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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.
Response to Comment E2-1.2
The Roadway Capacity section of the Purpose and Need (FEIS Section 1.3.1) discusses this need.

Response to Comment E2-2.1
Comment noted.

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, LAUNP’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.

LAURIE WEBB AND ASSOCIATES (702) 386-9322
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-95 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

Laurie Webb and Associates (702) 386-9322
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.
BEVERLI FOWELL, 1515 DARLENE WAY

MS. FOWELL: 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.
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 DHS 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 proposals. That comes out to approximately a 57 percent 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.
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.
E. PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPT COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

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.
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 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 Grace and Michael Landko 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. He indicated it was not to be revealed to
the public because it was, quote, a work in progress,
end quote.

In summary, I believe the city should
re-evaluate its position with respect to supporting
alternative B. 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.
Their houses for the view of the waters. A highway is
not going to obstruct their view of the water.

The people on my side of the city bought
their house 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.

And so any kind of highway will get into our
mountain view, and there's a lot more people on my side
of the road than there are in Hemmaway Valley.

Any highway is going to impact wildlife. The
southern alignment will impact archaeological digs. It
will impact Lake Mead National Recreational area. It
will impact much more than any other spot for this
highway.

But I sincerely hope in view of 9/11 that you
will consider reroute this whole highway through
Searchlight and Laughlin. I for one do not want to see
millions of people die because somebody was able to get
a nuke on the dam. And we thought the World Trade
Center couldn't happen and it did.
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

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.

LAURIE WHIS AND ASSOCIATES (702) 386-9322

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 DHS people and NDOT by those in our community who have some financial ability to sway others' 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.
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. HALLDARSON: 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.
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.
Respectfully, Ken and Elbera Isaacson,
Boulder City, Nevada.
MS. THERRIEN: What I want on record is that the map, that is displayed here in grossly inaccurate. It goes back prior to 1997. It shows absolutely no homes that have been built and people are 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. PRIEM: My opinion is that keep it on the I-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 I-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 Oatman'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. Stimson: 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.
E17
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Ken Byler, 1017 El Camino

Mr. Byler: 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.

Laurie Webb and Associates (702) 386-9322

Response to Comment E17-5.1
Comment noted.
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.
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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, at cetera.

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
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traffic and bypass Boulder City, therefore, 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.

And, of course, in addition 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.

Thank you for your time.

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 bikers. 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.

Response to Comment E21-2.20
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, Sections 2.4 and 2.5, for a description of the initial alternatives analyzed and eliminated from further consideration based on the results of a screening evaluation.
VOLKSWAGEN: The scenery is beautiful. You have the mountains. You have the guys coming down with their paragliding. 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 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 alarms, 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
MR. COMPTON: My name is Gary Compton. I live at 1626 Georgia Avenue. And I just have a few comments concerning the different alternatives.

I definitely think that some alternative needs to be selected. I don't think alternative A is viable, alternative A being no build.

As between the other three alternatives, alternative B seems to follow the existing roadway relatively closely, based on the impact statement would have the least impact, negative impact on the community as far as the business community goes. It would not divert pollution or noise or -- 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 is -- 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.

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 or 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 125 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.
 Response to Comment E28-3.13
The proposed interchanges at Railroad Pass and at the eastern end both allow for access onto existing U.S. 93, by which both casinos would be accessed.

Response to Comment E28-3.14
The entire project is contained in the recently adopted RTC Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The design and right-of-way elements are contained in the TIP, with the construction phases scheduled in the years 2005 through 2020.
1 By 2006, 2007, that with the traffic that's going to be
2 in Boulder City, the best thing they could do to spend
3 75 or a hundred million dollars would be to build three
4 or four interchanges, a couple of them in the wash or
5 the area in the area of the wash and two -- two at both
6 ends of the city, and that would provide access to
7 anybody who wants to get from one side of the city to
8 the other.

9 And they may have depress the existing road a
10 little bit, but, you know, the traffic is going to be so
11 bad in 10 years that if we can't build this thing in 10
12 years, they better do something immediately, and I
13 don't see an intermediate answer to this that they ought
14 to be looking at if there is no money in any budget to
15 do this for that length of time.

16 That's about all I got to say.
MS. ADAMS: I'm not going to be able to give a full comment tonight because I just received my paper copy of the DEIS on Thursday, but I will be able to comment on the process, on this draft and public comment period.

NDOT may have met the letter of NEPA by posting the DEIS draft -- 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.

This project, whichever corridor is chosen, will impact Boulder City more than any development in decades, and if 60 percent of the citizens, adults in this town don't realize what's happening -- from my talk on the street many people are confused on the alternatives and what the actions are -- then NDOT is not doing its job.

I request two additional months for the public comment period and two 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 a charging for a draft

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 scoping of the BIS 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.

Mr. Strum: 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. Strum: I also feel route D is the only alternative for Boulder City without destroying our cute quaint town.

(Meeting adjourned at 8:00 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 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 Highway 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 those vehicles passing through the Railroad Pass area take the turn off at Highway 96 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 48% of those people traveling on these two 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% of traffic that passes through our town in order to visit Lake Mead and/or Hoover Dam. We are also subjected to these dangerous stretches of highway.

Building the southern bypass will not alleviate those dangerous highway conditions which NDOT is supposed to ameliorate. Alternative B is however, which is a widening and modification of existing Highway 93, will alleviate these safety concerns.

According to NDOT, Alternative B, which includes improvement of existing Highway 93, proposes a new highway interchange at Railroad Pass, a 20' widening of Highway 93 (it is currently 65' 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 community stretch of Highway 93.

If the southern bypass is the selected Alternative, the treacherous stretches of Highway 93 will continue to threaten the safety of our school children, family and friends. Under such a scenario, our local and state government, as well as our elected officials, should prepare to deal with the aftermath of civil lawsuits brought by those that have been injured or have lost loved ones due to the dangerous conditions existing on Highway 93. As a part of our duty to ensure the safety of our community, legal action should be taken to ensure that those that caused these dangerous conditions be held accountable.

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
293-9698
LETTER TO THE EDITOR:
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 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 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 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 18 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 fields and the skateboarding park.

Additionally, fewer than 50% of the registered voters responded to question number 1. (2,920 voted in favor of this ill-defined multi-pass southern bypass route and 1,485 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 issues of debate are not enough to cause alarm, 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 officials...

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 Council member 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 1995 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.

At this September 26th meeting, Mr. Tom Greco of MDOT 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 Emmett 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 $40 million higher) cost to build Alternative D due to the fact that Alternative D involves the same 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 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
1530 Georgia Ave.
Boulder City
293-7623

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.
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 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 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.
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 analyzes the environmental and economic costs of the alternatives to improve existing I-25. In the letter by Dr. Mattill (BC News 3/29/02) it is clear that those who support the southern bypass (Alt. D) and compose 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. B 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 $50 reduction in tourism expenditure, an $18 million reduction in sales and a reduction of 200 BC tourism jobs, resulting in a closure of 30-40 BC businesses. (DEIS at pg. 4-121). 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 to 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 (3/7/02), city manager John Sullard stated that if Alt. 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 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 lists 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 NRA that did not previously exist (DEIS at pg. E5-15); Alt. D will disturb 676 acres of habitat for the desert tortoise and impact the highhorn sheep calving area, causing the greatest disturbance to wildlife of all of 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. E5-20) it would also create the most dust (DEIS at pg. E5-97). 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.