would be in the neighborhood of $500,000. This is a cost that has not been figured in. The Boulder Rifle and Pistol Club range is the only range with a courtesy area open to the public in Clark County. The range is in use 7 days a week. There are shooters on the public range daily, and on weekends the range is full. This range is also used for national match competition. It is one of the few ranges with a 1,000-yard capability in the southwest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D75</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>Harry W. Helfrich</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The DEIS goes into a lot of detail on Alternative D as to bike paths, equestrian trails, and parking but says nothing about Boulder Rifle and Pistol Club range. This range has been in existence for over 65 years. If the road goes through, as the draft says, the range will have to close. The cost of moving the range would be in excess of $750,000. The earthwork, including interior roads and range facilities, would be in the neighborhood of $500,000. This is a cost that has not been figured in. The Boulder Rifle and Pistol Club range is the only range with a courtesy area open to the public in Clark County. The range is in use 7 days a week. There are shooters on the public range daily, and on weekends the range is full. This range is also used for national match competition. It is one of the few ranges with a 1,000-yard capability in the southwest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D76</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>Barbara Hughes</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. The other routes tear Boulder City apart adversely impacting the majority of citizens. We don’t want the dirt, noise, etc. that these freeways bring. It would be a travesty to ruin our quiet, peaceful small community – the reason we moved here in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D77</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>James Hughes</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it should cause the businesses in Boulder City less problems, including relocating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D78</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>Ken Isaacson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the only feasible solution to keep from dividing Boulder City in half and to prevent the noise and air pollution that would result from any other option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternatives B and C would ruin our city, and the noise and air pollution would be unbearable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D80</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>Cameron Jayne</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I think there is a pre-existing decision already…that you are being kind – in a Machiavellian sort of way – to make us “think” we have a say. Truth is you’ve already decided. But what I want is as far away as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D84</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>Curtis D. Karr</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative B the least. The air quality and noise levels and vehicle and pedestrian safety level will continue to rise (higher numbers) throughout the useful life years of the highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D85</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>M. Kay</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. I live in L.M.E. and am concerned regarding present “living” environment – wish to maintain it. See this route as less invasive to populated areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternatives B and C the least, especially Alternative C, because of noise, traffic, unsightly (although necessary) sound barriers.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>D87</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>L. Kevorkian</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. The impact on desert animals and plants will be felt, but not ruinous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D87</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternatives B and C least. Any road that creates more pollution (noise, fumes, and dust) for residents is not a good thing. This area of the United States is developing so rapidly. We must suffer from some inconveniences, but routing a highway so-called “bypass” through residential areas is really a poor plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D88</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>Len Kevorkian</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is my preference. The increase in traffic, especially trucks, in the next few years will have a great impact on the smog, noise, and safety of residents, especially in the Hemenway Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D88</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The possibility of nuclear waste transportation coming right through town is intolerable. If there is a nuclear or other hazardous waste accident, at least the southern route “D” will be out of the residential area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D89</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Kittleson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives A, B, and C are terrible. Please do not ruin our lovely lake view residential areas with pollution, sound walls, and dangerous traffic. Tourists don’t like traffic either. Local businesses will suffer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D90</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>Karen W. Lampus</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because there is less traffic through Boulder City. Less noise – less smog – safer roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D91</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>Marie Langer</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. My home is off U.S. 93, and I do not relish the idea of a freeway close to me. Boulder City is a wonderful town with clear air, etc., and I would like to keep it that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D95</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>Peter Linzmaier</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives B and C are not practical. It would disrupt the peaceful living now enjoyed by Boulder City residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D96</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>Antoinette Luisi</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternatives B and C the least. I don’t want noise level up and property value down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D97</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>Paul Luisi</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Noise levels would increase with Alternatives B and C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D98</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>Jacqueline Lytal</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because this route will not cut the town in half and ruin living conditions for the people of Boulder City. Many people of Boulder City will have to move if we don’t get Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D101</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>Darryl Martin</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B would have too much of an increase in noise, pollution, and traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D102</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>Nina and John McDonald</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The noise and visual disturbances with Alternative C in turn would cause the peace, serenity, and beauty for which we decided to buy our first home in that locale to cease to exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D104</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>Diane McMakim and Roger Legare</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D has the least impact to existing structures, nature of town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D105</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>R. F. Merino</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D eliminates at least 50 percent of noise from traffic through Hemenway Valley to and from Arizona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D105</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternatives B and C the least because both will be longer, dirtier, and noisier during construction.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>D106</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>Lori Merrell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D would be the best option for noise reduction. This is the route chosen by the Chamber of Commerce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D107</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>Robert Merrell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it preserves the quiet, small-town community that he moved here for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D107</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative D decreases noise and light pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D107</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternatives B and C disrupt our small community with sound walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D107</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative C scars beautiful Red Mountain and cuts through Red Mountain golf course (hurting this tourist destination).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D107</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The environmental impact on the people who live in this city would be irreparably damaged by Alternatives B and C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D110</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>Byron L. Miller</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it keeps truck and through traffic out of populated areas. Reduces noise and emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D110</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternatives A, B, and C continue to bring truck and through traffic through residential and congested area. Increased traffic hazard noise and pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D111</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>Milan R. Milar</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because this is a quiet bedroom community that would like to stay that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D111</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B is not realistic. All drawings viewed at EIS meeting appear not to scale through Hemenway Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D112</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>Linda Mooney</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D will not interrupt any humans at this time, and after all, aren’t humans and their homes as or more important than turtles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D113</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>Barbara J. Morris</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D has the least impact upon people and their existing homes. Going down to the Lake and passing St. Jude’s is a beautiful sight, but not if it turns into a freeway – ugly. Beautiful Boulder City will be a thing of the past – how sad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D113</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative C, with its freeway overpasses and huge amount of traffic, would impact not only the residents in Hemenway Valley, but the hikers, park, St. Jude’s youngsters, etc. with the noise and air pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D114</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>Ken Morris</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Any alternative along the existing U.S. 93 is not acceptable from a noise, pollution, and aesthetic reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D116</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>Robert Monwiek</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Boulder City is a beautiful, peaceful town. Any alignment other than Alternative D will only change it forever.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D116</td>
<td>2.101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternative B the least because it will cause unhealthy emissions in Boulder City plus unhealthy noise levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D118</td>
<td>2.102</td>
<td>Robert Musick</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D will not disrupt our quiet lifestyle. It keeps trucks out of our city streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D118</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B only creates more noise, traffic, and pollution in town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D120</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>Bill and Betty Nickell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives B and C are unacceptable. They would ruin our view, lifestyle forever.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D123</td>
<td>2.104</td>
<td>Donald and Deonne Oliver</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I think NDOT engineers have done a good job showing the proposed routes along with the visual topographic drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D124</td>
<td>2.105</td>
<td>Jim Paxinos</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D overall seems to have the least impact on the present lifestyle for Boulder City residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B comes directly through our town and would require sound walls and would just not be logical to build a freeway in the center of a community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D125</td>
<td>2.107</td>
<td>Virginia Perkins and Jeff Dalby</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C because Hemenway Valley – bought their houses for a view of the lake. An improved highway is not going to hurt their view and a road already exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D least. I bought my house on San Felipe 1.5 years ago for the mountain view. I did not pay for a highway view. Had I known (I came from out of state), I would not have bought this house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D126</td>
<td>2.109</td>
<td>Barbara Perry</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it eliminates traffic and noise through Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D127</td>
<td>2.110</td>
<td>Ronald Perry</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D would decrease noise levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternative B the least. Against rising noise and traffic levels in Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D128</td>
<td>2.112</td>
<td>Mildred Petersen</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative A because of air quality, safety, and noise levels. Prefers Alternative C the least because of noise levels, air quality, and safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D130</td>
<td>2.113</td>
<td>Jack and Vanessa Peterson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D will achieve and maintain a quaint Boulder City environment. It will protect accidental spillage making its way to Lake Mead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative D will eliminate noise or keep it at a minimum. It is a waste of money spent on flood channels at U.S. 93. Alternative D won’t have unsightly sound walls running through town. It will avoid separating the town by a major freeway, and it has the least amount of disruption of traffic for construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D132</td>
<td>2.115</td>
<td>Ricardo Pontillo</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Before any final action, two additional public comment months are required. It is my sense that insufficient time has been allowed for public comment and input. At a minimum two (2) additional public hearings are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The northern alternative has the least potential impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D133</td>
<td>2.117</td>
<td>Beverli G. Powell and Jack F. Powell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D has less disruption for the city. Imagine nuclear waste coming right through town!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B divides the city – would be terrible for residents on either side!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D134</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td>Jack F. Powell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D leaves Boulder City occupied area with minimal disturbance. Through traffic is routed outside of the residential and business areas. The reduction in through traffic would improve the aspects of small-town life. The city would not be bisected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D136</td>
<td>2.120</td>
<td>Barbara Raulston</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternatives B or C because land is already developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D the least. Why ruin more desert around Boulder City in order to avoid improving an already existing route?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homeowners on the south side of town use that area for recreation. Alternative D would take that away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizens need more time to review the DEIS prior to attending a public meeting on the issue. There should be more than one hearing on such an important issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The comment period should be extended to allow more citizen education – one side of town is very informed and one isn’t. Extend the comment period to allow all citizens input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why is there no mitigation required for the increased noise in LMNRA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a problem with getting a hard copy of the DEIS. Apparently, leaving a message on the project voicemail isn’t sufficient. There was no information given out to the public prior to the ONLY public hearing about how to obtain a hard copy of the DEIS until attending the meeting. Would have been good to get a copy beforehand. Not everyone has web access, or time to sit up at City Hall/Library and read the document. This seems a way to avoid controversy versus providing as much access and information to as many people as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative D would go around the town reducing the traffic in congested areas and reduce the sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative C would be right next to town increasing noise and traffic in town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My grandparents live right where the freeway (Alternative C) will be. This is a home where my great-grandparents grew up. It means a lot to our family. This choice would only bring more traffic and noise to Boulder City. I feel Alternative D would benefit everybody. There are no homes where Alternative D is routed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D139</td>
<td>2.127</td>
<td>Steven Riley</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D would have no noise during construction and no sound walls would be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative D would have a view of the lake. Tourists stop to take pictures from U.S. 93.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area for Alternative D is not usable for homes or business due to transmission lines.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>D144</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>Harold Selson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D would have no noise during construction and no sound walls would be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative D would have a view of the lake. Tourists stop to take pictures from U.S. 93.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area for Alternative D is not usable for homes or business due to transmission lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D147</td>
<td>2.136</td>
<td>Ann Struve</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. Any other route will destroy Boulder City’s quite quaint atmosphere. We live in Boulder City to get away from the major growth and noise. I know we need a safer route, but please don’t put it in the middle of our town! Alternative D is a win win for everyone, including present businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D150</td>
<td>2.137</td>
<td>Terra Vista, LP</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B would be least preferred. It would create more traffic, noise, and pollution in our own backyard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D151</td>
<td>2.138</td>
<td>Mary Jane Therrien</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. It makes the most sense in order to preserve the quality of life that has been here from 1935 and earlier. We will risk families and communities if we do not choose this plan. It will not disrupt anyone by going through the desert, which has no communities involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C least. This will destroy our home, our retirement, our quality of life. We worked all our lives to achieve. We paid taxes and saved to move here and enjoy the natural, quiet surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D152</td>
<td>2.140</td>
<td>Russ Thompson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it reduces truck traffic through Boulder City – less noise and air quality problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D153</td>
<td>2.141</td>
<td>Sue Thompson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. If Alternative B or C is used, the noise level to residents would be prohibitive. Six to eight lanes of traffic surely will have more noise than two lanes. To date, Boulder City is a quiet community. To have huge amounts of traffic flow through would be the same as living in Las Vegas, Cleveland, or New York. By having a bypass, which Alternative D would allow, Boulder City would retain a small-town quality not seen in larger cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D154</td>
<td>2.142</td>
<td>Gladys C. Towles</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is too close to Georgia Avenue. Noise will be too much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D155</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>Robert Towles</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D will be in fill as it crosses Buchanan, thus more noise, fumes, etc. The prevailing winds are from the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D157</td>
<td>2.144</td>
<td>Pamela Triolo</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the one I prefer. It will leave our town intact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Mead is a beautiful recreational area. Coming down U.S. 93, the view is magnificent and should not be destroyed by overpasses. We need to preserve areas of beauty, not destroy them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D158</td>
<td>2.146</td>
<td>Julie Troiola</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D impacts our desert environment too much. Parts of these desert areas are “untouched” and have been forever. The only area for horses is B hill, don’t cut off our desert access. That is why we live here. You cannot have horses anywhere else. There is desert life, plants, etc. that would be sacrificed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2-1-2
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D159</td>
<td>2.147</td>
<td>Arlene Troup</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D will be the least disruptive to the whole town and will be far enough away so the noise will be less than it is now on the truck route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D160</td>
<td>2.148</td>
<td>Carl Trygstad</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives B and C would adversely affect the city. The noise and pollution would increase, and sound walls are only unsightly band-aids. These alternatives put busy freeway traffic right through the middle of beautiful residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A freeway through Hemenway Valley would totally disrupt the lives of many residents. The environmental impact would be huge. The residents’ homes and access to homes would be adversely affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D162</td>
<td>2.150</td>
<td>Joseph P. Wagner</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B will disturb much less acres of land. It will use less Boulder City land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With Alternative B, there should be less exhaust pollutants in Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D163</td>
<td>2.152</td>
<td>Edward L. Waymire</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. We don’t want the noise, dust, and traffic. Nevada is fighting Yucca Mountain – are we going to have hazardous waste through our city – no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C the least because we do not want this traffic through our city – noise – dust – destroying our homes – our way of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D164</td>
<td>2.154</td>
<td>Mrs. Billie Waymire</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the only acceptable alternative. Any of the others would destroy the beautiful view of Lake Mead and destroy existing homes, developments, etc. This can be constructed without stopping traffic flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative C is the least acceptable as it destroys Hemenway Valley and the beautiful Lake Mead we all love.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D165</td>
<td>2.156</td>
<td>Molly A. Weaver</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because of improved air quality and it’s the best way to provide optional access to Boulder City without forcing a lot of traffic through town, which would have many negative effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D169</td>
<td>2.157</td>
<td>John Zerfoss</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative B because base roadway is there now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D the least because we open new ground up. Let’s not impact the land more than we have to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D172</td>
<td>2.159</td>
<td>Jerome and Karen Zuniga</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. Both Alternatives B and C will establish a freeway (four or 6 lanes) right by our home – with all the accompanied noise, pollution, and visual ugliness. Alternative D will route this chaos around our wonderful little town, maintaining the pristine, quality life that we all moved here for.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Comments

<table>
<thead>
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<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D174</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>Mary Hinson</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative B. This alternative has the least impact with the most gain. Not sure where the increased “unsafe conditions” or “increased wildlife vehicle collisions” would occur – the bypass already exists here. There is a “safe” public use trail with plans to continue it into the park – construction of new bypass would include “bridges” for bighorn sheep to go under safely – noise will be limited to Hemenway Valley, thus saving the majority of Boulder City. This entire area has already been impacted. Not sure where the 327 acres of disturbance is going to happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D the least. It has the most impact to Boulder City residents, resources, and environment. This plan proposes to disturb pristine desert tortoise habitat, as well as bighorn sheep habitat. It would require a road within the recreation area, which totally conflicts with backcountry user groups. A large portion of residents would be impacted by an increase of noise and pollution. Not sure why you have listed “decreased noise levels in Boulder City” – only that you want the majority of residents mislead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D175</td>
<td>2.162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative D would totally destroy the view and soundscapes that exist in the desert right now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D177</td>
<td>2.163</td>
<td>Rebecca L. Mahaney</td>
<td>5/13/02</td>
<td>Alternative D disturbs acres of wildlife land, pulls all traffic away from town, thus taking business away from current businesses that depend on more than the locals, and impacts residents on the south and east side of town who, when they bought their homes, were not impacted by the noise and pollution of a highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.164</td>
<td>Leslie Paige</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I prefer Alternative B, if I had to choose from A, B, C, or D. Leave bypass where it was originally built. Less impact on people, land, habitat, and environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D the least. It destroys pristine desert. It destroys bighorn sheep/tortoise habitat. It shifts noise and pollution to south side of Boulder City. It surrounds Boulder City with highway/freeway. It is too expensive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D3. Implementation and Construction

<p>| D1        | 3.1   | Paul Adams              | 4/4/02   | Alternatives B or C would split the town in pieces. Construction would create dust, noise, and worsened traffic for about 2 years. After that, the town would still be divided and traffic in Hemenway Valley would be very heavy in a housing area. |
| D5        | 3.2   | Jan Anderson            | 4/4/02   | Alternative B is not realistic. It will cost more.                                                                                                                                                     |
| D9        | 3.3   | William W. Barnes       | 4/4/02   | I like Alternatives B and C the least because they will be most expensive and will needlessly destroy a beautiful, quiet community. If this happens, I will move to Wyoming.                                |
| D13       | 3.4   | Kenneth L. Bell         | 4/4/02   | I prefer either Alternative B or C. These are by far the best from a cost standpoint.                                                                                                                 |
| D13       | 3.5   |                        |          | Prefers Alternative D the least because it is projected to cost more than double the cost of Alternatives B or C. I feel that this is an understated amount for this route.                           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D29</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Chuck Cascioppo</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D seems to be the most effortless to build. Nothing is in the way of progress. It could be built where you would never see it or hear it. You’d only need a sound wall on one side and with the right elevation you’d never see it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D35</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Joyce D. Cook</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I’ve heard that Alternative D would be the most expensive route – not that that would deter the government from picking this route. They think we taxpayers have bottomless pockets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D36</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Donald K. Cooper</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative B because it is the cheapest and will serve the purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D38</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Ray Crooks</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative C is no good for Boulder City. The expense would be prohibitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D38</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Matt Di Teresa</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative B because it is least disruptive to the environment, the cheapest, the most direct, and does not direct traffic away from our business district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D45</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D the least because it is most expensive; will impact the most citizens via noise, pollution, etc.; least direct route to the bridge; and directs traffic away from our business district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D54</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Frank E. Ensign</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives B and C will destroy Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D54</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Highway designers and planners consistently underdesign roads and highways for future traffic conditions. Even if Alternative D is more expensive now – it would provide easy and inexpensive future expansion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D57</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Meg Fair</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D was the route voted on by the citizens of Boulder City as our advisory issue several years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D57</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Any other route but Alternative D will have to be rerouted there in a very short period after completion due to the increased population of the Las Vegas Valley.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D63</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Hans A. Ganz</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. It is faster for traffic, quieter for neighborhood, and easier to build outside established residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D68</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>William L. Grant</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D would need to be asphalt, not concrete, to cut down on noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D72</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Jan Hansen</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative B – lowest cost, least amount of impact on business and loss of quality of life in Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D72</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>Alternative D has the highest cost and most impact on the quality of life in Boulder City, especially along Georgia Avenue and the Lewis Homes around the golf course. If Alternative D could be pushed towards the mountains behind and east of the Mead Substation, maybe that would be more acceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D75</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>Harry W. Helfrich</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C. I believe that the cost of Alternative D is prohibitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D76</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>Barbara Hughes</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>If you selected Alternative B and expansion is needed in the future, where would you go?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-1-2
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D77</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>James Hughes</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I hope they haven’t already made up their minds as I have heard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D78</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>Ken Isaacson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Neither Alternative B nor C provide for future expansion without destroying more of our city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D84</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>Curtis D. Karr</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C. It will be the shortest route to the present route of U.S. 93 through Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D105</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>R. F. Merino</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. It is cleaner during the construction period. It avoids years of construction through and in downtown Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D108</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>Scott Meyer</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative A. It is a huge waste of money since U.S. 95 is already funded and approved for widening to four lanes from the Laughlin turnoff, through Searchlight, to the U.S. 93/95 interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D111</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>Milan R. Mlarar</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it is less cost overall when considering keeping existing roads open during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D112</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>Linda Mooney</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. Since the early ‘60s, this has been going on, and each year the cost will increase. So, I don’t feel the cost should be a factor since the taxpayers are paying in the long run and the government has drug their feet for 40 years to increase the cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D130</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>Jack and Vanessa Peterson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D allows for further expansion, if necessary, in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D134</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>Jack F. Powell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives B and C would ultimately destroy the concept of Boulder City life and as traffic increases and the routes must be expanded – what then?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D135</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>Alfred A. Radosta</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the least offensive to the taxpayers of Boulder City. Payment for this project and future projects of this nature, as well as our future employment are funded by taxpayers, not sheep and tortoise. 85 percent of the land area of Nevada is dedicated to their survival. Leave 15 percent for the taxpayer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D136</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Barbara Raulston</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives B and C are the least expensive routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The cost of each alternative should include mitigation costs. This is considerably more for Alternative D than the other alternatives, and taxpayers need to know that the price of Alternative D will be even more than what is in the DEIS!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D148</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>David S. Struve</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D has the least impact on homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D155</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Robert Towles</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C because it costs less. There is already a highway existing. Those that have built there were aware of the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D the least due to being too close to Georgia Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D156</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>Bob Triolo</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I would really like to see the bridge that is being built now to bypass the Dam be considered the driving initiative to getting started on Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D157</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>Pamela Triolo</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>If Alternative B or C come to pass, Hemenway Valley might as well just be annexed by Henderson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D164</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>Mrs. Billie Waymire</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B or C would be horrible while constructing and also when completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| D173      | 3.41 | John D. Bayer  | 5/10/02   | The current study begins approximately 100 feet east of Foothills Drive. According to conversations with members of the NDOT staff, they indicate that the next study moves from the above reference point to the spaghetti bowl. I feel that the first study should be expanded westward approximately 200 feet west of the Wagon Wheel Interchange. My suggestion is based on the following facts:  
1. A homebuilder is currently under construction to build 900 homes and is working with the BLM for the trade of the land in that area that will expand his development 10 fold.  
2. Car County development is under negotiations to build 300 apartments, 300 condos, an extended-stay hotel, and 400 timeshare units.  
3. The Nevada State College will begin this fall with approximately 200 acres for future development. It will not be long before this college has at least 5,000 students in minimum attendance.  
All of this development will be forced to use the Wagon Wheel Interchange which, with its current design, this interchange is insufficient to handle this amount of future growth. I have met with Joe Damiani, a public works engineer for the City of Henderson, and expressed my concerns. He indicated the Henderson staff was meeting with Boulder City and NDOT in order to address my concerns and those of the City of Henderson. |
| D174      | 3.42 | Mary Hinson    | 5/10/02   | It would open the area up for development in that all public services would be too far away. It would ruin local business opportunity and it would cost $125,000,000.00 more to build.                        |
| D175      | 3.43 | Rebecca L. Mahaney | 5/13/02 | From your choices, I choose Alternative C, the new through-town alignment. It is less costly but pulls truck traffic off our main street.  
Alternative D is too costly.  
Those homes/businesses along the existing U.S. 93 have always had the highway beside them. They knew it was there when they bought. Some counted on it! Improving and aligning what we already have makes the most sense to the environment and the pocketbook. |
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D176</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>Michael L. Mahaney</td>
<td>5/13/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternatives B or C for the following reasons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It is less expensive than Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It impacts less property than Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It will take less time to build.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Alternatives B or C are close to the existing U.S. 93, which has existed for years, and everyone that owns property now or purchased property did so knowing that U.S. 93 was there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I least prefer Alternative D for the following reasons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It costs more than $100 million above B or C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It impacts far more property than B or C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It impacts more residents than B/C since U.S. 93 has always been near Alternative B or C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It will take some business away from Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It will take more time to build.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It will be more costly to maintain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Property owners all along the existing U.S. 93 knew when they purchased their property a highway existed, so to upgrade the existing highway along the same route will not significantly impact businesses, people, property, or property owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To build a route around the city will impact property, people, old business, and new business. It will also impact cost to build, cost to maintain, and property owners who purchased their homes away from the existing U.S. 93 originally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To build bypass Alternative D would be a slap in the face to property owners on the east side and a pat on the back to the lake view owners, which is totally unfair, as well as illegal!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D177</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Leslie Paige</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>There already is a Boulder City bypass. People in Hemenway Valley chose to build next to “the truck route.” It would be wasteful to build another bypass because of this. I feel a new bypass to the south is unfair to residents in the heart of Boulder City and careless to the environment. What will stop building along the new freeway in the future? We treasure the beautiful view and freedom to walk out into the desert in our backyard. Don’t destroy that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D4. SOCIO-ECONOMICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Paul Adams</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. A bypass does not necessarily hurt most business. The Chamber polled business in Boulder City. About 75 percent felt it would not harm them. It would take through traffic away from the residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Jan Anderson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because few businesses will be impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Judith A. Barton</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C because it is still close enough to town for visitors without traffic problems through town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Summary of Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D21</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Joe Bowyer</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives A, B, and C will not be good for the people of Boulder City. They will ruin the businesses in Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Gene Breeden</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. I own a business in Boulder City – A-1 Truck Driver Training at 1105 Industrial Road. I have been at the same location for 23 years. Getting the traffic out of town is my hope – both as a homeowner in Boulder City since 1968 and as a businessman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers Alternative B the least. We just get the traffic out of town. Our quality of life is at stake. I know businesses will close, but that’s life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Grace H. Caporusso</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>As for the businesses in Boulder City, the truckers are not tourists. Tourists would still come to Boulder City whether by car or tour bus. Alternative D would keep Boulder City quiet and peaceful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative C would take valuable properties from citizens of Boulder City. It will create a concrete jungle in Boulder City. It will divide this town in half.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D27</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Noel Caporusso</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. Boulder City does not need an increase in truck traffic. Trucks bring pollution to Boulder City – noise, burning rubber tires, diesel fumes. Truckers don’t stop or spend money in Boulder City. Alternative D should be designated truck traffic only. Tourist traffic will still come to Boulder City. Most cities have bypass roadways to keep trucks from driving through the cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Property values will downslide on either side of Alternative C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Who would buy a house close to or overlooking a multilane highway, bridges, and sound barriers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D29</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Chuck Cascioppo</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B would kill all business down Nevada Highway at Veterans Memorial Drive to Buchanan at the turn off to the lake. The way it is now with the trucks diverted through Laughlin, it is now a people friendly area to shop and eat and get service. Keep the through traffic out of Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The downtown area needs the people who want to see Boulder City, not the people who have to drive through only. Boulder City has a lot of people who come here. Make it a destination and not just a thoroughfare through town. There’s enough people who see the dam, the lake, the marinas, Hacienda Hotel – let’s keep the town the same – user friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Fred M. Cheek</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative A would be a disaster, especially when trucks are again allowed over the new bridge. Alternatives B and C are not any help to the new houses to the right going to the lake or any of the homes in Hemenway Valley. The increased traffic and noise will decrease property values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D33</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Gary Compton</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative C would divert business from the business community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D34</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>Diane Conrad</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Keep Nevada Highway the same. I have a business at 1649 Nevada Highway and do not depend on tourists or traffic. I like no trucks on or in our town. Keep things in town quiet and people will still come in who want to. Even people who don’t stop will still come in and take scenic route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D36</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>Donald K. Cooper</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B will help Boulder City business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boulder City will dry up and blow away with Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D40</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>Art Davie</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D serves the residents of Boulder City best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D46</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>Aileen Dike</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>It is up to the merchants and citizens of Boulder City to make tourists want to come here, forcing traffic to come through our city will have disastrous results and will only discourage voluntary visitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D47</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>Fred and Joyce DiManno</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Either Alternative B or C will have a negative impact on the value of our home, as well as our neighbors’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D49</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Angela Doyle</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>If you build a new road, I believe that it will take business away from downtown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D55</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>Don and LaVonne Estes</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Any other route, other than Alternative D, would effectively nullify our way of life, likely forcing us to leave the area and seek peace elsewhere – and we have been at our present address about 38 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D59</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>Bob Faiss</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Route D is the only one that ensures the preservation of St. Jude’s Ranch for children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D66</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>Jeff Gifford</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives A, B, and C bring the highway right through town. It will lower property values, bring more pollution, and cut our town in half.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D67</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>Linda Goodman</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>We would like to improve the quality of our roads and some to be widened, but not at the costs of creating new highway and traffic through Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D73</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>Dennis Hanson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because of Alternative B and C impacts on Boulder City and Hemenway Valley, and the loss of value to properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D84</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>Curtis D. Karr</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative C will also improve the current local business trade traffic situation in Boulder City and make it the most convenient for future through traffic to use Boulder City local business. It also will be the shortest time route and economical route to build.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local business will be used less along the route every continual year of the useful life years of the highway with Alternative B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D86</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>Stephen Kay</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Trade in Boulder City will not be affected materially by any of the proposed four locations. Those who wish to visit Boulder City will come either route. Others will still just drive through and maintain their schedules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D87</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>L. Kevorkian</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. Traffic through town, those that want to go to restaurants, stores, Hoover Dam, etc., will continue, but those not interested will and can use the southern bypass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boulder City is a unique community in many ways. Its small-town feel is wonderful to live in, and we'd like to keep it as peaceful as we can, with the understanding that there will be growth. My question is, “Does growth have to come at such a high price?” The southern, or “D” route seems to address both needs. It satisfies the need for more roads for the future (and now) but eliminates the negative impact or more traffic through our little town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D88</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>Len Kevorkian</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Any tourism going to the Dam or Boulder City will still continue to come through town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional economic impact [of the construction of Alternatives B or C] is real possibility of many homeowners leaving the area, thus depressing values of property and low-income families filling the void, which in turn lowers the tax base. This may sound elitist, but it is a fact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D92</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>Jane Lasiewicki</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>With Alternatives B or C, property values will decline. It will hurt businesses because of so much traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D93</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>John D. Lasiewicki</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternatives B and C the least because these routes affect Boulder City business. The trucks do not shop in Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D95</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>Peter Linzmaier</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D is the only practical route. Common sense dictates that this route will have the least impact on Boulder City. Business owners object to this route, but their concerns are not valid. Tourists and locals will still patronize them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D96</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>Antoinette Luisi</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. I am sure that all of the reasons are very clear. Property values will go down, nuclear waste won’t be transported through our town, and the project will be invisible to our city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D98</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>Jacqueline Lytal</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives B and C will ruin the business on the main street. Property values will fall and people will move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D99</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>Norman Lytal</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Feels that Alternatives B and C will cause lower property values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D102</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>Nina and John McDonald</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative C would directly impact our family, as it would mean the new route would cross only 300 feet from our property line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D106</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>Lori Merrell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D would pose the least disruption to our small town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative B would greatly affect the poor businesses during the 5 years of construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To live in this town because of the “small town” atmosphere, anything but Alternative D will ruin our town.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>D107</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>Robert Merrell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D results in the least amount of disruption of local business during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D112</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>Linda Mooney</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative B the least because of the traffic through town, and then Alternative C because it will either take our home and the next door where my husband was raised, our retirement home, or fly over it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D113</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>Barbara J. Morris</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>With Alternative B or C, people will move from Boulder City, and the businesses will then really suffer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D116</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>Robert Morwiek</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it will be the least disturbing route to Boulder City. Trucks do not stop in Boulder City – only at the casinos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D123</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Donald and DeOnne Oliver</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives B and C both would destroy too many property owners’ home and land values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D129</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>C. E. Peterson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D will least destroy the lifestyle of Boulder City. It will enhance the tourist experience in Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternatives B and C will not only split Boulder City, but a lot of local businesses will not survive the construction period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D136</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>Barbara Raulston</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Homeowners in Hemenway purchased their homes near an existing highway, which was originally built as a bypass. All that’s being done with Alternative B or C is improving it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D143</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>Dolores Selson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>With Alternative D, there would be no drop in property values. Boulder City would not be just another freeway town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D144</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>Harold Selson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>With Alternative D, there would be no drop in property values. Boulder City would not be just another freeway town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D146</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>Tracy Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D the least. I believe Alternative D will have the greatest negative impact on our local economy. Alternative D is also the least economical solution to the traffic problem. It costs $125 million more dollars, or 56 percent, more than Alternative B or C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D148</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>David S. Struve</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B cuts the heart out of this great city! Please do not send the trucks through our town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Our businesses will continue to stay in business with Alternative D. People that want to come in and see our town still will with Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D156</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>Bob Triolo</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I really would consider selling my house and leave Boulder City if the truck traffic is not diverted from the city.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>D157</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>Pamela Triolo</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. We will still get Lake Mead and Hoover Dam tourists, yet the town won’t be split in half with a highway. Both needs of residents and businesses should be considered. Boulder City is a family town first, tourist town second.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D158</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>Julia Triola</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B would still provide business access for our local businesses. This is the least expensive way of doing it correctly. Truck-only bypass would be perfect!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D160</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>Carl Trygstad</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I think through traffic needs to go around Boulder City. Traffic going through after that would be the people who want to be there; thus, the economic impact would be minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D161</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>Steve Tuggle</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Out-of-town traffic that is interested in visiting Boulder City will make the effort to drive into town and conduct their business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D162</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph P. Wagner</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives B – it’s the shortest route. It will keep local businesses in business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D163</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>Edward L. Waymire</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The people that live along Highway 93 knew that was an important highway when they bought their property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D164</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>Mrs. Billie Waymire</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The business will still come to town (Boulder City) if they so choose, no matter what.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D171</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>Lettie Zimmerman</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. A portion of non-city land could be developed for/casinos along the bypass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D172</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>Jerome and Karen Zuniga</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The tourists will still visit our town and spend money here, as always, and the local businesses will not suffer with Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D175</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>Rebecca L. Mahaney</td>
<td>5/13/02</td>
<td>There are miles and miles of desert out there. If you are considering going around Boulder City (Alternative D), why stay so close? I expect it is economics. The way the City Council is pushing Alternative D, there must be some money in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5. OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Robert Ashley</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative A the least. Existing conditions are intolerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Judith A. Barton</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D has too many problems involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Robert Bickel</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C the least because it is closest to my home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Charlene Blackwell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. It is an accomplishment of prime agenda, an efficient route for current heavy traffic and known future heavy traffic increase on a main highway, and it will include off/on-ramps into Boulder City business and residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Joe Bowyer</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it will affect less people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D23</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Richard W. Brown</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D28</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Ken and Suzanne Carpenter</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it has less impact. If it takes more money, let's spend it on something that is going to benefit the people of our great little town. It would be a shame if Alternative B or C was chosen and our town suffered forever.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D32</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Robert C. Clark</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C the least.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D41</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>William S. Davis</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C the least. Why disrupt the old part of town? It would cause many problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D44</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Roxanne Dey</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D51</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>Robert Draney</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives A, B, and C are stupid alternatives that can only be supported by a few well connected businesses and landowners who would make some money to the detriment of the residents of Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D54</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>Frank E. Ensign</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it has less impact to Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D60</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Bob Ferraro</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D65</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>Caryn Gifford</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternatives B and C would completely ruin Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D66</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>Jeff Gifford</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D will have the least impact on Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D70</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>Larehta O. Halfason</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D74</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>Daniel Hearn</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D has the least impact on the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D97</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>Paul Luisi</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. The project needs to be invisible to the city of Boulder City. Transportation of nuclear waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D99</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>Norman Lytal</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D102</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>Nina and John McDonald</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D seems the most logical alternative in terms of impact to Boulder City residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D109</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>Billie Miller</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. It will be the least offensive to everyone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>D123</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>Donald and DeOnne Oliver</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D would cause the least impact (adverse) to Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D135</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>Alfred A. Radosta</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternatives A, B, and C the least. They will destroy our way of life in Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D138</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>Martin S. Rihel</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D because it is the furthest from town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D140</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>Linda Schrick</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D141</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>Barbara and Ron Schuster</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D142</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>Gene Segerblom</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D145</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>Georgia Sigundson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D150</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>Terra Vista, LP</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>We prefer Alternative D. It will have less of an impact on the quality of life Boulder City residents have come to know and appreciate and expect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D154</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>Gladys C. Towles</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D170</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>John Zerfoss</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>More hearings – at least two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D84</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>Curtis D. Karr</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The route that would of went through the area just north of Hemenway residential area and through River Mountains area should of not been eliminated and the commercial truck vehicle traffic should of been permanently route through Laughlin, Nevada, area and U.S. 95.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D89</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Kittleson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Too bad that the &quot;environmentalists&quot; teamsters, truck lobbyists, and gaming interests &quot;scrapped&quot; your original truck route south of town near Nelson and Willow Beach. It would have worked too!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>E. PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>E1. ACCESSIBILITY, OPERATIONS, AND SAFETY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Caryn Gifford</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I’m a parent of two very precious teenagers. One is a brand-new driver, one will be next year, and I’m scared to death to have them dodging semi-trucks going in and out of their favorite fast-food restaurants and video stores. I think we all love or know someone who is a new driver or an elderly driver somewhere in our family or our friends. We have a lot of elderly in this town. It’s just causing too much danger. I’m not willing to sacrifice my precious children’s lives or my loved ones. And I’m very much in favor, if we must have the bridge, for Alternative D. I would rather not have the bridge. That makes no sense, but I understand that’s a done deal. So I am very much in favor of Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Robert J. Hartman</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The current route is ill-suited to handle the current traffic, let alone be adequate to handle increased traffic as these communities continue to grow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I believe it is incumbent upon us to make this route as safe as possible along with the building of the most desirable alternative of the four choices that we have. I strongly support implementation of Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Joanna Ettrich</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I live in Hemenway Valley and the traffic is already very bad on U.S. 93, and I just can’t see trying to make it any better by making it wider, which would disrupt all of the people and divide our city into two places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Tracy Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>It has been declared by numerous public agencies that U.S. 93 needs to be improved because it is a dangerous roadway. Consequently, the City of Boulder City will inherit a dangerous roadway that will require future expenditures to attempt to correct the problems with that highway. No one has given an estimate as to what those costs were. If the city inherits U.S. 93, they will become responsible for the maintenance of the roadway, which will be significant, but greater they will be responsible for the design defect that they inherit and the accidents, which will inevitably occur on that highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Hardy, who is a council member, indicated that on September 26th of the year 2001, after the trucks had been rerouted, that is, they were no longer going through existing U.S. 93, that still individuals in his area and his constituents were complaining of the noise of the traffic. So, consequently, there will still be noise on U.S. 93 if Alternative D is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Virginia Perkins</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I think that putting any highway in at this time is a security risk to us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most traffic that goes to the Dam – and the reason for all the delays are the pedestrians and most traffic that goes to the Dam stays at the Dam. They don’t go across into Arizona. That is just trucks and a few people from Arizona.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>David Hatcher</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The grade down the hill on the existing road is very steep, and that costs truckers a lot of money, and that’s usually the money that we get to develop these things is helping truckers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>David and Shirley Buck</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I would go along with the alternative that puts most of the traffic outside of the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Ken Isaacson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>We are absolutely opposed to heavy truck traffic going through or near Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Steve Tuggle</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I am a 27-year veteran of the LVPD. For the last 17 years I have spent in the traffic section. In the last 17 years, I’ve dealt with traffic with all the problems that growth generates from traffic. My experience tells me having worked in the areas of enforcement, education, and engineering and making recommendations to local traffic engineers within my department’s jurisdiction that Boulder City’s roads are now too busy and will only become more busy unless Alternative D is used. To try to upgrade U.S. 93 to be more of a “freeway,” with an overpass for side roads, etc., isn’t going to solve the problem in the long term and will actually create problems in the short term because of local residents and their needs to travel to and from on side streets. By removing that traffic that overcrowds Boulder City’s roads now, especially U.S. 93, and the Nevada Highway where most businesses are located, the traffic flows will reduce to allow for a more local flow as opposed to a local flow of residents as well as out-of-town vehicles that now have to use the same local roads to travel through Boulder City. By using Alternative D, my experience tells me that removing that traffic that now must go through Boulder City, even if they don’t want to stop and have a hamburger or fill their car with gas, shop at a local business, divert to the southern bypass, that immediately improves the local traffic flow to keep it as local traffic. Those out-of-town vehicles coming out of Arizona or coming from the Las Vegas Valley traveling towards Boulder City that want to conduct business within the community will make an effort to leave the highway system. Those vehicles, especially commercial, that obviously have no desire to stop, would just as soon bypass a community because it’s faster for them to make their commute than to have to be encumbered by the extreme volume of traffic that currently exists and will only grow for the next 10, 20, 30 years. Local people should use local streets. NDOT can remove the out-of-town traffic and bypass Boulder City, enabling the local streets to be elevated to a safer flow, accommodating local residents and those out-of-town residents that desire to conduct business here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Emil Morneault</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>My vote is for Alternative B, and the reasons are for business aspects, least impact on business aspects, least cost, and least environmental impact. I’m against Alternative D totally. Maybe if Alternative D would be way below the substation, not the proposal right now, it’s a maybe. I’m against Alternative D because of the cost, environmental impact, and noise, and as I live on Georgia Avenue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E21</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Sharon Lazar</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The fact that Alternative D is so close to the airport, we have had incidents of fatal crashes, and it would be a shame if a truck was involved in a crash with an airplane because the route was too close to the approach to the airport, bearing in mind that this airport has no air controller system, that each pilot looks after himself and for those who may be in the area. So that may, too, prove to be a safety hazard, and a bit more consideration to the distance between the airport and the intended road maybe should be taken into consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Sandra Reuther</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative A is the best because I was disappointed tonight to see that Alternative D does not go as far south as I was led to believe. It does not go south of the substation, the electrical substation, and I find that surprising and disappointing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>George Cox</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The current traffic coming into Boulder City from Las Vegas frequently backs up from Wyoming almost to Buchanan. Add another 5 years of growth in southern Nevada, plus the traffic problems associated with major highway constructions on Alternatives B and C, and the town would almost be gridlocked with traffic in that area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Gary Compton</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D certainly removes the traffic from Boulder City, but only about 25 percent of the traffic, and that’s just the through traffic. The main traffic problem, which is Boulder City traffic, which is approximately 50 percent of the traffic pattern, would not be used or be affected by Alternative D. So, Alternative D doesn’t really address the significant traffic problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E27</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>Charlene Blackwell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative D, I believe this is the way to go. It’s accomplishment of the prime agenda, an efficient route for current heavy traffic and known future traffic increase on a main highway, and to include off- and on-ramps into business and residential areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E31</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Tracy and Linda Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>It is the duty of our elected officials and our local and state government to take all necessary steps to ensure our safety and well being. When our elected officials and local and state government become aware of a dangerous condition affecting the safety of our community, legally such awareness constitutes “notice” and can subject our local and state governmental entities as well as our elected officials to litigation if and when an accident is caused by this known dangerous condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With this in mind, one of the paramount but less publicized issues present in the debate over Alternatives B, C, and D (i.e., the southern bypass issue) is the current unsafe condition of Highway 93. In this regard, information presented at the Community Working Group (CWG) meetings reveals that engineers with NDOT have been directed to solve traffic issues related to our current Highway 93. Specifically, a history of crashes along U.S. 93 through Boulder City documents that this stretch of highway is extremely dangerous. Crash statistics show that at Lakeshore Drive, the crash rate is two times higher than the state average. To no one’s surprise, crash statistics also show that the crash rate at Railroad Pass is five times greater than the state average. The data reveals that 16 percent of those vehicles passing through the Railroad Pass area take the turnoff at Highway 95 and head for Laughlin, thereby encountering only the dangerous Railroad pass area. Twenty percent of those who live to pass through both the Railroad Pass and Lakeshore Drive areas keep going with the ultimate destination of Arizona. More importantly, however, is that 48 percent of those people traveling on these 2 treacherous stretches of Highway 93 have the ultimate destination of Boulder City; in other words, the majority of those that are subjected to these treacherous stretches of highway live and/or work in our community. Also, let us not forget that there is also a remaining 16 percent of traffic that passes through our town in order to visit Lake Mead and/or Hoover Dam; we are also subjecting them to these dangerous stretches of highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building the southern bypass will not alleviate those dangerous highway conditions, which NDOT is supposed to address. Alternative B, however, which is a widening and modification of existing Highway 93, will alleviate these safety concerns. According to NDOT, Alternative B, which is the improvement of existing Highway 93, proposed a new highway interchange at Railroad Pass, a 20-foot widening of Highway 93 (it is currently 80 feet wide and it will be widened to 100 feet), 2 travel lanes in each direction along with a frontage road, and a raised median separating opposing lanes of traffic. Clearly, these proposed modifications will remedy the current unsafe and hazardous conditions present in our Boulder City stretch of Highway 93.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If the southern bypass is the selected alternative, the treacherous stretches of Highway 93 will continue to threaten the safety and well being of our family and friends. Under such a scenario, our local and state government, as well as our elected officials, should prepare for an onslaught of civil lawsuits brought by those that have been injured or who have lost loved ones due to the dangerous conditions existing on Highway 93. As a part of those lawsuits, those elected officials who support the southern bypass alternative will undoubtedly have to articulate sound and rational reasoning as to why, in the face of overwhelming crash statistics, they did not take action to remedy the dangers existing on Highway 93 and otherwise ensure the safety and well being of those living in, visiting, or traveling through our community. As lawyers living in our community, we would love to be involved in the interrogation.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Robert J. Hartman</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B is unacceptable because of the disruption of the quality of life in the Hemenway Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative C is unacceptable due to the fact that it refers to the proposed Boulder Ridge Golf Course and Bootleg Canyon. It would deteriorate the quality of life in Boulder City with the increase in traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative D would have the least negative impact on the city and its residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Joanna Ettrich</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Boulder City is a pretty place, nice little town, and we would like to keep it that way. I would really like to see Alternative D, if I had my choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Beverli Powell for Jack Powell and Barbara and Ron Schuster</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>We all feel strongly that route chosen should be Alternative D because the thought they would be transmitting nuclear waste coming right through the middle of Boulder City on any of the other routes would be disastrous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Tracy Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The DEIS report indicates that approximately 673 acres of land will be disturbed by building Alternative D. It’s a minimal impact on the environment of building Alternatives B or C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>According to a statement made by Tom Greco back September 26th of 2001, he indicated that the goal of this project was to have the least environmental damage that is reasonable and feasible. It appears that Alternative D violates his goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative D will now increase noise to an area that had no noise, specifically the Lake Mead recreational area, as pointed out in the DEIS report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Virginia Perkins</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The people in Hemenway Valley bought their houses for the view of the waters. A highway is not going to obstruct their view of the water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The people on my side of the city bought their houses for a view of the mountains. I’ve only lived here a year and a half. If I had known this was a consideration, I would not have bought this house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any highway is going to impact wildlife. Alternative D will impact archaeological digs. It will impact Lake Mead National Recreational area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Linda Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The southern side of our town does not have any major highways in it, and it is actually a very quiet area of town, and that whole side of town will be disturbed and will have a noise level in it that currently does not exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That is not at all reflected in this document, which is being displayed to members of our public and which is now being touted as being the analysis of the environmental considerations of Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>David Hatcher</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The noise that truck driving makes when it goes up and down that hill is rather tremendous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Chuck Cascioppo</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative C would ruin the user-friendly part of the lake drive going down to the lake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Leo Doyle</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>By using Alternative D, the right elevations on one side with the sound wall where you would not even see it go around the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Loretta C. Halldarson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I think it would be a crime if Alternative D is selected because it looks like an appeasement to the affluent and rich people who live in the Hemenway Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Ken Isaacson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I’m going for Alternative D, which is greater for us, the residents of Boulder City, and I live on Lake Havasu Lane here on top of the hill, and now that the trucks have been diverted, it is so peaceful and we want it to remain that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>Mary Jane Therrien</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>In light of the fact that Yucca Mountain nuclear storage is being thrust upon us against our will and future shipments of nuclear materials on our highways will follow shortly, it’s imperative that we rethink your options. Since no one can guarantee that there will never be an accident involving nuclear material shipment, we don’t want them anywhere near us or traversing our national recreation areas. In the event that the logic and common sense do not prevail and you insist on destroying Black Canyon and Sugarloaf Mountain, then we would reluctantly endorse Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>Steve Prisem</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative C, the map that is displayed here, is grossly inaccurate. It goes back prior to 1997. It shows absolutely no homes that have been built and people are living in along U.S. 93 below St. Jude’s Ranch and Lake Mountain. They show absolutely no home structures or subdivisions, and there are probably at least three or four subdivisions right along there, including the Spanish Steps condominium projects. Now, I resent the fact that they are misleading the public about the level of families, the level of number of families that are living along that route. This comes directly through residential communities with young people, with new families and retired citizens; and if they’re going to put this forth as a proposed alternative, it should at least be accurate and not incorrect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Steve Tuggle</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Just protect a one-of-a-kind town like this. If they put a bridge through and heavy traffic around it, it will ruin this town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Steve Tuggle</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>You’re going to have improved noise factors, pollution factors, and vehicular accidents will be less if you divert the majority of the congestion away from the city as opposed to putting it on local roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>E21</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>Sharon Lazar</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I am in favor of Alternative D. However, the maps here were not drawn to scale, nor was the legend given a scale, so that it’s very difficult to be able to visualize exactly how each of the routes is going to be constructed in this location to the environment around them. I asked the gentlemen about Alternative D, and he said that it was 0.8 mile from the intersection of Buchanan and Georgia. Now, 0.8 mile is a very, very short distance and puts it very close to the sewage plant. The sewage plant area has an approximate 3-mile asphalt road meant for the trucks that service the plant, the state trucks that go in there and do whatever they do. And that particular asphalt road is used by bikers. It’s used by joggers. It’s used by people like myself who walk my 2 dogs every day there for 2 miles. It’s used by the BMX people. They have now their own area right off the asphalt for BMX bikes, and a lot of people walk there because it’s desert. The scenery is beautiful. You have the mountains. You have the guys coming down with their parachuting. So, it’s a lovely area to be. Once in a while it smells a bit, but you put up with that. I just wanted to make the powers that be aware of the fact that there is a recreational area, that there are folks on their bicycles down there as well, and that perhaps they may consider, if they choose Alternative D, extending it a bit farther out in the desert because there is plenty of room there and that will give us more safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>George Cox</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I’ve been a resident of Boulder City for 32 years, and I feel strongly to preserve the quality of life that we all enjoy as citizens of this community. There’s only one realistic alternative, and that is Alternative D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>Gary Compton</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B seems to follow the existing roadway relatively closely, would have the least negative impact on the community as far as the business community goes. It would not divert pollution or noise to other parts of the community. It would stay as the community developed. Alternative C apparently goes through a golf course that seems to have come out of the thin air, but if you assume that golf course would be built, which is probably a relatively large assumption, then it would impact recreation lands and is probably not an appropriate selection. Alternative D also impacts and substantially affects the quietness, rural nature of the residence along Georgia on the southern edge of the city. I happen to live there, and that is very much of a negative impact for myself. It impacts my peaceful use and enjoyment of my property. I understand that it may be within federal decibel levels, so is my Dodge diesel truck, and my neighbors don’t care for that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>George Cox</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>As a landowner in Hemenway Valley with approximately 1,500 feet of property bordering the proposed Alternatives B and C, that would take approximately 5 to 8 acres of my prime view land. Add to that a 30-foot rise in the elevation of the new route resulting in a total loss of view and an increase in noise level. Where I once had a valuable asset, it would be greatly diminished in value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E27</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>Charlene Blackwell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative A is inappropriate, too heavy traffic volume and increasing. Alternative B, congestion through business area, heavy traffic noise through upscale residential areas. And remember these people in the upscale, they have expensive lots and they do pay higher taxes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E29</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>Pam Adams</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>NDOT may have met the letter of NEPA by posting the DEIS on the website and mailing it to two locations in Boulder City, but it has certainly not met the intent of NEPA, which is to provide materials to both agencies and to the public to comment on the proposed development. I request 2 additional months for the public comment period and 2 more hearings in Boulder City, as well as a fact sheet with an executive summary sent to every resident in Boulder City with an offer by NDOT to provide a hard copy at no cost. I have never heard of charging for a DEIS. That’s ridiculous. Posting things on the web is a relatively new operation that people are doing to meet NEPA, and I’m not even sure if it will hold up in court as meeting the CEQ regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E30</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>Dave and Ann Strue</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I just want to let the state of Nevada know that Alternative D is the only option for this town so we don’t destroy it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E32</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>Tracy Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Currently, the only southern route that is being considered is identified as Alternative D. Alternative D provides, among other specifics not addressed in Question 1, a highway exit on Buchanan Street for the use of semi-trucks and commercial trucks to enter Boulder City. Obviously, the voters in 1999 were never informed that commercial trucking would disturb the peace and quiet at the Veteran’s Cemetery, the Boulder City Hospital, our golf course (and our new golf course), and the Homestead retirement home. Also, back in 1999 the residents undoubtedly never envisioned heavy truck traffic passing by the areas we have set aside for our children, namely the baseball diamonds, the soccer field, and the skateboard park. Additionally, fewer than 50 percent of the registered voters responded to Question 1. (2,935 voted in favor of this ill-defined multi-guess southern bypass route, and 1,855 voted against it.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>At this September 26th meeting, Mr. Tom Greco of NDOT indicated that the environmental impact concerning the 3 proposed routes (Alternatives B, C, and D) currently under consideration, will be completed and the results published in November of this year. He indicated that the reports will be extremely detailed with respect to the environmental impact of each alternative. In that regard, Alternative B, which involved the use of a substantial amount of existing Highway 93, will undoubtedly cause the least amount of damage to the environment of Boulder City. Alternative C, which creates some rerouting north of Highway 93 before Buchanan Street and rework of Highway 93 through Hemenway Valley, will cause a little more damage to the environment to Boulder City than Alternative B. Nevertheless, Alternatives B and C will cause substantially less damage to our environment than Alternative D. Consistent with his initial assessment of the environmental impact of Alternatives B and C, is the substantially higher (approximately $80 million higher) cost to build Alternative D due to the fact that Alternative D involves the mass destruction and despoliation of virgin tracts of desert habitat by construction of the new highway through the southern portion of Boulder City. Once the environmental impact report is completed and available to the citizens of Boulder City, then and only then will a vote on all the proposed alternatives have some merit. Hopefully our political leaders will have the courage to allow informed citizens to vote on the three alternatives that has only just now become clearly defined, detailed, and illustrated, complete with the environmental impact that they will have on our community. If a new vote on the three alternatives is now allowed, the politicians, and those who master minded the timing of Question 1 on the ballot, will be allowed to achieve their goal of cramming down our throats an alternative that will forever cause damage to our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E33</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>We follow with great interest the letters written concerning the new CANAMEX route. We wish to voice our opposition to the proposal calling for the southern bypass. We own a home on Georgia Avenue. At most hours of the day it is so quiet that we can hear the wings of a bird as it soars above our home. Though we purchased our home with full knowledge that we must deal with the occasional “four” from a golfer, traffic on Georgia Avenue, and the sound of a plane landing at or taking off from the airport, we found those inconveniences to be minor in comparison to living on the side of town where Highway 93 passes through. When we purchased our home, there was no indication that a full-scale highway would soon be built less than a mile from the front of our residence. Indeed, with the exception of the airport, our side of town has always been the residential side. We made a trade-off; we have no view of the lake, but no highway either.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>Also, take into consideration the fact that sound generally rises. By placing the CANAMEX route above the industrial area of town, the highway would be at a higher elevation than the majority of the town, and consequently less noise pollution. In comparison, the proposed southern bypass is located lower than the rest of town, and therefore those residences on the south end of town will now be bombarded with noise pollution that will be unabated. Of course, needless to say that the construction of 13 miles of highway in the fine dirt and sand, which comprises our desert, will create a dust bowl the likes of which we have not seen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E34</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>Tracy Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The financial devastation of Alternative D is dwarfed by its dire environmental impact. DEIS itemizes the numerous polluting and negative impacts on the environment: Alternative D will cause a substantial increase in noise levels in portions of the LMNRA that did not previously exist (DEIS pg. ES-15); Alternative D will disturb 679 acres of habitat for the desert tortoise and impact the bighorn sheep calving area, causing the greatest disturbance to wildlife of all of the other proposed alternatives; Alternative D will have a greater long-term impact than Alternatives B or C on the waters of the Colorado River/Lake Mead because it covers a larger area with wider wash crossings and requires more fill, thereby impacting these waters three times greater than the other two alternatives (DEIS pg. ES-20); it would also create the most dust (DEIS pg ES-27). The DEIS report makes it clear that Alternative B is the most economically and environmentally sound proposal for those that live and work in Boulder City. Let's just hope that the facts and circumstances of this study are not outweighed by the politically connected and financially influential members of the Coalition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMPLEMENTATION AND CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Tracy Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>According to the DEIS report, Alternatives B and C cost $220 million in 2002 dollars. Alternative D would cost $345 million, which is a $125 million excess as to the other proposals. That comes out to approximately a 57 percent increase in cost for Alternative D. In the DEIS report, there’s no justification that would indicate that Alternative D provides any better solution to the goal of providing better overall transportation and reduced traffic congestion in the city of Boulder City. Consequently, it seems to be a waste of public taxpayer funds in the amount of $125 million.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2

A number of individuals have indicated that question No. 1 initiative put on the ballot in 1999 showed that the citizens of Boulder City preferred the southern bypass.

I believe that is a misleading statement inasmuch as in 1999 there were 40 alternatives being considered. It had gotten narrowed down to 16, but it appears that most people believed when they were discussing the southern bypass, they were talking about rerouting traffic through Searchlight and/or more probably Laughlin.

3.3

Dr. Hardy, on September 26th, the year 2001, showed a video that was apparently prepared by either a state agency or one of its contractors showing Alternative D as a computer-generated rendition of what it would look like.

It is my understanding with talking to Tom Greco and Michael Lasko that that video should not have been shown in public since it was a work in progress.

Mr. Greco indicated at the time that it was shown publicly in the city council chambers, though it was not a city council meeting, that the exchange of that information was not following the process and the rules with respect to dissemination of that information. He indicated it was not to be revealed to the public because it was a work in progress.
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Linda Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>There is an appearance of bias on behalf of NDOT and those that have prepared the preliminary DEIS report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Chuck Cascioppo</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I agree with Alternative D because it's the least inexpensive as far as congestion in the city and backups with traffic, and delays this traffic, and trying to take the freeway down through town as it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With Alternative C, the congestion that would cause to build all the overpasses and underpasses would delay the project even more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>David and Shirley Buck</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I think that they should move ahead with this project as fast as they can. Each month, each year that it stalls, the costs go up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Let's pick the cheapest route and get it done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Sandra Reuther</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I'm for Alternative A. I was for the north corridor. I'm very disappointed it was eliminated because of the cost. It's worth the money to not have this route come through our valley. The northern route stayed on the other side of the mountains in Henderson and was fairly direct. We have the technology to do the tunnels, and it would be worth it to build it that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Beth Murray</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>If Alternative D is chosen, I feel it's important that we not allow on- and off-ramps in numerous areas around the city. I believe the interchanges should be as proposed on the EIS as we're coming into Boulder City and then around Boulder City by the Hacienda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I don't believe the residents want to see that traffic every day. Let the tourists decide as they're entering town, do they want to come into Boulder City, come and visit our businesses, or do they want to go straight to Arizona and Hoover Dam, but don't let then have that choice again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Gary Compton</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I don't see anything that any alternative particularly has materially over another alternative. I'm referring to Alternatives B, C, or D. And so in light of the fact that Alternative D costs an additional $125 million or approximately 60 percent more than all the other alternatives, that would not seem to be a feasible or viable project. So, I'm left to conclude that Alternative B is the only reasonable alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E26</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>James Blackwell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I think Alternative D is the poorest of a lot of poor choices. It seems to me like it was shortsighted and really silly not to plan the whole project as one project from the Henderson city limits to well across the Colorado River. The bridge is being placed too close to the existing Boulder Dam. Farther south would provide a greater margin of safety from terrorist attack. I think that routing the bypass near the Hacienda was probably unduly influenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We should have an on- and off-ramp in the near vicinity of the existing landfill, garbage landfill, with a frontage road between there and Georgia/Buchanan Boulevard. Certainly this will become a necessity at some future time and should be planned for at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter No.</td>
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<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E28</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Bob Broadbent</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I'm not opposed to Alternative D providing the interchanges at both ends – don’t put the casinos that are there out of business – and providing they can build it in a reasonable length of time. It’s my understanding that the interchanges as proposed for Alternative D are such that the traffic would be pushed around the Hacienda and Railroad Pass and would probably lead to those people going out of business. And I don’t think that’s the right thing to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All of the studies that I've seen of money that’s available to build this bypass, and 300-and-some-odd-million dollars, show that there is no money programmed in either RTC, Clark County, or the NDOT projections for projects that will be built in the next 15, 20 years. They're not in it anywhere. And if that's the case, any release of an EIS right now would mean that you would have to do some kind of conforming EIS 10 or 15 years from now before you could ever build it. It would be my judgment that if they can't build this for 20 or 30 years and the fact that we're going to have the bridge across the Colorado River built by 2006, 2007, that with the traffic that's going to be in Boulder City, the best thing they could do to spend $75 million or $100 million would be to build 3 or 4 interchanges, a couple of them in the wash or the are in the area of the wash, and 2 at both ends of the city, and that would provide access to anybody who wants to get from one side of the city to the other. And they may depress the existing road a little but, but you know, the traffic is going to be so bad in 30 years that if we can't build this thing in 30 years, they better do something intermediately, and I don't see an intermediate answer to this that they ought to be looking at if there is no money in any budget to do this for that length of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E32</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Tracy Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Consequently, it is this type of shrill rhetoric of some of our elected officials that cast doubt on the objectivity of what is in the best interests of our town. If the above-referenced misuse of our political system is not enough to cause alarm, then the next proposal by one of elected officials surely will. In this regard, it appear that the &quot;Coalition&quot;, as well as some of our elected officials, are attempting to speed up the construction of the southern bypass in order to achieve their goal before we have an opportunity to truly examine the Alternatives. In this regard, at the September 26th meeting, one Councilmember proposed a “build to plan” proposal. Under this unusual approach, the southern bypass would be completed before the federal government complete the bridge across the Colorado River just south of Hoover Dam. This rush to build the southern bypass sounds incredibly like the 1999 rush to have Question 1 placed on the ballot before the voters became fully educated about the destructive impact the southern bypass would have on Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E33</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Tracy and Linda Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The construction of the CANAMEX through the south side of town is a ludicrous proposition compared to the modification of the existing Highway 93 through Hemenway Valley. Based on the NDOT Corridor Study map, it appears that the CANAMEX bypass through the south side of town will result in the need for construction of at least 13 miles of highway through our desert on the side of town which is residential in nature. Compare the southern route with the proposed modification of current Highway 93, which would result in the construction of about 5 new miles of highway above the industrial area of our town, and a modification of about 3 miles of current Highway 93. Therefore, we are looking at about 8 additional miles of construction with the southern route.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Beverli Powell for Jack Powell and Barbara and Ron Schuster</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>People who are going to the Dam will still go through town. They will stop. The truckers don’t stop in Boulder City. They don’t get any business from the truckers. All they do is cause traffic problems and it would divide the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Tracy Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Michael Lasko of CH2M HILL indicated on October 16, year 2001, that out of the ten major retailers that they spoke to and interviewed with respect to different alternatives, eight of those ten indicated that Alternative D would have a negative financial impact on their businesses, and they favored Alternative B. Two out of those same ten indicated that building Alternative D would have severe financial impact on their businesses. So, consequently, the economy would be affected at least by the ten largest retailers in town and employers. The DEIS report indicates that the Boulder Dam Credit Union believes that if Alternative D is selected, that there will be a 50 percent reduction in retail sales, which equates to $18 million in lost revenue to the city and its businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Linda Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>There was a meeting that occurred on October 15th, 2001, at which point in time a Michael Lasko appeared. He had retained the services of Dun &amp; Bradstreet to go out and determine the ten largest employers in Boulder City and to determine whether or not those employers were in favor of Alternatives B, C, or D. He reported that eight out of the ten largest employers in Boulder City favored Alternative B and two out of those same ten employers believes there would be severe financial impact if Alternative D was the chosen alternative. That information was not included in the DEIS report despite the fact that it was given at a DEIS meeting, and in discussing that with the people that are present here today from DEIS, we were told that that information was included in an appendix to the DEIS report, but that this appendix was not disseminated along with the DEIS report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>David Hatcher</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I support Alternative D, and the reason that I support that is because I looked at the effect that California had in routing its freeways, and if they get freeways through town, it kills the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Chuck Cascioppo</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Alternative B would ruin the businesses downtown because I did own a business at the Ameritom Paint Nevada Highway. And now with the trucks going through Laughlin and detoured through town, it's more of a user-friendly city now, and all the businesses can have patrons going in and out of their parking facility without getting run down by someone who is just in a hurry to get to Vegas or Arizona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>David and Shirley Buck</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Use the Alternative A. I honestly don't believe that it’s going to make any difference to the shops and stores because people who are not going to stop won’t stop anyway. The ones that are going to stop will stop even if it is the southern route, and they'll come through town instead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Leo Doyle</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>They're going to increase the value of their property at the expense of the Nevada taxpayers at a time when our state government is hard pressed to balance its budget. I hope a decision is made based upon the impact to the environment, the future economic viability of Boulder City, and good, rational evaluation and analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Steve Prisem</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>If they use the southern route and the bridge, that will cause development at the first off-ramp that goes to this town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Rob and Gretchen Steenson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>We have three businesses in town and feel the only alternative is Alternative D. Even though it may have some impact on us on the business side, the quality of life in Boulder City is our number one concern, and that's why we live here, and returning the highway so close to so many residences and so close to the center of town would be really disruptive to the environment that the people love in town. I honestly feel that in the long run our businesses will be better off by not having a traffic jam in town, by having a better environment for people to visit in, as well as live in, and just strongly against Alternatives B and C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Barbara Morris</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Primarily they say if we have Alternative D that would bypass all the business and the commercial stores in town would suffer. I could appreciate and understand their viewpoint. However, I notice there has been a lot of traffic the last couple weeks going to the Dam. If 1 in 20 stopped downtown, that was pretty good. Most of them just drove straight through towards the Dam on U.S. 93. We should advertise more where we have signs that say: Welcome to our Town Boulder City. I don't mean anything garish like a billboard, but maybe see the famous hotel where Howard Hughes stayed, see where Shirley Temple stayed. If you put out some of these celebrity names, and also Clark Gable I believe was one of them, this will get your tourists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E29</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Pam Adams</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Boulder City should choose to keep this new development in already developed areas, so I prefer Alternative C and not D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E33</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Tracy and Linda Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>And what about support services for the new highway? The proposed southern bypass will undoubtedly eventually offer gas stations and convenience stores for the weary traveler. Of course, if these highway support services are not built, one can anticipate a highway off-ramp at or around Buchanan, which will route traffic through our residential area, past our peaceful Veterans Cemetery, and past our golf course. Compare this scenario with the scenario presented by modification of the current Highway 93 – since the new highway would actually cross a portion of the existing Highway 93 just before the entrance to town, gas stations, and convenience stores already exist for the highway. Based on the NDOT map, the modification of current Highway 93 will result in very little disturbance to the residents of Hemenway Valley. It should be remembered that those residents purchased their homes with the existence of a 3-lane highway already in place. It seems entirely illogical that we, as a City, would desire to tear up virgin desert and build a highway where none ever existed, rather than widen an already existing highway. No one has yet discussed the fact that residents who have homes all along the southern side of town will undoubtedly suffer a reduction in property value upon commencement of construction of the southern bypass. Perhaps an inverse condemnation class action filed by the residents against the City would be the best avenue to determine whether monetary compensation is in order for those whose view, peace and quiet, and clean air have been compromised due to construction of a highway where none ever existed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E34</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Tracy Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>In the letter by Dr. Merrill (BC News 3/28/02), it is clear that those who support the southern bypass (Alternative D) and comprise the Boulder City Coalition (aka the “get the existing highway out of my backyard”) are allowing their personal agendas to overshadow what is best for Boulder City. In this regard, it is obvious to anyone who reads the DEIS report that the most economical and environmentally friendly alternative is the improvement of existing Highway 93 (Alternative B). Any logical reading of the report leads to the conclusion that Alternative D poses the greatest financial hardship and environmental impact on Boulder City and our surrounding environs. The report illustrates that Alternative D is the most costly in terms of construction and financial impact on the businesses of Boulder City. Construction costs for Alternative D are estimated to cost, in 2002 dollars, $125 million more to build than Alternatives B or C. The report references that the selection of Alternative D will most likely result in a 50 percent reduction in tourism expenditure, an $18 million reduction in sales and a reduction of 200 Boulder City jobs, resulting in a closure of 30 to 40 Boulder City businesses (DEIS pg. 4-101). Eight out of 10 of the largest Boulder City employers state that Alternative D is the least preferred choice, and 2 out of these same employers believe Alternative D will cause severe consequences to our local economy. Our city council and city manager have long recognized that Alternative D will have dire financial consequences for the local economy. As reported in BC News (2/7/02), city manager John Sullard stated that if Alternative D is approved, “then how do we bring people in for the existing businesses? That’s more people being diverted from Boulder City.” The city is contemplating, in the event of Alternative D approval, to hire an “events coordinator” to bring tourists back into Boulder City. It is ironic that we will have to spend money to bring back tourists, and at the same time will have less business sales receipts to support this additional cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Ken Byler</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I think this whole process, particularly this hearing tonight, is a mockery exercise to make us think that we’re going to have a voice in what NDOT and the federal government does. What they’re offering us here is four options on how to commit suicide as a community, and we’re here to voice our opinion on which we think would be the least painful way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On September 26th, I attended a meeting of the Boulder City Bypass Coalition, held at City Hall. This “Coalition” is a well financed, organized politically influential machine. This meeting was the latest in a series of attempts to influence those who are studying the viable options available for the routing of traffic across the Nevada-Arizona border.

In this endeavor, a City Councilmember represented to those in attendance that 61 percent of Boulder City support the southern bypass (identified as Alternative D). In support of this far-flung assertion, Councilmember, as many other, relied on a 1999 initiative referencing a southern bypass route.

Exposing this often-repeated proposition to the bright Nevada sun illustrates how this contention is baseless and misleading.

In 1999, Question 1, in confusing, unintelligible and vague language (a hallmark of Boulder City initiatives), asked Boulder City residents “yes” or “no” to direct the city counsel to give their consent to the State for a southern bypass. (Sounds confusing?) At the time the voters were asked to vote on this question, there were approximately 16 southern routes under consideration. It appears from numerous letters to the editor that a number of people that voted at that time believed that a southern bypass included the possibility of traffic being diverted to Laughlin or through Searchlight. Most believed that the route would be considerable distance to the south of Georgia Avenue.

Additionally, Question 1 never specifically mentioned any of the alternatives available involving existing Highway 93. More importantly, Question 1 neither mentioned that the proposed southern bypass would include an exit on Buchanan Street nor any other specifics regarding the issues relating to air quality or destruction of our desert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E32</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Tracy Strickland</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>On September 26th, I attended a meeting of the Boulder City Bypass Coalition, held at City Hall. This “Coalition” is a well financed, organized politically influential machine. This meeting was the latest in a series of attempts to influence those who are studying the viable options available for the routing of traffic across the Nevada-Arizona border. In this endeavor, a City Councilmember represented to those in attendance that 61 percent of Boulder City support the southern bypass (identified as Alternative D). In support of this far-flung assertion, Councilmember, as many other, relied on a 1999 initiative referencing a southern bypass route. Exposing this often-repeated proposition to the bright Nevada sun illustrates how this contention is baseless and misleading. In 1999, Question 1, in confusing, unintelligible and vague language (a hallmark of Boulder City initiatives), asked Boulder City residents “yes” or “no” to direct the city counsel to give their consent to the State for a southern bypass. (Sounds confusing?) At the time the voters were asked to vote on this question, there were approximately 16 southern routes under consideration. It appears from numerous letters to the editor that a number of people that voted at that time believed that a southern bypass included the possibility of traffic being diverted to Laughlin or through Searchlight. Most believed that the route would be considerable distance to the south of Georgia Avenue. Additionally, Question 1 never specifically mentioned any of the alternatives available involving existing Highway 93. More importantly, Question 1 neither mentioned that the proposed southern bypass would include an exit on Buchanan Street nor any other specifics regarding the issues relating to air quality or destruction of our desert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Alfred A. and</td>
<td>1/20/00</td>
<td>Our concern with the Boulder City/U.S. 93 Corridor Study is the alleviation of truck-induced congestion in and through the Boulder City area. Truck congestion has escalated at an exponential rate due to the growth of Clark County. In our opinion, the truck traffic should be routed out and around Boulder City, not through it. This is the environmental improvement sought by the homeowners along this corridor. Access: Increased truck traffic impedes all side street access. Exit and entrance ramp revisions, if truck traffic was redirected, would not be required at this time. Additional traffic control by stop lights, which would increase congestion and noise levels, would be eliminated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety: Direct street access to U.S. 93 in the Boulder City corridor is a major safety concern now. Trucks compound the problem with slow-moving tourist vehicles. Double and triple trailers hauling heavy loads further increase safety concerns. Without setbacks and service drives to corridor business establishments, the system is currently equated to “an accident looking for a place to happen.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>David R. Michel, Steven Spearman</td>
<td>12/28/01</td>
<td>This range has recreational and historical values that cannot be replaced. Typical inquiries, to Police Departments and Gun Shops throughout southern Nevada, about a safe place to shoot that is open to the public will result in a recommendation to visit the range in Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clifton A. Williams, Jr., Michael W. Brueske, William D. Sorensen, Dolores McNamara, Stanley R. Willis, George Ann Watson, Tom Hawks, Jonathan E. Bensinger, Marge &amp; John Wierdson</td>
<td>12/31/01 12/26/01 11/30/01 11/26/01 12/26/01 12/9/01 12/10/01 11/28/01 11/29/01 12/10/01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Robert Jones</td>
<td>11/29/01</td>
<td>I strongly support any freeway route or bypass plan that will preserve the Boulder City shooting range. I use the Range about twice a month and estimate that well more than 10,000 different people use the Range every year. A really good number is difficult to obtain since part of the Range is free to the general public and most users are not counted in any way. The Boulder Rifle &amp; Pistol Club membership only represent a small number of dedicated people who are willing to devote some of their time to keeping the range cleaned up and making improvements. There is no other outdoor range where long-range shooting is possible in the area that is open to the general public. Closure will result in people shooting in unsafe areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Alfred A. and Norma R. Radosta</td>
<td>1/20/00</td>
<td>Aesthetics: Sound barriers would not be required in the proximity of residential areas to attenuate noise if truck traffic were routed out and around Boulder City. This would benefit area residents and increased tourist traffic aesthetics along the way to Hoover Dam. Air Quality: Diesel trucks increase particulate contamination and carbon monoxide levels far above tourist vehicles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noise Levels: Increased truck traffic increases noise levels to a point that sound attenuation would be required by adjacent residences [if truck traffic is not routed out and around Boulder City].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazardous Waste: Spills are possible with congested truck traffic as a result of car/truck accidents. Nuclear waste trucked to the Yucca Mountain repository will increase over the coming years. Unfortunately the route must cross the river at some point based on NAFTA agreements. A noncongested direct crossing point is highly desirable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F4. SOCIO-ECONOMICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closure of this range would result in many of these people shooting in undesignated desert areas where accidents and injury could occur to others. In fact, this is currently the only shooting range in southern Nevada providing an area open to the general public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have been informed that Alternative D will result in the closure of the shooting range that the Boulder Rifle &amp; Pistol Club currently runs in Boulder City. I consider this a bad idea for the following reasons: 1) Closing this range will displace the 300 club members and countless hundreds of nonmembers for whom this is the only structured place for them to shoot in southern Nevada. 2) This range is used for formal competition shooting by a number of different organizations. This is one of the few ranges in the entire country with the facilities for 1,000-yard matches. 3) In addition to civilian users, local law enforcement and police departments use the range for training. 4) The facility is also used by both the Boulder Rifle &amp; Pistol Club and the National Rifle Association to conduct safety and shooting courses open to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Harry W. Helfrich</td>
<td>12/10/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Alfred A. and Norma R. Radosta</td>
<td>1/20/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-1-3
Comments that do not Apply to this Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>State of Nevada Department of Cultural Affairs, Division of Museums and History, Nevada State Railroad Museum/Boulder City</td>
<td>4/9/02</td>
<td>It has recently been brought to my attention that NDOT plans to widen Interstate 15 in Las Vegas near Russell Road and that there are plans to replace the current Union Pacific Railroad’s Boulder Branch Bridge near Russell Road. I brought this matter to the attention of Mr. Scott Rawlins, NDOT Project Manager, during the Public Hearing and asked if there was any possibility of using the bridge for the referenced project. Mr. Rawlins explained the geometrical differences between the UPRR Bridge and the bridge to be designed for the Boulder City project. Still, I would request that you give the matter some consideration as a possible alternative before deciding to send the bridge to northern Nevada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Hal Berghel</td>
<td>5/2/02</td>
<td>At this moment, Hoover Dam is closed to truck traffic. Non-auto traffic is diverted through Laughlin. This seems to be an effective solution to a problem. Is there a major issue that I’m unaware of? The routing through Laughlin seems to be viable. Let’s reconsider it as a permanent solution. It is a fundamental mistake to do something ill-conceived in the interest of “political realities.” Given the events of 9/11, one really has to examine how reasonable it is to place a bridge even within a few miles of the Dam. Wouldn’t it be safer in the long run to get the heavier traffic as far away from Hoover Dam as practicable? I’m no expert, but as a frequent flyer over this area, routing truck traffic through Laughlin or over the Henderson cut seems to make a lot more geographical sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Richard J. Bravo</td>
<td>5/9/02</td>
<td>The ballot initiative mentioned above was 3 years ago. Sugarloaf Mountain was selected as the location for the Hoover Dam Bypass in January of that year (1999), but the feeling in Boulder City was that the bridge could still be stopped by strong political action. That is not the case today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Michael W. Brueske</td>
<td>4/10/02</td>
<td>Personally, I would prefer to see all four alternatives eliminated and simply enlarge the bridge in Laughlin and improve the existing U.S. 95 through Searchlight to Railroad pass to make it the designated route. This would be far more cost effective for the taxpayers as it would eliminate the proposed boondoggle bridge and roadwork south of Hoover Dam that will undoubtedly cost citizens hundreds of millions of dollars by the time it is completed. Furthermore, expanding the current Searchlight route could be completed much faster than Alternatives B or C. With safety and terrorism being used as an argument to fast track the Boulder City options, isn’t time an important consideration? I know the trucking industry is opposed to the Searchlight route, but are they the ones calling the shots here? Aren’t there more important concerns than their marginally increased costs, most of which, of course, have already been passed on to consumers?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-1-3
Comments that do not Apply to this Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Joe Cain for Norm Greene</td>
<td>4/8/02</td>
<td>The “Fifth Alternative” should be recognized as a predominating addition to all of the efforts put forth in creating world interest for visitors to the Dam. The bridge to be constructed should be planned to remove all traffic from the top of the Dam. This planned recreation area provides a garden-type, homey atmosphere, and a comfortable access area for photography. If the new bridge has to be unwisely erected within photo range, giving the whole scene a “factory appearance,” this garden-type view park might help to try to preserve the simple beauty surrounding the Dam. Route D had always been shown to connect directly to the new bridge; not to the Gold Strike Casino (Hacienda). Your mailer does not indicate why this original plan was changed. As shown in your mailer, all four “recommended alternatives” looks like they were “recommended” by the casino.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Joe Cain for Bill Ferrence</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>Prefers using U.S. 95 south through Laughlin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Joe Cain for Roxanne Dey</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>Prefers a Laughlin bypass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C37</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Nicola Collins</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>I think the Hoover Dam bridge is a waste of taxpayer's money that defaces the setting of one of the wonders of the modern world and puts the waters of Lake Mohave at risk. I don't know how you will clean up a spill off that bridge. You have given Boulder City three bad choices when the route to Laughlin is working and can be improved at a fraction of the cost of the Hoover Dam bridge and the Boulder City bypass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C56</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Alfred L. Hartig</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I'll have to admit I am like Will Rogers. All I know is what I've read in the newspapers. I advocate the continued use of U.S. 95 detour with improvements to stop the carnage that is occurring on this two-lane road due to faulty driving and antiquated road engineering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C57</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Daniel W. Hearn</td>
<td>4/14/02</td>
<td>I believe the widening/upgrading of U.S. 95 to freeway specifications would be a prudent option for the following reasons: 1) Less expense than building a dam across one of the most difficult areas on the Colorado River, when considering the terrain, traffic disruptions, and potential security implications with regard to the proximity of Hoover Dam; 2) Reinforces the strong traffic flow already using U.S. 95 since the terrorist's attacks of 9/11/01; 3) Makes a better traffic pattern for commercial traffic using Interstates 8, 10, and 40 West to proceed north to south Nevada and Utah; 4) Improves the north/south corridor from the southern California/Arizona border with Mexico making U.S. 95 a true commercial route; and 5) Interstates 8, 10, and 40 already afford crossing points over the Colorado River, it seems natural to improve U.S. 95 to accommodate the traffic already using these national thoroughfares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C60</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>Ken and Elberta Isaacson</td>
<td>4/5/02</td>
<td>We are still of the opinion that common sense should prevail and the truck traffic should be routed south on U.S. 95 through Laughlin on a permanent basis. The only additional comment in this regard is that U.S. 95 should be widened to four lanes between Railroad Pass and State Route (SR) 163.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-1-3
Comments that do not Apply to this Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C63</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>Carl L. Lodjic and Frances Virginia Lodjic</td>
<td>No date</td>
<td>Who, but the citizens of Boulder City will be affected by the decisions made on the suggested bypass? Should they not then be the persons that you need to convince in the final decision? I have previously suggested that you consider the proposed CANAMEX as part of your determining factors. Both could be solved with a widening to a six-lane freeway, U.S. 95 south. Yes, the truckers would be put to a few extra miles, but the fuel consumption, and therefore the air pollution would be less than that generated through the cutbacks going down to and up from Hoover Dam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C87</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>Sandra Reuther</td>
<td>3/29/02</td>
<td>I am for Alternative A now. Hopefully the state will realize Boulder City would be better off with the upgrade to U.S. 95 and the trucks going down south there instead of across a new bridge. Then, hopefully, the state could convince the federal government not to build the new bridge. It is unnecessary to spend the money on a new bridge for truck traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C89</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>Martin S. Rihel</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>My real choice would be that the bridge and connecting roads be built further south so that Boulder City would not be impacted at all. The Laughlin route is really the best way to go, especially since U.S. 95 is already going to be widened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C90</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>Sandie Rock</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I am a resident of Bullhead City, Arizona, and travel this route many times to Henderson and Las Vegas, Nevada, for doctor's appointments, shopping, airport, etc., and that stretch of road has always been very hazardous and has had many deadly accidents including our best friend's &quot;only&quot; son, and now since the September 11th ordeal and the Hoover Dam detour, it has gotten even worse, and I can tell you many, many other stories about people passing large trucks and vehicles coming the other direction and so many &quot;almost&quot; collisions and another deadly one that my husband and I witnessed a couple of weeks ago coming back the airport, which killed a small child. This stretch of road is traveled by so many people from Laughlin/Bullhead area and now with all of the detoured trucks, it desperately needs to be a four lane with a center median. How many more people have to die before something is done? At the rate we are going, we are going to be up with the number that was lost on September 11. I plead with your agency to do something and do it as fast as you can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C92</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>Mary Shope</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>Recommendation: Alternative A. No Build Alternative. Instead of Alternatives B, C, D, the Project should improve the river crossing in Laughlin, Nevada, and improve U.S. 95 to handle the traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C100</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>Dr. Michelle Tusan</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I would like to register my concern for the overall impact of this project, regardless of the alternative decided upon. Won't these proposals just create a further bottleneck situation at the Dam? Why not widen U.S. 95 southbound to provide a viable alternative into Arizona rather than create a situation where the Dam will be put under further strain from traffic – not to mention create a security nightmare since more vehicles than ever would be trying to get to the dam? I think we should discourage commercial use of the Dam (i.e., trucks) for passage to the south. A new bypass would only encourage potentially dangerous vehicles to use the Dam as a crossing. Needless to say, this should be of particular concern in these times of increased threats from terrorism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-1-3
Comments that do not Apply to this Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C104</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>Ruth Zeman</td>
<td>4/3/02</td>
<td>I heartily approve of the widening of U.S. 95 to four travel lanes from SR 163 to the junction of U.S. 93/95. It is a project that should have been done years ago. Everyone I speak to comments on the dangers of that strip of highway. I drive it often enough to have seen cars pass in no passing zones, drive oncoming traffic off the road, and in other ways exhibit irresponsible driving practices. Cars have driven side by side in the truck passing lanes so no one could pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C108</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>Ronald B. McAlister</td>
<td>4/29/02</td>
<td>The need for a second bridge over Hoover Dam is totally illogical. As the study contends, proposals are made on a 25-year traffic projection. By diverting the commercial trucking, existing roads, with little improvement would be quite sufficient for the next 25 years. This is a fact that can be verified easily, based upon reduced traffic conditions, since the trucks were diverted after 9/11/01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A much less expensive, direct and effective solution is an expansion of Highway 68 west from Kingman, Arizona, to Highway 95, then an expansion of Highway 95 north to Highway 93. This also leaves routing through Needles, California, as a very efficient backup route. The savings with this plan would be in the hundreds of millions of dollars and would protect and preserve one of America’s most beautiful regions to the benefit of the people for years to come. If the second bridge over Hoover Dam is to be constructed, even after considering the extreme long-term security risk and what will end up a billion dollar plus expenditure, a corridor around Boulder City would be the only solution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. COMMENT SHEETS RECEIVED DURING OR AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Kenneth L. Bell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>My biggest concern for the use of any of the alternatives is the planned bridge crossing below the Dam. Are we setting up a perfect shoot zone, for drivebys, to take out the power generators, if not the Dam?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>J. M. and C. V. Blackwell</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative D. It has the least undesirable impact on the people of Boulder City. It appears to me the study should have covered from Henderson City limits to Colorado River crossing well south of the Hacienda Hotel and much south of planned new bridge. Boulder Dam will still be exposed to tourists from new bridge. Very short-sighted plan in small disjointed separate projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Marge Blockley</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative A with truck route through Laughlin or bypassing Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D31</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Beatrice Clark</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>If not Alternative D, then just widen U.S. 95 and expand that route for trucks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D32</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Robert C. Clark</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers none of the alternatives. Leave U.S. 93 as is, widen U.S. 95 to I-40 with a new bridge and approach near Nelson at Willow Beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D35</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Joyce D. Cook</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>We must not go with Alternative A. Something needs to be done to alleviate the traffic over Hoover Dam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D42</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Andrew Davlin, Jr.</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>First preference is for a route south to Searchlight and Laughlin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D50</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Leo Doyle</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>You should be using that money to fight Yucca Mountain. The state is short of money, is talking about instituting a state income tax, yet is also considering spending extra millions to appease a few rich people who want to increase their property values at the taxpayer expense. It is a scam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D52</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>Leigh Dunn</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I would prefer a new alternative. Take the traffic south on U.S. 95 through Searchlight/Laughlin. The road needs to be widened. There is a plan to do so. Why not widen the road, make it appropriate for truck traffic, save millions of dollars, and lessen congestion in Boulder City and also relieve the future problem of added noise pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D54</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>Frank E. Ensign</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The FHWA should pick up the cost difference between Alternative D and B or C because of their poor bridge site selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D56</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>D. V. Fagan</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Building a convenient platform (the bridge) from which to destroy the Dam is a dumb idea. The only thing holding the Dam in place is Lake Mead. Exploding a small nuke from the bridge will remove the pressure and with it, the Dam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D67</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>Linda Goodman</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers taking the traffic through Laughlin. Since September 11 (2001), all the truck traffic has been forced to go that route. It has made life “much improved in Boulder City.” Safer and quieter roads, less air pollution, and much less congestion to Lake Mead and over the Dam. Saving a national treasure, “the Hoover Dam,” is very important. So is peace and quiet!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D71</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>Albert K. Hamel</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Traffic needs to be taken off the Dam. It is too dangerous. A bridge below the Dam is needed to help U.S. 95 traffic. I worked at Hoover Dam from 5/90 to 1/95 and seen a lot of trucks sideswipe ending up dumping their loads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D83</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>Louis Kaboli</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers none of the alternatives. There is nothing wrong with the route the trucks are taking presently. Please widen U.S. 95 to Laughlin so they may go the existing route and please stop wasting our tax dollars. The other natural route is through Nelson. Don’t know why you dropped that route.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D93</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>John D. Lasiewicki</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>What has Mexico done for us!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D108</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>Scott Meyer</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The consumer is already paying for the extra mileage (freight charges) due to the trucks being diverted, so there is no additional cost to the consumer since trucks have had to use this route since September 11, 2001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D113</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>Barbara J. Morris</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Although I realize that it isn’t an option, widening U.S. 95 is the logical choice. It is the most cost effective and it is doable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D114</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>Ken Morris</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I would prefer to see a route through Laughlin and on to U.S. 95. The trucks are now using it – and with the planned enhancements, it should be an adequate truck route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D115</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>Marlene Morwick</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>If I really had a choice, it would No Build. Use route to Searchlight. However, this seems to be “out of our hands” already.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D117</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>Jim Murphy</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>No bridge within 10 miles of Dam – terrorism – for tactical and strategic reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D125</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>Virginia Perkins and Jeff Dalby</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>We can’t just send the through traffic to Laughlin. They want it more than we do. Sure, it’s 22 miles out of the way, but it’s not that far. This bypass will not alleviate Dam traffic hardly at all. Also, I’m concerned about my national security. Some nut parks a nuke on the bypass and it’s millions, not thousands, that’s hurt by it because it will affect the Dam, the water, and the power. Let’s use our heads. Keep this road away from the Dam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D135</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>Alfred A. Radosta</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>The simple solution which benefits all taxpayers but shunts political contributions by special interests is to confine truck traffic to U.S. 95 as has been the case since 9/11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D138</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>Martin S. Rihel</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I disagree with the location of the bridge – too close to the Dam. The best solution is to have the traffic go south to Laughlin or a bridge further downstream from the proposed site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D152</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>Russ Thompson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Prefers all truck traffic to continue use of U.S. 95 south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D164</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>Mrs. Billie Waymire</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Traffic is already too heavy crossing the Dam. The backup and waiting is terrible. We have a second home at Temple Bar, Arizona, and we need to pass over the Dam to reach our home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D166</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>Vennita J. Wilson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I would much rather have Highway 95 become four lanes and bridge built in Laughlin, but whatever plan keeps the trucks the farthest away from Boulder City is the best.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>D175</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>Rebecca L. Mahaney</td>
<td>5/13/02</td>
<td>I like an alternative that you do not offer – one where the bridge is well below Hoover Dam and the highway branches off around the U.S. 93/95 intersection. That keeps the tourists going through Boulder City on their way to Lake Mead and Hoover Dam but pulls the trucks and interstate travelers well away so they aren’t congesting and polluting Boulder City. That is a no-brainer solution to me, but I guess no one else saw this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D175</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I fully understand the need to relieve the traffic off of Hoover Dam. We have inched along for 45 minutes to cross the dam. The need is great to make changes; however, how to find the best solution!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D175</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If it were my choice entirely, I’d take U.S. 93 south of Boulder City to join the existing U.S. 93 in Arizona somewhere near Willow Beach offroad straight shot from Railroad Pass to Willow Beach. Leave current U.S. 93 as is and add my southern bypass keeping trucks off dam. Why doesn’t NDOT make U.S. 95 south a double or triple lane divided highway all the way to the California border? You could permanently keep all trucks off of Hoover Dam and the new U.S. 95 could accommodate them very well! Improve the bridge at Bullhead/Laughlin too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D176</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>Michael L. Mahaney</td>
<td>5/13/02</td>
<td>Alternatives should have included a route away from Boulder City – including a bridge away from Hoover Dam. Why are there no choices that encompass a bypass?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D177</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>Leslie Paige</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>The best solution is Alternative E – go south to Laughlin like they are already doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D37</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>Curtis Cornelius</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>Let’s not even build the bridge. It is not the solution to the possibility of pollutant contamination of the Colorado River flow south. The route down U.S. 95 is good for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D35</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>Joyce D. Cook</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
<td>After the tragedy of September 11, it would seem we have a route away from Boulder City. Why not widen U.S. 95 to Laughlin and make other improvements if necessary? Maybe this is a simplistic approach, but sometimes simpler is better and cheaper. It would take trucks away from town, and they don’t stop for food or to buy gifts or to sightsee anyway. Other vehicles could stop if they wanted to.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| E2         | 6.1  | Robert J. Hartman | 4/4/02| Another alternative at one time was discussed. That was to widen U.S. 95 from the interconnection of U.S. 93 south to connect with I-40 near Needles, California. I recall that route was dismissed as causing too much pollution due to the extra distance that truck traffic would have to travel.  
Also, there was a discussion regarding the different grades the truck would have to negotiate. Since the tragic events of September 11, these same trucks must now negotiate that route, that remains a two-lane highway.  
In light of that and with public safety in mind, may I call your attention to the tremendous increase in traffic along U.S. 95. Daily there is a literal parade of heavy traffic along this route. There are several businesses along this route that have serious issues with this traffic. Since this route will not be widened to accommodate the increased traffic, I have some suggestions that you may wish to consider.  
First, approximately 10 miles south of U.S. 93 interchange is the township of Nelson. The approach to Nelson has very well engineered and built turn lanes, providing easy and safe entrance and exit into that area. Two and one-half miles south of that is Eldorado Valley Drive. This is the access road to SEC’s Eldorado Substation, LADWP’s McCullough & Marketplace Substation and Reliant Energy’s Eldorado Generating Station. Each of those existing facilities have between 12 and 20 employees who must daily literally take their lives into their hands to enter or leave the property. This does not take into consideration each facility also receives on a daily basis deliveries, temporary contract personnel, and temporary assigned work crews.  
It is my understanding that yet a second generating plant is planned for this location. During the construction of the Eldorado Generating Station, construction crew traffic, albeit temporary, numbered approximately 250 vehicles daily.  
Also, it is my understanding the city has proposed an energy park to develop and showcase new technologies. This would, of course, increase the traffic on Eldorado Valley Drive on a more permanent level.  
Therefore, while we are considering what route the bypass will take and how much funding it should receive and in light of the fact that there are no plans to widen the already overburdened U.S. 95, why not consider a turn-out lane at Eldorado Valley Drive on U.S. 95 and additional signage by the gravel pit turn-offs just south of U.S. 93 interchange warning motorists of oncoming trucks?  
Anyone who drives U.S. 95, as I do daily, can tell you horror stories of near misses and accidents, particularly on holiday weekends.  
Recently I have noticed an increase presence of Nevada Highway Patrol, Metro Police, and Boulder City Police patrols on U.S. 95. While I applaud their efforts, they cannot be at every potential trouble spot 24-7 and they have other obligations to fulfill. |
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<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Virginia Perkins</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>I think it’s a security risk to the Dam. Cars only over the Dam has not posed a security, but even a bypass at 1,500 feet down the river is not good enough for me. And what would happen if anything happened to Hoover Dam? Number 1, there would be a huge flood. All of southern California, Arizona, and Boulder City would lose all their power, all their farming techniques. It would be a countless loss of lives. And that’s my first preference, nothing near the Dam whatsoever. I think they ought to widen the existing truck route they decided upon as of 9/11 and widen the bridge down in Laughlin and send the trucks that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Ken Isaacson</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>In view of the fact that the world has changed since 9/11/01 and the truck traffic since then has been diverted south on U.S. 95 to Laughlin and Kingman, in our opinion the highway bypass situation has remedied itself. We would ask that you review your options and serious consider making this a permanent solution. Common sense tells us that the widening of U.S. 95 to four lanes from Railroad Pass to the SR 163 intersection with a simple interchange there permanently removes all heavy truck traffic from or near Hoover Dam and Boulder City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Steve Prisem</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>My opinion is that keep it on U.S. 95 because it’s being developed in the first place starting in July.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Steve Prisem</td>
<td>4/4/02</td>
<td>Since the cheapest way is U.S. 95, the logistics are better, through Laughlin, small town, Searchlight, it might add 30 to 40 miles, and they say the switch backs through Laughlin and on the Arizona side of the river, but that can be handled by the big trucks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Richard and Marge Phegley</td>
<td>9/23/01</td>
<td>Since the unfortunate day of 9/11/01, truck traffic has been halted across the Dam. We wish to voice our opinion that it should be halted permanently and made to continue to go through Laughlin. If it has become a safety issue with the government since that date, we feel it should have always been one. Although it might cause the truckers more time, it must be safer for everyone else concerned. It also should reduce the length of the trip for passenger cars both ways as they don’t have to crawl behind a truck go up the grades. It also makes our traffic in Boulder City less hazardous and congested. One could only shudder to think what might have happened or could happen in the future had one of the trucks caught on fire on the Dam instead of at the intersection of Buchanan and Nevada Highways it did recently. This concern is not a new one. We have always felt this way. We also wonder if trucks could be required to use the right-hand lane only when not passing or making a left turn. We appreciate your support in this issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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