

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
A. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES				
A1. ACCESSIBILITY, OPERATIONS, AND SAFETY				
A1	1.1	State of Nevada Department of Cultural Affairs, Division of Museums and History, Nevada State Railroad Museum/Boulder City	4/9/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
A2. ENVIRONMENTAL				
A2	2.1	United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	5/10/02	<p><u>Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit Requirements:</u> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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			<p><u>Impacts Minimization and Mitigation:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.3			<p><u>Best Management Practices (BMPs) Monitoring Program:</u> The DEIS states that a program will be implemented to monitor the effectiveness of the BMPs utilized in this project (DEIS, page 4-33).</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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			<p><u>Indirect Effects</u> 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 <i>Code of Federal Regulations</i> [CFR] 1508.8). EPA is particularly concerned about the potential indirect effects of Alternative D.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the potential for Alternative D to accelerate the timing and influence the location of developing 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

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.5			<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u> 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.</p> <p>The Council on Environmental Quality's <i>Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations</i>, 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 (<i>Forty Most Asked Questions</i>, 19b).</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
	2.6			<p><u>Air Quality – Construction Impacts</u> 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 (PM₁₀), and the magnitude of this project, we recommend including the following mitigation measures, as appropriate.</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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.
	2.7			<p><u>Recycled Materials, Materials Reuse, and Recycling</u> 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.</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 http://www.epa.gov/cpg.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.8			<p><u>Invasive Species</u></p> <p>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.</p>
A3	2.9	State of Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources Division of Wildlife (NDOW)	5/10/02	<p>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.</p>
	2.10			<p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.11			<p><u>Bighorn Sheep</u> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.12			<p><u>Desert Tortoise</u> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	2.13			<p><u>Banded Gila Monster</u> 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 <i>Evaluation</i> 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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.14			<u>Chuckwalla, Burrowing Owl, and Peregrine Falcon</u> 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.
	2.15			<u>Species Noted and Their Relationship to Clark County MSHCP</u> 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 <i>covered</i> 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 <i>covered</i> species in the Clark County MSHCP. The DEIS could benefit by providing the list of species <i>covered</i> 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 <i>covered</i> and are under the authority of the Division, we foresee the need to discuss additional mitigation for these species.
	2.16			<u>Alternative D: Highway Crossing Structures and Fence</u> 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.
	2.17			<u>Alternatives B and C: Highway Crossing Structures and Fence</u> 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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.18			<p><u>Acreage Associated with Construction Impacts</u> 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.</p>
A5	2.19	United States Department of the Interior	5/23/02	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.
	2.20			<p>Late last year, CH2M HILL was provided with National Park Service (NPS) directives entitled <i>Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis and Decision Making</i>. 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.</p> <p>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.</p>
A6	2.21	Department of the Army	6/26/02	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.
	2.22			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.
	2.23			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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
A7	2.24	United States Department of the Interior National Park Service (NPS)	7/22/02	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.
	2.25			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.
A3. IMPLEMENTATION AND CONSTRUCTION				
A1	3.1	State of Nevada Department of Cultural Affairs, Division of Museums and History, Nevada State Railroad Museum/Boulder City	4/9/02	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.
A4	3.2	City of Boulder City	5/23/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
B. ORGANIZATIONS				
B1. ACCESSIBILITY, OPERATIONS, AND SAFETY				
B3	1.1	Park Place Entertainment	5/17/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
B2. ENVIRONMENTAL				
B1	2.1	AhaMakav Cultural Society Fort Mojave Indian Tribe	3/28/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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&2, by Associated Cultural Resource Experts.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
B4. SOCIO-ECONOMICS				
B2	4.1	Boulder City Chamber of Commerce	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The majority of respondents felt they were well informed and strongly supported Alternate D/the Southern route traveling south of town.</p> <p>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.</p>
C. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS				
C1. ACCESSIBILITY, OPERATIONS, AND SAFETY				
C2	1.1	Nancy Barlow	3/30/02	I vote for Alternative D. I have been very happy to not have all the big trucks through town for the past 6 months.
C3	1.2	Dr. Daniel Benyshek	4/4/02	Without additional highway development, any of the three proactive U.S. 93 corridor proposals will simply worsen the traffic bottleneck at Hoover Dam.
C6	1.3	Richard J. Bravo	5/9/02	<p>Energy Use (Operational)</p> <p>Alternative B – 15,700 gallons of fuel used during a 2027 peak hour.</p> <p>Alternative C – 16,660 gallons of fuel used during a 2027 peak hour.</p> <p>Alternative D – 18,504 gallons of fuel used during a 2027 peak hour.</p> <p>The 15 percent to 18 percent higher fuel consumption under Alternative D is supposedly negated by delay time reduction and “indirect and circulation benefits.” These factors apply to all alternatives, and D is clearly the worst choice for energy consumption.</p>
C13	1.4	Joe Cain for Mark Garrity	4/8/02	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.
C23	1.5	Christina Casey	5/10/02	Alternative C will make it easier to get on and off the freeway. I am in favor of Alternative C.
	1.6			I am opposed to Alternative D as it will make it more difficult to go out into the desert.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C26	1.7	Christina Casey	5/10/02	I am in favor of Alternative C because it will preserve my access to the desert.
C28	1.8	Lindy Casey	5/9/02	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.
C30	1.9	Lindy Casey	5/10/02	I am in favor of Alternative C because it includes a frontage road and ramps.
	1.10			I am opposed to Alternative D because it will restrict access to the desert.
C31	1.11	Lindy Casey	5/10/02	I am in favor of Alternative C because it keeps the bypass in the area of the current bypass.
C33	1.12	Lindy Casey	5/10/02	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.
C34	1.13	Jane Cheek	4/5/02	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.
C35	1.14	Nick Christensen	3/18/02	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.
	1.15			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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C43	1.16	Patricia J. Culler	4/4/02	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.
C44	1.17	Thomas C. Culler, Jr.	4/4/02	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.
C52	1.18	Caroline Dykstra	5/10/02	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.
C54	1.19	Donald Gildner Mackie B. Gildner	4/4/02	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.
C55	1.20	Christine A. Goodwin	5/10/02	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.
C56	1.21	Alfred L. Hartig	4/4/02	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.
C59	1.22	Esther Holland	4/4/02	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.
C61	1.23	Mr. and Mrs. Korda	5/2/02	Please do not split our town in half. Designation D is the answer. Why destroy some people and businesses' life.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C65	1.24	Robert Merrell	4/24/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	1.25			<p>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.</p> <p>My family and I strongly support Alternative D as the one and only solution to the traffic problems that plague Boulder City.</p>
C67	1.26	Joe Miller	5/10/02	I am in favor of Alternative C because it will be easier to get on and off the freeway.
C69	1.27	Joe Miller	5/10/02	I am opposed to Alternative D because it will make it harder for me to go out into the desert.
	1.28			I am for Alternative C because that's where the road to the lake is and it should stay there.
C81	1.29	Richard and Margaret Phegley	3/29/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C91	1.30	Mike and Debby Scholl	4/8/02	We are residents of our historical town of Boulder City. We have been, and still are absolutely appalled at the idea at 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, then 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.
C92	1.31	Mary Shope	5/10/02	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.
C93	1.32	Mike Sitton	No date	<p>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.</p> <p>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.”</p> <p>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.</p>
C95	1.33	Bill Smith	3/19/02	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.
C98	1.34	Ron and Mary Jane Therrien	4/3/02	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.
C102	1.35	John F. Wiles	5/10/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C108	1.36	Ronald B. McAlister	4/29/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p>
C2. ENVIRONMENTAL				
C1	2.1	Scott Lee Baranoff, M.D., F.A.C.S.	3/28/02	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.
C3	2.2	Dr. Daniel Benyshek	4/4/02	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.
	2.3			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.
C4	2.4	Hal Berghel	5/2/02	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.
	2.5			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.
C5	2.6	Cokie Booth	No date	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.7			<p>With Alternative D, no one would be disturbed, have to put up with noise pollution, dust pollution, or traffic tie-up.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>If nuclear waste does come to Nevada, I do not want it that close to my home.</p>
C6	2.8	Richard J. Bravo	5/9/02	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.
	2.9			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 "Such levels are below existing...levels" 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 "B" 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.
	2.10			<p><u>Air Quality</u> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.11			<p><u>Noise</u> 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.</p> <p>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!</p>
	2.12			<p><u>Biology/Threatened Species</u> Alternative B – 327 acres disturbed. Alternative C – 460 acres disturbed. Alternative D – 679 acres disturbed.</p> <p>This is an important reason not to use Alternative D. Of the 679 acres, more than 145 acres is high-density desert bighorn sheep territory.</p>
	2.13			<p><u>Water Resources/Stormwater Runoff</u> 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.</p>
	2.14			<p><u>Water Resources/Erosion</u> Alternative B – Moderate. Alternative C – Moderate. Alternative D – Severe.</p> <p>Alternative D’s deepest cut is 230 feet versus 98 feet for B and C, and it has 2,065 feet of cuts deeper than 80 feet versus 98 feet for B and C. Section 11-39-7.U of the Boulder City Code requires subdivisions to “...retain all natural features, to a reasonable degree, including original grade, topography, and drainage ways... .” Alternative D clearly fails the “reasonable degree” test.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.15			<p><u>Water Resources/Length of Steepest Grades</u> 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</p> <p>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.</p>
	2.16			<p><u>Water Resources/Sediment Production</u> Alternative B – Low Alternative C – Low Alternative D – Highest</p> <p>Alternatives B and C both avoid the problems created by the Alternative D sediment.</p>
	2.17			<p><u>Wetlands/Waters of the U.S.</u> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	2.18			<p><u>Floodplains (Operational)</u> Alternative B – 10 acres are impacted. Alternative C – 5.9 acres are impacted. Alternative D – 4.1 acres are impacted.</p> <p>Alternative D requires less permanent mitigation than either B or C.</p>
	2.19			<p><u>Cultural Resources, Archaeological Sites</u> Alternative B – 3 sites may be impacted. Alternative C – 6 sites may be impacted. Alternative D – 2 sites may be impacted.</p> <p>Alternative D is narrowly better.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.20			<p><u>Land Use/Section 4(f)</u> Alternative B – 45 acres of LMNRA land is used. Five structures demolished. Impacts River Mountains Loop Trail. Electrical tower/line impacts are low. Alternative C – 45 acres of LMNRA land is used. Impacts River Mountains Loop Trail. Potential golf courses affected. Electrical tower/line impacts are medium. Alternative D – 85 acres of LMNRA land is used. Casino access is modified. Rifle range may be moved. Electrical tower/line impacts are high.</p> <p>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.</p>
	2.21			<p><u>Visual</u> Alternative B – Laguna Lane residential views are impacted. Alternative C – Laguna Lane residential and two historic structure views are impacted. Alternative D – Only minimal impact on casino patron views.</p> <p>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.</p>
	2.22			<p><u>Economic</u> Alternative B – Driveby-dependent businesses may lose revenue. Alternative C – U.S. 93 businesses may see lower sales. Alternative D – Short-term negative effect on City business is likely, long-term not likely.</p> <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.23			<p><u>Social</u> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	2.24			<p><u>Bicycles/Pedestrians</u> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>
C7	2.25	Michael W. Brueske	4/10/02	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.
C8	2.26	Joe Cain for Boulder City News	4/4/02	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.
C9	2.27	Joe Cain for Bob Draney	4/8/02	Our Number 1 priority should be the 15,000 residents, not the businesses, not the desert tortoise, and not the bighorn sheep.
C10	2.28	Joe Cain for Rod and Meg Fair	4/8/02	Despite getting about 20 percent of their business from drive-by traffic, they want the vehicle exhaust and dust pollution diverted south of town.
C11	2.29	Joe Cain for Cokie Booth	4/8/02	Both of my businesses would benefit from a southern route that would take trucks and recreational vehicles out of the downtown area.
C12	2.30	Joe Cain for Don Estes	4/8/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C20	2.31	Joe Cain for Darryl Martin	4/12/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	2.32			<p>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?</p> <p>It is clear that Route D best serves these objectives of preserving our environment and quality of life.</p>
C21	2.33	Joe Cain for Chuck and Linda Lee Patterson	4/12/02	<p>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.</p>
	2.34			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
C22	2.35	Darva Campbell	5/9/02	<p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C24	2.36	Christina Casey	5/10/02	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.
	2.37			I am in favor of Alternative C because it will use an existing road, rather than making alterations to the landscape.
C25	2.38	Christina Casey	5/10/02	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.
C26	2.39	Christina Casey	5/10/02	I am opposed to Alternative D because it will go through a tortoise reserve.
C28	2.40	Lindy Casey	5/9/02	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.
C29	2.41	Lindy Casey	5/10/02	I am opposed to Alternative D because it goes through the LMNRA, which has been preserved from development by a congressional order.
C31	2.42	Lindy Casey	5/10/02	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.
C33	2.43	Lindy Casey	5/10/02	I am opposed to Alternative D. It will affect our view of Hemenway Valley.
C34	2.44	Jane Cheek	4/5/02	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!
C35	2.45	Nick Christensen	3/18/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C36	2.46	Curtis F. Clark	3/30/02	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.
C37	2.47	Nicola Collins	5/10/02	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).
C43	2.48	Patricia J. Culler	4/4/02	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.
C44	2.49	Thomas C. Culler	4/4/02	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.
C46	2.50	Peter de Beauchamp	5/9/02	<p>I am opposed to Alternative D for these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) We already have an existing bypass. 2) There are clearly much greater negative natural habitat impacts from Alternative D. 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. 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. 5) Alternative D would shift all of the pollution immediately down wind of the town. 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. 7) Alternative D has negative cultural impacts to the AmaHaKav tribe. 8) Alternative D is tremendously more expensive than the other alternatives. 9) Alternative D will have a huge impact and relatively wild desert areas. 10) Destroying gorgeous views of the Eldorado Valley and the mountains beyond. 11) Negative impacts on wildlife that is NOT impacted now. <p>I prefer Alternative B or C. I find the present situation of sending the trucks through Laughlin to be the most satisfactory.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C47	2.51	Jack L. Delp	5/5/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
C48	2.52	Matt Di Teresa	5/5/02	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.
C49	2.53	Caroline Dykstra	5/10/02	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.
C50	2.54	Caroline Dykstra	5/10/02	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.
C53	2.55	David and Gisela Gere	3/31/02	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.
C54	2.56	Donald Gildner Mackie B. Gildner	4/4/02	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.
C55	2.57	Christine A. Goodwin	5/10/02	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).
C58	2.58	Kevin and Nancy Hendricks	5/10/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C59	2.59	Esther Holland	4/4/02	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.
C60	2.60	Ken and Elberta Isaacson	4/5/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
C64	2.61	Joseph A. Mendenhall Leone R. Mendenhall	3/30/02	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.
C66	2.62	Joe Miller	5/10/02	I am opposed to Alternative D because it goes through Lake Mead's land and near Boy Scout Canyon where there are petroglyphs.
C67	2.63	Joe Miller	5/10/02	I am opposed to Alternative D because it will interfere with the view.
C74	2.64	Gertrude L. Paige	5/9/02	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 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!

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C76	2.65	Leslie Paige	5/7/02	<p>I am absolutely against Alternative D for these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We already have an existing bypass. 2. Negative impacts on natural habitat. 3. Negative impacts on desert recreation to the south of Boulder City. 4. Negative impacts on the Boulder City Rifle and Gun Club. 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. 6. Negative cultural impacts to the AmaHaKav tribe. 7. Too expensive. 8. Destroying pristine desert. 9. Destroying gorgeous views of the Eldorado Valley and the mountains beyond. 10. Negative impacts on wildlife that is NOT impacted now. <p>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.</p>
C80	2.66	Joseph and Dominique Pfeiffer	5/9/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
C82	2.67	Ed and Judy Pitchford	3/31/02	<p>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.</p>
C83	2.68	Barbara Raulston	5/8/02	<p>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.</p>
C85	2.69	Barbara Raulston	5/8/02	<p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C86	2.70	Jason Reuther	4/25/02	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.
C89	2.71	Martin S. Rihel	4/12/02	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.
C98	2.72	Ron and Mary Jane Therrien	4/3/02	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.
C99	2.73	Mary Jane Therrien	4/4/02	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.
C100	2.74	Dr. Michelle Tusan	4/4/02	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.
C101	2.75	Chanteil Walter	5/9/02	<p>I am a Boulder City resident, and I am completely opposed to Alternative D for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There are clearly much greater negative impacts to the natural environment from Alternative D. 2) Alternative D would shift all of the population immediately down wind of the town. 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. 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. 5) Alternative D is ridiculously more expensive, both economically and ecologically, than the other alternatives. 6) It will damage the unhindered aesthetically pleasing view of the Eldorado Valley and mountains beyond. 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. <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C103	2.76	Jennifer Wood	5/10/02	I am strongly opposed to this proposal. It will be detrimental to Boulder City and the lands that surround it.
C105	2.77	Frank E. Ensign	4/29/02	<p>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.</p> <p>A freeway or truck route skirting the area will seriously harm the beautiful and enjoyable area.</p>
C107	2.78	Richard H. Bryan	5/8/02	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.
	2.79			<p>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.</p> <p>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 ambience Boulder City has worked so hard to protect.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.80			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 make sense.”</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 Major 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.”</p> <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.81			<p>Several other dignitaries attended the hearing in support of Alternative D and several other elected officials provided letters of support for Alternative D.</p> <p>U.S. Senator Harry Reid's Regional Director, Jerry Reynoldson, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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."</p> <p>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.</p>
	2.82			<p>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.</p>
C108	2.83	Ronald B. McAlister	4/29/02	<p>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.</p>
C109	2.84	Ronald P. Therrien	4/4/02	<p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
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			<u>Energy Use (Construction)</u> 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			<u>Estimated Cost</u> Alternative B – \$220 million. Alternative C – \$220 million. Alternative D – \$345 million. \$125,000,000 more for an inferior solution.
	3.5			<u>Construction Time Period</u> 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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C32	3.9	Lindy Casey	5/10/02	I am in favor of Alternative C because it is less expensive. I am opposed to Alternative D because it is most expensive.
C35	3.10	Nick Christensen	3/18/02	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.
	3.11			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.
	3.12			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).
C36	3.13	Curtis F. Clark	3/30/02	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.
C45	3.14	Myrna Danforth	5/1/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C47	3.15	Jack L. Delp	5/5/02	<p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p>
C51	3.16	Caroline Dykstra	5/10/02	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.
C68	3.17	Joe Miller	5/10/02	I am opposed to Alternative D because it costs more money. I am for Alternative C because it costs less money.
C77	3.18	Angela Pestana	4/10/02	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.
C78	3.19	Joseph Pestana	4/10/02	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.
C79	3.20	Joseph Pestana	4/10/02	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.
C84	3.21	Barbara Raulston	5/8/02	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 "one-on-one" 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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C96	3.22	Rob and Gretchen Steensen	4/15/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
C4. SOCIO-ECONOMICS				
C5	4.1	Cokie Booth	No date	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.
	4.2			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
C6	4.3	Richard J. Bravo	5/9/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C7	4.4	Michael W. Brueske	4/10/02	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.
C27	4.5	Christina Casey	5/10/02	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.
C17	4.6	Joe Cain for Ed Waymire	4/12/02	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.
C18	4.7	Joe Cain for Chad Blair	4/12/02	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.
C19	4.8	Joe Cain for Rod and Meg Fair	4/12/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	4.9			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
C29	4.10	Lindy Casey	5/10/02	I am in favor of Alternative C because it will still encourage visitors to enter Boulder City via off-ramp.
C62	4.11	Mr. and Mrs. Korda	5/2/02	Route D is the only answer. It may cost more money, but it won't destroy people's and businesses' life.
C66	4.12	Joe Miller	5/10/02	I am in favor of Alternative C because I think it will still get people to come to our stores.
C70	4.13	G D Newbould	4/12/02	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.
C71	4.14	Gerald D. Newbould	5/7/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>
C73	4.15	Wendy O'Sullivan	4/4/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C93	4.16	Mike Sitton	No date	<p>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.</p> <p>The Southern Bypass is by far the superior choice for Boulder City.</p>
C96	4.17	Rob and Gretchen Steensen	4/15/02	<p>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.</p>
C108	4.18	Ronald B. McAlister	4/29/02	<p>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.</p>
C5. OTHER				
C6	5.1	Richard J. Bravo	5/9/02	<p>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.</p>
C37	5.2	Nicola Collins	5/10/02	<p>I favor route A.</p>
C38	5.3	Ramon Collins	5/5/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Old Town doesn't have the political power and wealth of HV (the same thing), but we do have the courts.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C39	5.4	Ramon Collins	5/9/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
C40	5.5	Ray Collins	5/1/02	<p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p>
C41	5.6	Ray Collins	5/3/02	<p>“D” is for DUMB.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p>
C42	5.7	Mark D. Cook	4/27/02	<p>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.</p>
C72	5.8	Mike and Marcia Novello	4/2/02	<p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C75	5.9	Lawrence and Diane Paige	4/12/02	As a resident of Boulder City, I want to endorse Alternative D.
C88	5.10	S. Louise Reuther	5/9/02	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.
C94	5.11	Michael Sitton	5/5/02	Use Alternative D.
C97	5.12	Suthmm@aol.com	5/6/02	Plan C or B.
C106	5.13	Richard W. and Mary Y. Allesee	3/31/02	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.
C108	5.14	Ronald B. McAlister	4/29/02	Route D is the only route which would protect, preserve, and best serve Boulder City and this beautiful land.
D. COMMENT SHEETS RECEIVED DURING OR AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING				
D1. ACCESSIBILITY, OPERATIONS, AND SAFETY				
D2	1.1	Robert Anaclerio	4/4/02	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.
	1.2			Alternative B solves nothing – heavy congestion – cross traffic – most likely impossible – one fender bender and the whole thing becomes a parking lot.
D3	1.3	Andrea Anderson	4/4/02	I would like to see the highway located south of WAPA.
D5	1.4	Jan Anderson	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because it gets the freeway out of town.
D7	1.5	Cynthia Bandy	4/4/02	Alternative B does the most to disrupt the quality of life for Boulder City citizens and produces the most congestion for the commercial vehicles.
D10	1.6	Karen Bartholomew	4/4/02	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!
D12	1.7	Robert V. Barton	4/4/02	Alternative C gets traffic out of main thoroughfare but leaves it in area presently disturbed with high traffic levels.
D14	1.8	Boris A. Bernstein	4/4/02	An exit should be provided at the Buchanan (future) and the bypass crossing.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D17	1.9	J. M. and C. V. Blackwell	4/4/02	A frontage road and on/off-ramps will be needed at or between Dump Road and extension of Georgia/Buchanan.
D19	1.10	William Blockley	4/4/02	Prefers none of the single alternatives. Keep Alternative A as it is. Add a “truck route” only by passing the city, possibly Alternative D.
D21	1.11	Joe Bowyer	4/4/02	Why do we have to connect to Ensign’s Casino?
D24	1.12	Ken Byler	4/4/02	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.
D25	1.13	Priscilla Calvert	4/4/02	The large number of businesses located along Alternative C would have to relocate due to access issues.
D26	1.14	Grace H. Caporusso	4/4/02	Alternative D is the route to use since it would be a “truck route.” This would limit the truck traffic through town.
	1.15			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.
D27	1.16	Noel Caporusso	4/4/02	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.
D30	1.17	Mr. and Mrs. Fred M. Cheek	4/4/02	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?
D33	1.18	Gary Compton	4/4/02	Alternative B would make travel safer.
	1.19			Alternative D does not solve the traffic problem caused by Boulder City residents.
	1.20			Something needs to be done to make our road (U.S. 93) safer.
D35	1.21	Joyce D. Cook	4/4/02	I prefer Alternative D because it takes the traffic away from town.
D41	1.21	William S. Davis	4/4/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D43	1.22	Ralph and Sara Denton	4/4/02	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.
	1.23			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.
D48	1.24	Ferne Dismuke	4/4/02	<p>Prefers Alternative D because it keeps through traffic, trucks, utility vehicles, and dust out of town.</p> <p>At West Junction, put a huge sign, such as:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> 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 </p>
D50	1.25	Leo Doyle	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative C because it preserves existing traffic flow while improving access to shopping areas from town.
D53	1.26	Johanna Eltrich	4/4/02	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.
D62	1.27	Dolores Gabay	4/4/02	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.
	1.28			Alternative B makes it difficult getting in and out of Lake Mountain Drive.
D65	1.29	Caryn Gifford	4/4/02	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.
D68	1.30	William L. Grant	4/4/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D69	1.31	Manfred and Margot Guenther	4/4/02	The volume of traffic if either Alternative B or C were chosen would be catastrophic for residential areas.
D75	1.32	Harry W. Helfrich	4/4/02	Alternative B would be my last choice. I don't want the traffic on the existing highway coming into town from Las Vegas.
D77	1.33	James Hughes	4/4/02	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.
D79	1.34	C. Jayne	4/4/02	Keep the trucks as far away from the city as possible.
D81	1.35	Edward H. Jensen	4/4/02	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.
D82	1.36	Teresa M. Jensen	4/4/02	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.
D85	1.37	M. Kay	4/4/02	With Alternatives B and C, real concern "fear" regarding increased traffic over years, especially the threat of nuclear waste coming our way – "Stop Yucca"!
D86	1.38	Stephen Kay	4/4/02	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.
	1.39			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.
D87	1.40	L. Kevorkian	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because future expansion (widening, etc.) will be simpler in a less populous area.
D89	1.41	Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Kittleson	4/4/02	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.
D92	1.42	Jane Lasiewicki	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D. It's hard enough now getting out on U.S. 93 if you live on either side of the highway.
	1.43			Prefers Alternatives B and C the least because they will tear apart the town and are dangerous traveling.
D93	1.44	John D. Lasiewicki	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because he has seen more cars in Boulder City since the trucks are not allowed across the Dam.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D95	1.45	Peter Linzmaier	4/4/02	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.
D98	1.46	Jacqueline Lytal	4/4/02	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.
D99	1.47	Norman Lytal	4/4/02	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.
D100	1.48	James R. Markham	4/4/02	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.
D101	1.49	Darryl Martin	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D, as far as possible from town.
D103	1.50	Darrell McGarvey	4/4/02	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.
D104	1.51	Diane McMakim and Roger Legare	4/4/02	Alternatives A and B are poor choices. They will not handle increased traffic.
D107	1.52	Robert Merrell	4/4/02	Alternative D decreases the amount of unwanted truck and through traffic that does not significantly contribute to the community.
	1.53			Alternative D makes the travel for local residents easier in town.
	1.54			Alternative B does not serve the purpose of travel/traffic and safety.
D108	1.55	Scott Meyer	4/4/02	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.
D115	1.56	Marlene Morwick	4/4/02	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???
D119	1.57	Gloria Nelson (Wootten)	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D to keep the trucks out of Boulder City.
D121	1.58	Damon Ohlerking	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because it bypasses the city while making it possible for visitors to access the city and its region.
	1.59			Prefers Alternative B the least because it bisects the city and does it in a very aggressive, noxious manner.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D122	1.60	Charles Oligschlaeger	4/4/02	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.
D125	1.61	Virginia Perkins and Jeff Dalby	4/4/02	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.
D127	1.62	Ronald Perry	4/4/02	Alternative D will decrease traffic through Boulder City.
D130	1.63	Jack and Vanessa Peterson	4/4/02	Alternative D will alleviate the traffic through town.
	1.64			Alternative D will avoid unnecessary bypass traffic at Buchanan.
	1.65			Alternatives B and C will increase traffic problems through Hemenway Valley.
D131	1.66	Linda Lee Peterson	4/4/02	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.
	1.67			Alternatives B and C will destroy the town by dividing it and increase the noise, pollution and endanger residents.
D132	1.68	Ricardo Pontillo	4/4/02	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.
D136	1.69	Barbara Raulston	4/4/02	Alternatives B and C maintain the current traffic patterns the most instead of destroying new desert land south of town.
D137	1.70	Vaughn Reuther	4/4/02	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. 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.
D143	1.71	Dolores Selson	4/4/02	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.
D144	1.72	Harold Selson	4/4/02	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.
	1.73			Alternative B would bring traffic congestion through town.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D146	1.74	Tracy Strickland	4/4/02	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.
	1.75			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.
D156	1.76	Bob Triolo	4/4/02	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.
D157	1.77	Pamela Triolo	4/4/02	A small town should not have to deal with freeway exits to facilitate trucks traveling from Mexico to Canada. We shouldn't be sacrificed.
D160	1.78	Carl Trygstad	4/4/02	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.
	1.79			Prefers Alternatives B and C the least. The access in and out of my neighborhood is absurd and totally ridiculous.
D161	1.80	Steve Tuggle	4/4/02	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.
	1.81			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.
	1.82			The infrastructure in Boulder City cannot continue to handle increased traffic flows.
	1.83			The southern bypass option is the correct choice for 2003 and on into 2010, 2020, and 2030.
D162	1.84	Joseph P. Wagner	4/4/02	Alternative B will probably have less long grades.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D164	1.85	Mrs. Billie Waymire	4/4/02	We can't have the trucks and heavy traffic through town. It is very unsafe for us to go to town now.
D167	1.86	Virginia Wines	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because it does not make sense to keep running all the trucks and traffic through the center of town.
D168	1.87	Maudie Wohlbrandt	4/4/02	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!
	1.88			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.
D171	1.89	Lettie Zimmerman	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D, although access for emergency vehicles needs to be addressed.
	1.90			I don't believe Alternative B will solve congestion. It will add pollution and will split the town.
D174	1.91	Mary Hinson	5/10/02	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.
D175	1.92	Rebecca L. Mahaney	5/13/02	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?
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.
D8	2.6	Gayle Barnes	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D – less traffic in Boulder City – less noise – keeps city as a small town.
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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D10	2.8	Karen Bartholomew	4/4/02	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!
D11	2.9	Judith A. Barton	4/4/02	Alternative C disturbs the least amount of desert.
D12	2.10	Robert V. Barton	4/4/02	Alternative D goes through presently undisturbed area bringing high noise levels to a side of Boulder City presently without these high noise levels.
D13	2.11	Kenneth L. Bell	4/4/02	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.
D14	2.12	Boris A. Bernstein	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D. It will take traffic and noise out of the residential area.
D15	2.13	Robert Bickel	4/4/02	Alternative D has less noise, less pollution, less traffic through Boulder City.
D16	2.14	Charlene Blackwell	4/4/02	Alternative B is the least preferred – too much truck traffic through town and residential areas, noise pollution, smog pollution.
D18	2.15	Marge Blockley	4/4/02	Alternatives B, C, and D adversely affects someone – or the environment/LMNRA – and is lots more costly.
D20	2.16	Delwin D. and Eloise Blue	4/4/02	Alternative D is the only acceptable proposal. Alternatives B and C would only tear up the town for 3 or 4 years.
D25	2.17	Priscilla Calvert	4/4/02	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).
	2.18			Many of our senior and retired residents live along the Alternative C route. The traffic noise and pollution would be horrible!
D27	2.19	Noel Caporusso	4/4/02	Future trucks carrying radioactive waste to Yucca Mountain. Highways are unattractive. Views of Lake Mead will be obstructed with Alternative C.
	2.20			Boulder City does not need the noise and dirt pollution with the major construction of Alternative C.
	2.21			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.
	2.22			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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D28	2.23	Ken and Suzanne Carpenter	4/4/02	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.
D30	2.24	Mr. and Mrs. Fred M. Cheek	4/4/02	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.
D31	2.25	Beatrice Clark	4/4/02	Alternative D is the least disruptive of present residents. More quiet city environment. Less city pollution. Few trucks in local traffic.
	2.26			Sound barriers would destroy neighborliness and small-town atmosphere. Consider the inputs of residents seriously – not just window dressing.
D33	2.27	Gary Compton	4/4/02	Alternative B is the least environmentally damaging.
D34	2.28	Diane Conrad	4/4/02	Prefers Alternatives A and D because I want things to stay the same.
	2.29			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.
D36	2.30	Donald K. Cooper	4/4/02	Should be able to build Alternative B with the least disturbance to the environment.
D37	2.31	Curtis Cornelius	4/4/02	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
D38	2.32	Ray Crooks	4/4/02	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.
D42	2.33	Andrew Davlin, Jr.	4/4/02	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.
D43	2.34	Ralph and Sara Denton	4/4/02	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.
	2.35			The two most valuable considerations, air quality and noise, are by far improved with Alternative D. If 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?

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D44	2.36	Roxanne Dey	4/4/02	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.
D46	2.37	Aileen Dike	4/4/02	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.
	2.38			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.
D47	2.39	Fred and Joyce DiManno	4/4/02	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.
	2.40			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.
D49	2.41	Angela Doyle	4/4/02	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.
D51	2.42	Robert Draney	4/4/02	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.
D54	2.43	Frank E. Ensign	4/4/02	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.
	2.44			Alternative C would be equivalent to building a freeway through the middle of Zion National Park.
D55	2.45	Don and LaVonne Estes	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D. This is the only route that leaves some semblance of the essence of Boulder City.
D57	2.46	Meg Fair	4/4/02	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.
	2.47			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.
D58	2.48	Rod Fair	4/4/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D59	2.49	Bob Faiss	4/4/02	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.
	2.50			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.
D61	2.51	James Froseth	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because there would be improved air, reduced congestion, and improved safety in Boulder City for pedestrians and bikers.
D62	2.52	Dolores Gabay	4/4/02	I am sure the decision has already been made and you are not listening to the people who will be affected.
D64	2.53	Mark Garrity	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D – sound – light – safety – view of the surroundings.
	2.54			We need bike paths irrespective of route.
D67	2.55	Linda Goodman	4/4/02	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.
D68	2.56	William L. Grant	4/4/02	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.
	2.57			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 & 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.
D69	2.58	Manfred and Margot Guenther	4/4/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D71	2.59	Albert K. Hamel	4/4/02	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.
	2.60			Alternative B may be cheaper, but will end up looking like I-215 and I-515 in Henderson.
D75	2.61	Harry W. Helfrich	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
D76	2.62	Barbara Hughes	4/4/02	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.
D77	2.63	James Hughes	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because it should cause the businesses in Boulder City less problems, including relocating.
D78	2.64	Ken Isaacson	4/4/02	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.
	2.65			Alternatives B and C would ruin our city, and the noise and air pollution would be unbearable.
D80	2.66	Cameron Jayne	4/4/02	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.
D84	2.67	Curtis D. Karr	4/4/02	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.
D85	2.68	M. Kay	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D. I live in L.M.E. and am concerned regarding present “living” environment – wish to maintain it. See this route as least invasive to populated areas.
	2.69			Prefers Alternatives B and C the least, especially Alternative C, because of noise, traffic, unsightly (although necessary) sound barriers.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D87	2.70	L. Kevorkian	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D. The impact on desert animals and plants will be felt, but not ruinous.
	2.71			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.
D88	2.72	Len Kevorkian	4/4/02	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.
	2.73			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.
D89	2.74	Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Kittleston	4/4/02	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.
D90	2.75	Karen W. Lampus	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because there is less traffic through Boulder City. Less noise – less smog – safer roads.
D91	2.76	Marie Langer	4/4/02	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.
D95	2.77	Peter Linzmaier	4/4/02	Alternatives B and C are not practical. It would disrupt the peaceful living now enjoyed by Boulder City residents.
D96	2.78	Antoinette Luisi	4/4/02	Prefers Alternatives B and C the least. I don't want noise level up and property value down.
D97	2.79	Paul Luisi	4/4/02	Noise levels would increase with Alternatives B and C.
D98	2.80	Jacqueline Lytal	4/4/02	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.
D101	2.81	Darryl Martin	4/4/02	Alternative B would have too much of an increase in noise, pollution, and traffic.
D102	2.82	Nina and John McDonald	4/4/02	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.
D104	2.83	Diane McMakim and Roger Legare	4/4/02	Alternative D has the least impact to existing structures, nature of town.
D105	2.84	R. F. Merino	4/4/02	Alternative D eliminates at least 50 percent of noise from traffic through Hemenway Valley to and from Arizona.
	2.85			Prefers Alternatives B and C the least because both will be longer, dirtier, and noisier during construction.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D106	2.86	Lori Merrell	4/4/02	Alternative D would be the best option for noise reduction. This is the route chosen by the Chamber of Commerce.
D107	2.87	Robert Merrell	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because it preserves the quiet, small-town community that he moved here for.
	2.88			Alternative D decreases noise and light pollution.
	2.89			Alternatives B and C disrupt our small community with sound walls.
	2.90			Alternative C scars beautiful Red Mountain and cuts through Red Mountain golf course (hurting this tourist destination).
	2.91			The environmental impact on the people who live in this city would be irreparably damaged by Alternatives B and C.
D110	2.92	Byron L. Miller	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because it keeps truck and through traffic out of populated areas. Reduces noise and emissions.
	2.93			Alternatives A, B, and C continue to bring truck and through traffic through residential and congested area. Increased traffic hazard noise and pollution.
D111	2.94	Milan R. Mlarar	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because this is a quiet bedroom community that would like to stay that way.
	2.95			Alternative B is not realistic. All drawings viewed at EIS meeting appear not to scale through Hemenway Valley.
D112	2.96	Linda Mooney	4/4/02	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?
D113	2.97	Barbara J. Morris	4/4/02	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.
	2.98			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.
D114	2.99	Ken Morris	4/4/02	Any alternative along the existing U.S. 93 is not acceptable from a noise, pollution, and aesthetic reasons.
D116	2.100	Robert Morwiek	4/4/02	Boulder City is a beautiful, peaceful town. Any alignment other than Alternative D will only change it forever.
	2.101			Prefers Alternative B the least because it will cause unhealthy emissions in Boulder City plus unhealthy noise levels.
D118	2.102	Robert Musick	4/4/02	Alternative D will not disrupt our quiet lifestyle. It keeps trucks out of our city streets.
	2.103			Alternative B only creates more noise, traffic, and pollution in town.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D120	2.103	Bill and Betty Nickell	4/4/02	Alternatives B and C are unacceptable. They would ruin our view, lifestyle forever.
D123	2.104	Donald and Deonne Oliver	4/4/02	I think NDOT engineers have done a good job showing the proposed routes along with the visual topographic drawings.
D124	2.105	Jim Paxinos	4/4/02	Alternative D overall seems to have the least impact on the present lifestyle for Boulder City residents.
	2.106			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.
D125	2.107	Virginia Perkins and Jeff Dalby	4/4/02	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.
	2.108			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.
D126	2.109	Barbara Perry	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because it eliminates traffic and noise through Boulder City.
D127	2.110	Ronald Perry	4/4/02	Alternative D would decrease noise levels.
	2.111			Prefers Alternative B the least. Against rising noise and traffic levels in Boulder City.
D128	2.112	Mildred Petersen	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative A because of air quality, safety, and noise levels. Prefers Alternative C the least because of noise levels, air quality, and safety.
D130	2.113	Jack and Vanessa Peterson	4/4/02	Alternative D will achieve and maintain a quaint Boulder City environment. It will protect accidental spillage making its way to Lake Mead.
	2.114			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
D132	2.115	Ricardo Pontillo	4/4/02	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.
	2.116			The northern alternative has the least potential impact.
D133	2.117	Beverli G. Powell and Jack F. Powell	4/4/02	Alternative D has less disruption for the city. Imagine nuclear waste coming right through town!
	2.118			Alternative B divides the city – would be terrible for residents on either side!

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D134	2.119	Jack F. Powell	4/4/02	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.
D136	2.120	Barbara Raulston	4/4/02	Prefers Alternatives B or C because land is already developed.
	2.121			Prefers Alternative D the least. Why ruin more desert around Boulder City in order to avoid improving an already existing route?
	2.122			Homeowners on the south side of town use that area for recreation. Alternative D would take that away.
	2.123			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.
	2.124			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.
	2.125			Why is there no mitigation required for the increased noise in LMNRA?
	2.126			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.
D139	2.127	Steven Riley	4/4/02	Alternative D would go around the town reducing the traffic in congested areas and reduce the sound.
	2.128			Alternative C would be right next to town increasing noise and traffic in town.
	2.129			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.
D143	2.130	Dolores Selson	4/4/02	Alternative D would have no noise during construction and no sound walls would be needed.
	2.131			Alternative D would have a view of the lake. Tourists stop to take pictures from U.S. 93.
	2.132			Area for Alternative D is not usable for homes or business due to transmission lines.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D144	2.133	Harold Selson	4/4/02	Alternative D would have no noise during construction and no sound walls would be needed.
	2.134			Alternative D would have a view of the lake. Tourists stop to take pictures from U.S. 93.
	2.135			Area for Alternative D is not usable for homes or business due to transmission lines.
D147	2.136	Ann Struve	4/4/02	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.
D150	2.137	Terra Vista, LP	4/4/02	Alternative B would be least preferred. It would create more traffic, noise, and pollution in our own backyard.
D151	2.138	Mary Jane Therrien	4/4/02	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.
	2.139			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.
D152	2.140	Russ Thompson	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because it reduces truck traffic through Boulder City – less noise and air quality problems.
D153	2.141	Sue Thompson	4/4/02	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.
D154	2.142	Gladys C. Towles	4/4/02	Alternative D is too close to Georgia Avenue. Noise will be too much.
D155	2.143	Robert Towles	4/4/02	Alternative D will be in fill as it crosses Buchanan, thus more noise, fumes, etc. The prevailing winds are from the south.
D157	2.144	Pamela Triolo	4/4/02	Alternative D is the one I prefer. It will leave our town intact.
	2.145			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.
D158	2.146	Julie Troiola	4/4/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D159	2.147	Arlene Troup	4/4/02	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.
D160	2.148	Carl Trygstad	4/4/02	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.
	2.149			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.
D162	2.150	Joseph P. Wagner	4/4/02	Alternative B will disturb much less acres of land. It will use less Boulder City land.
	2.151			With Alternative B, there should be less exhaust pollutants in Boulder City.
D163	2.152	Edward L. Waymire	4/4/02	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.
	2.153			Prefers Alternative C the least because we do not want this traffic through our city – noise – dust – destroying our homes – our way of life.
D164	2.154	Mrs. Billie Waymire	4/4/02	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.
	2.155			Alternative C is the least acceptable as it destroys Hemenway Valley and the beautiful Lake Mead we all love.
D165	2.156	Molly A. Weaver	4/4/02	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.
D169	2.157	John Zerfoss	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative B because base roadway is there now.
	2.158			Prefers Alternative D the least because we open new ground up. Let's not impact the land more than we have to.
D172	2.159	Jerome and Karen Zuniga	4/4/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D174	2.160	Mary Hinson	5/10/02	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.
	2.161			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.
	2.162			Alternative D would totally destroy the view and soundscapes that exist in the desert right now.
D175	2.163	Rebecca L. Mahaney	5/13/02	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.
D177	2.164	Leslie Paige	5/10/02	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.
	2.165			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.
D3. IMPLEMENTATION AND CONSTRUCTION				
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.
	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D29	3.6	Chuck Cascioppo	4/4/02	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.
D35	3.7	Joyce D. Cook	4/4/02	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.
D36	3.8	Donald K. Cooper	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative B because it is the cheapest and will serve the purpose.
D38	3.9	Ray Crooks	4/4/02	Alternative C is no good for Boulder City. The expense would be prohibitive.
D45	3.10	Matt Di Teresa	4/4/02	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.
	3.11			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.
D54	3.12	Frank E. Ensign	4/4/02	Alternatives B and C will destroy Boulder City.
	3.13			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.
D57	3.14	Meg Fair	4/4/02	Alternative D was the route voted on by the citizens of Boulder City as our advisory issue several years ago.
	3.15			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.
D63	3.16	Hans A. Ganz	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D. It is faster for traffic, quieter for neighborhood, and easier to build outside established residential areas.
D68	3.17	William L. Grant	4/4/02	Alternative D would need to be asphalt, not concrete, to cut down on noise.
D72	3.18	Jan Hansen	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative B – lowest cost, least amount of impact on business and loss of quality of life in Boulder City.
	3.19			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.
D75	3.20	Harry W. Helfrich	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative C. I believe that the cost of Alternative D is prohibitive.
D76	3.21	Barbara Hughes	4/4/02	If you selected Alternative B and expansion is needed in the future, where would you go?

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D77	3.22	James Hughes	4/4/02	I hope they haven't already made up their minds as I have heard.
D78	3.23	Ken Isaacson	4/4/02	Neither Alternative B nor C provide for future expansion without destroying more of our city.
D84	3.24	Curtis D. Karr	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative C. It will be the shortest route to the present route of U.S. 93 through Boulder City.
D94	3.25	James H. Lemon	4/4/02	Alternative D will cost too much money. Keep it on U.S. 93 through town.
D105	3.26	R. F. Merino	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D. It is cleaner during the construction period. It avoids years of construction through and in downtown Boulder City.
D108	3.27	Scott Meyer	4/4/02	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.
D111	3.28	Milan R. Mlarar	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because it is less cost overall when considering keeping existing roads open during construction.
D112	3.29	Linda Mooney	4/4/02	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 dug their feet for 40 years to increase the cost.
D130	3.30	Jack and Vanessa Peterson	4/4/02	Alternative D allows for further expansion, if necessary, in the future.
D134	3.31	Jack F. Powell	4/4/02	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?
D135	3.32	Alfred A. Radosta	4/4/02	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.
D136	3.33	Barbara Raulston	4/4/02	Alternatives B and C are the least expensive routes.
	3.34			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!
D148	3.35	David S. Struve	4/4/02	Alternative D has the least impact on homes.
D155	3.36	Robert Towles	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative C because it costs less. There is already a highway existing. Those that have built there were aware of the situation.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	3.37			Prefers Alternative D the least due to being too close to Georgia Avenue.
D156	3.38	Bob Triolo	4/4/02	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.
D157	3.39	Pamela Triolo	4/4/02	If Alternative B or C come to pass, Hemenway Valley might as well just be annexed by Henderson.
D164	3.40	Mrs. Billie Waymire	4/4/02	Alternative B or C would be horrible while constructing and also when completed.
D173	3.41	John D. Bayer	5/10/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>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.</p>
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	<p>From your choices, I choose Alternative C, the new through-town alignment. It is less costly but pulls truck traffic off our main street.</p> <p>Alternative D is too costly.</p>
	3.44			<p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D176	3.45	Michael L. Mahaney	5/13/02	Prefers Alternatives B or C for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is less expensive than Alternative D. • It impacts less property than Alternative D. • It will take less time to build. • 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.
	3.46			I least prefer Alternative D for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It costs more than \$100 million above B or C. • It impacts far more property than B or C • It impacts more residents than B/C since U.S. 93 has always been near Alternative B or C. • It will take some business away from Boulder City. • It will take more time to build. • It will be more costly to maintain.
	3.47			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.
	3.48			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.
	3.49			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!
D177	3.50	Leslie Paige	5/10/02	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.
D4. SOCIO-ECONOMICS				
D1	4.1	Paul Adams	4/4/02	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.
D5	4.2	Jan Anderson	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because few businesses will be impacted.
D11	4.3	Judith A. Barton	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative C because it is still close enough to town for visitors without traffic problems through town.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D21	4.4	Joe Bowyer	4/4/02	Alternatives A, B, and C will not be good for the people of Boulder City. They will ruin the businesses in Boulder City.
D22	4.5	Gene Breeden	4/4/02	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.
	4.6			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.
D26	4.7	Grace H. Caporusso	4/4/02	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.
	4.8			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.
D27	4.9	Noel Caporusso	4/4/02	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.
	4.10			Property values will downslide on either side of Alternative C.
	4.11			Who would buy a house close to or overlooking a multilane highway, bridges, and sound barriers?
D29	4.12	Chuck Cascioppo	4/4/02	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.
	4.13			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.
D30	4.14	Mr. and Mrs. Fred M. Cheek	4/4/02	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.
D33	4.15	Gary Compton	4/4/02	Alternative C would divert business from the business community.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D34	4.16	Diane Conrad	4/4/02	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.
	4.17			Alternative B is the least preferred in my opinion. I don't want traffic in front of my business with a six-lane highway to cross. My clients have a hard enough time turning now.
D36	4.18	Donald K. Cooper	4/4/02	Alternative B will help Boulder City business.
	4.19			Boulder City will dry up and blow away with Alternative D.
D40	4.20	Art Davie	4/4/02	Alternative D serves the residents of Boulder City best.
D46	4.21	Aileen Dike	4/4/02	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.
D47	4.22	Fred and Joyce DiManno	4/4/02	Either Alternative B or C will have a negative impact on the value of our home, as well as our neighbors'.
D49	4.23	Angela Doyle	4/4/02	If you build a new road, I believe that it will take business away from downtown.
D55	4.24	Don and LaVonne Estes	4/4/02	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.
D59	4.25	Bob Faiss	4/4/02	Route D is the only one that ensures the preservation of St. Jude's Ranch for children.
D66	4.26	Jeff Gifford	4/4/02	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.
D67	4.27	Linda Goodman	4/4/02	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.
D73	4.28	Dennis Hanson	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because of Alternative B and C impacts on Boulder City and Hemenway Valley, and the loss of value to properties.
D84	4.29	Curtis D. Karr	4/4/02	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.
	4.30			Local business will be used less along the route every continual year of the useful life years of the highway with Alternative B.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D86	4.31	Stephen Kay	4/4/02	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.
D87	4.32	L. Kevorkian	4/4/02	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.
	4.33			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.
D88	4.34	Len Kevorkian	4/4/02	Any tourism going to the Dam or Boulder City will still continue to come through town.
	4.35			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.
D92	4.36	Jane Lasiewicki	4/4/02	With Alternatives B or C, property values will decline. It will hurt businesses because of so much traffic.
D93	4.37	John D. Lasiewicki	4/4/02	Prefers Alternatives B and C the least because these routes affect Boulder City business. The trucks do not shop in Boulder City.
D95	4.38	Peter Linzmaier	4/4/02	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.
D96	4.39	Antoinette Luisi	4/4/02	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.
D98	4.40	Jacqueline Lytal	4/4/02	Alternatives B and C will ruin the business on the main street. Property values will fall and people will move.
D99	4.41	Norman Lytal	4/4/02	Feels that Alternatives B and C will cause lower property values.
D102	4.42	Nina and John McDonald	4/4/02	Alternative C would directly impact our family, as it would mean the new route would cross only 300 feet from our property line.
D106	4.43	Lori Merrell	4/4/02	Alternative D would pose the least disruption to our small town.
	4.44			Alternative B would greatly affect the poor businesses during the 5 years of construction.
	4.45			To live in this town because of the "small town" atmosphere, anything but Alternative D will ruin our town.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D107	4.46	Robert Merrell	4/4/02	Alternative D results in the least amount of disruption of local business during construction.
D112	4.47	Linda Mooney	4/4/02	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.
D113	4.48	Barbara J. Morris	4/4/02	With Alternative B or C, people will move from Boulder City, and the businesses will then really suffer.
D116	4.49	Robert Morwiek	4/4/02	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.
D123	4.50	Donald and DeOnne Oliver	4/4/02	Alternatives B and C both would destroy too many property owners' home and land values.
D129	4.51	C. E. Peterson	4/4/02	Alternative D will least destroy the lifestyle of Boulder City. It will enhance the tourist experience in Boulder City.
	4.52			Alternatives B and C will not only split Boulder City, but a lot of local businesses will not survive the construction period.
D136	4.53	Barbara Raulston	4/4/02	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.
D143	4.54	Dolores Selson	4/4/02	With Alternative D, there would be no drop in property values. Boulder City would not be just another freeway town.
D144	4.55	Harold Selson	4/4/02	With Alternative D, there would be no drop in property values. Boulder City would not be just another freeway town.
D146	4.56	Tracy Strickland	4/4/02	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.
D148	4.57	David S. Struve	4/4/02	Alternative B cuts the heart out of this great city! Please do not send the trucks through our town.
	4.58			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.
D149	4.59	M. Swanson	4/4/02	Alternative D impacts fewer residents. Alternative B impacts people and businesses.
D156	4.60	Bob Triolo	4/4/02	I really would consider selling my house and leave Boulder City if the truck traffic is not diverted from the city.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D157	4.61	Pamela Triolo	4/4/02	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.
	4.62			I would consider moving if any alternative other than Alternative D is chosen. I am sorry for any business that will be hurt, but when businesses are only open limited hours and not open on weekends, their needs should not get first consideration.
D158	4.63	Julia Troiola	4/4/02	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!
D160	4.64	Carl Trygstad	4/4/02	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.
D161	4.65	Steve Tuggle	4/4/02	Out-of-town traffic that is interested in visiting Boulder City will make the effort to drive into town and conduct their business.
D162	4.66	Joseph P. Wagner	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative B – it's the shortest route. It will keep local businesses in business.
	4.67			Alternative B will save time and fuel for all travelers.
	4.68			The people that live along Highway 93 knew that was an important highway when they bought their property.
D163	4.69	Edward L. Waymire	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative C the least. People that use Lake Mead – motels – cafes – will still come here.
D164	4.70	Mrs. Billie Waymire	4/4/02	The business will still come to town (Boulder City) if they so choose, no matter what.
D171	4.71	Lettie Zimmerman	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D. A portion of non-city land could be developed for/by casinos along the bypass.
D172	4.72	Jerome and Karen Zuniga	4/4/02	The tourists will still visit our town and spend money here, as always, and the local businesses will not suffer with Alternative D.
D175	4.73	Rebecca L. Mahaney	5/13/02	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.
D5. OTHER				
D6	5.1	Robert Ashley	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative A the least. Existing conditions are intolerable.
D11	5.2	Judith A. Barton	4/4/02	Alternative D has too many problems involved.
D15	5.3	Robert Bickel	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative C the least because it is closest to my home.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D16	5.4	Charlene Blackwell	4/4/02	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.
D21	5.5	Joe Bowyer	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because it will affect less people.
D23	5.6	Richard W. Brown	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D.
D28	5.7	Ken and Suzanne Carpenter	4/4/02	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.
D32	5.8	Robert C. Clark	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative C the least.
D41	5.9	William S. Davis	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative C the least. Why disrupt the old part of town? It would cause many problems.
D44	5.10	Roxanne Dey	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D.
D51	5.11	Robert Draney	4/4/02	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.
D54	5.12	Frank E. Ensign	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because it has less impact to Boulder City.
D60	5.13	Bob Ferraro	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D.
D65	5.14	Caryn Gifford	4/4/02	Alternatives B and C would completely ruin Boulder City.
D66	5.15	Jeff Gifford	4/4/02	Alternative D will have the least impact on Boulder City.
D70	5.16	Larelta O. Hallfauson	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D.
D74	5.17	Daniel Hearn	4/4/02	Alternative D has the least impact on the community.
D97	5.18	Paul Luisi	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D. The project needs to be invisible to the city of Boulder City. Transportation of nuclear waste.
D99	5.19	Norman Lytal	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D.
D102	5.20	Nina and John McDonald	4/4/02	Alternative D seems the most logical alternative in terms of impact to Boulder City residents.
D109	5.21	Billie Miller	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D. It will be the least offensive to everyone.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D123	5.22	Donald and DeOnne Oliver	4/4/02	Alternative D would cause the least impact (adverse) to Boulder City.
D135	5.23	Alfred A. Radosta	4/4/02	Prefers Alternatives A, B, and C the least. They will destroy our way of life in Boulder City.
D138	5.24	Martin S. Rihel	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D because it is the furthest from town.
D140	5.25	Linda Schrick	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative A.
D141	5.26	Barbara and Ron Schuster	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D.
D142	5.27	Gene Segerblom	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D.
D145	5.28	Georgia Sigundson	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative D.
D150	5.29	Terra Vista, LP	4/4/02	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.
D154	5.30	Gladys C. Towles	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative C.
D170	5.31	John Zerfoss	4/4/02	More hearings – at least two.
D84	5.32	Curtis D. Karr	4/4/02	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.
D89	5.33	Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Kittleson	4/4/02	Too bad that the “environmentalists” teamsters, truck lobbyists, and gaming interests “scrapped” your original truck route south of town near Nelson and Willow Beach. It would have worked too!

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E. PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPTS				
E1. ACCESSIBILITY, OPERATIONS, AND SAFETY				
E1	1.1	Caryn Gifford	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
E2	1.2	Robert J. Hartman	4/4/02	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.
	1.3			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.
E3	1.4	Joanna Ettrich	4/4/02	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.
E5	1.5	Tracy Strickland	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	1.6			Dr. Hardy, who is a council member, indicated that on September 26 th 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.
E6	1.7	Virginia Perkins	4/4/02	I think that putting any highway in at this time is a security risk to us.
	1.8			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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E8	1.9	David Hatcher	4/4/02	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.
E10	1.10	David and Shirley Buck	4/4/02	I would go along with the alternative that puts most of the traffic outside of the city.
E13	1.11	Ken Isaacson	4/4/02	We are absolutely opposed to heavy truck traffic going through or near Boulder City.
E19	1.12	Steve Tuggle	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
E20	1.13	Emil Morneault	4/4/02	<p>My vote is for Alternative B, and the reasons are for business aspects, least impact on business aspects, least cost, and least environmental impact.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I'm against Alternative D because of the cost, environmental impact, and noise, and as I live on Georgia Avenue.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E21	1.14	Sharon Lazar	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
E22	1.15	Sandra Reuther	4/4/02	<p>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.</p>
E24	1.16	George Cox	4/4/02	<p>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.</p>
E25	1.17	Gary Compton	4/4/02	<p>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.</p>
E27	1.18	Charlene Blackwell	4/4/02	<p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E31	1.19	Tracy and Linda Strickland	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	1.20			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	1.21			<p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E2. ENVIRONMENTAL				
E2	2.1	Robert J. Hartman	4/4/02	Alternative B is unacceptable because of the disruption of the quality of life in the Hemenway Valley.
	2.2			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.
	2.3			Alternative D would have the least negative impact on the city and its residents.
E3	2.4	Joanna Ettrich	4/4/02	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.
E4	2.5	Beverli Powell for Jack Powell and Barbara and Ron Schuster	4/4/02	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.
E5	2.6	Tracy Strickland	4/4/02	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. According to a statement made by Tom Greco back September 26 th 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.
	2.7			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.
E6	2.8	Virginia Perkins	4/4/02	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. 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.
	2.9			Any highway is going to impact wildlife. Alternative D will impact archaeological digs. It will impact Lake Mead National Recreational area.
E7	2.10	Linda Strickland	4/4/02	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 Alternative D.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E8	2.11	David Hatcher	4/4/02	The noise that truck driving makes when it goes up and down that hill is rather tremendous.
E9	2.12	Chuck Cascioppo	4/4/02	Alternative C would ruin the user-friendly part of the lake drive going down to the lake.
	2.13			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. The only thing you're going to obstruct is the dump, the horse corrals, the airport, and the sewer ponds. 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.
E11	2.14	Leo Doyle	4/4/02	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.
E12	2.15	Loretta C. Halldarson	4/4/02	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.
E13	2.16	Ken Isaacson	4/4/02	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.
E14	2.17	Mary Jane Therrien	4/4/02	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.
E15	2.18	Steve Prisem	4/4/02	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.
E19	2.19	Steve Tuggle	4/4/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E21	2.20	Sharon Lazar	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
E24	2.21	George Cox	4/4/02	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.
	2.22			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.
E25	2.23	Gary Compton	4/4/02	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.
	2.24			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.
	2.25			<p>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.</p> <p>I understand that it may be within federal decibel levels, so is my Dodge diesel truck, and my neighbors don't care for that.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E27	2.26	Charlene Blackwell	4/4/02	<p>Alternative A is inappropriate, too heavy traffic volume and increasing.</p> <p>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.</p>
E29	2.27	Pam Adams	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	2.28			<p>I think in my initial scanning of the EIS, long-term land use planning has not been considered, nor the reasonably foreseeable impacts that will occur if the open land is developed in Alternative D.</p>
E30	2.29	Dave and Ann Strue	4/4/02	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.
E32	2.30	Tracy Strickland	4/4/02	<p>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 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.</p> <p>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.)</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.31			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
E33	2.32	Tracy and Linda Strickland	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	2.33			<p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E34	2.34	Tracy Strickland	4/4/02	<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>
E3. IMPLEMENTATION AND CONSTRUCTION				
E5	3.1	Tracy Strickland	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	3.2			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	3.3			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E7	3.4	Linda Strickland	4/4/02	There is an appearance of bias on behalf of NDOT and those that have prepared the preliminary DEIS report.
E9	3.5	Chuck Cascioppo	4/4/02	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.
	3.6			With Alternative C, the congestion that would cause to build all the overpasses and underpasses would delay the project even more.
E10	3.7	David and Shirley Buck	4/4/02	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.
	3.8			Let's pick the cheapest route and get it done.
E22	3.9	Sandra Reuther	4/4/02	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.
E23	3.10	Beth Murray	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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 them have that choice again.</p>
E25	3.11	Gary Compton	4/4/02	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.
E26	3.12	James Blackwell	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E28	3.13	Bob Broadbent	4/4/02	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.
	3.14			<p>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.</p> <p>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 area 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.</p> <p>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.</p>
E32	3.15	Tracy Strickland	4/4/02	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 "Coalition", 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 26 th 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.
E33	3.16	Tracy and Linda Strickland	4/4/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E4. SOCIO-ECONOMICS				
E4	4.1	Beverli Powell for Jack Powell and Barbara and Ron Schuster	4/4/02	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.
E5	4.2	Tracy Strickland	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>So, consequently, the economy would be affected at least by the ten largest retailers in town and employers.</p> <p>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.</p>
E7	4.3	Linda Strickland	4/4/02	<p>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 & 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	4.4			<p>Economic impacts are being downplayed with respect to the impacts from Alternative D.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>That is not reflected as an impact from Alternative D in this document – Environmental Considerations to Existing U.S. 93 Through Boulder City. Instead, all that is indicated is that there will be an impact from decreased Boulder City traffic volumes.</p>
E8	4.5	David Hatcher	4/4/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E9	4.6	Chuck Cascioppo	4/4/02	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.
E10	4.7	David and Shirley Buck	4/4/02	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.
E11	4.8	Leo Doyle	4/4/02	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.
E15	4.9	Steve Prisem	4/4/02	If they use the southern route and the bridge, that will cause development at the first off-ramp that goes to this town.
E16	4.10	Rob and Gretchen Steenson	4/4/02	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.
E18	4.11	Barbara Morris	4/4/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E29	4.12	Pam Adams	4/4/02	Boulder City should choose to keep this new development in already developed areas, so I prefer Alternative C and not D.
E33	4.13	Tracy and Linda Strickland	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E34	4.14	Tracy Strickland	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
E5. OTHER				
E17	5.1	Ken Byler	4/4/02	<p>I think this whole process, particularly this hearing tonight, is a mockerian exercise to make us think that we’re going to have a voice in what NDOT and the federal government does.</p> <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E32	5.2	Tracy Strickland	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Exposing this often-repeated proposition to the bright Nevada sun illustrates how this contention is baseless and misleading.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
F. COMMENTS RECEIVED BEFORE DEIS RELEASE				
F1. ACCESSIBILITY, OPERATIONS, AND SAFETY				
F6	1.1	Alfred A. and Norma R. Radosta	1/20/00	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	1.2			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."
F2. ENVIRONMENTAL				
F1	2.1	David R. Michel Steven Spearman Clifton A. Williams, Jr. Michael W. Brueske William D. Sorensen Dolores McNamara Stanley R. Willis George Ann Watson Tom Hawks Jonathan E. Bensinger Marge & John Wierdson	12/28/01 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	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.
F4	2.2	Robert Jones	11/29/01	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 & 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.
F6	2.3	Alfred A. and Norma R. Radosta	1/20/00	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.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
	2.4			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].
	2.5			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.
F4. SOCIO-ECONOMICS				
F1	4.1	David R. Michel Steven Spearman Clifton A. Williams, Jr. Michael W. Bruest William D. Sorensen Dolores McNamara Stanley R. Willis George Ann Watson Tom Hawks Jonathan E. Bensinger Marge & John Wierdson	12/28/01 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	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.
F2	4.2	James C. Douglass	11/29/01	I have been informed that Alternative D will result in the closure of the shooting range that the Boulder Rifle & Pistol Club currently runs in Boulder City. I consider this a bad idea for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 & Pistol Club and the National Rifle Association to conduct safety and shooting courses open to the public.

TABLE 2-1-2
Summary of Comments

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
F3	4.3	Harry W. Helfrich	12/10/01	<p>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 DEIS and is referred to as the Southern Bypass, would cause the Boulder Rifle & 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.</p> <p>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.</p>
F6	4.4	Alfred A. and Norma R. Radosta	1/20/00	Property Values: Noise levels, local access problem, traffic flow, and speed limits would lower property values [if truck traffic is not routed out and around Boulder City].
	4.5			Social and Economic Considerations: Rerouting truck traffic away from Hoover Dam will enhance an inflow of tourist traffic. This will stimulate local business. Nonlocal truckers contribute little to the economic base of Boulder City.

TABLE 2-1-3

Comments that do not Apply to this Project

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
A. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES				
A1	6.1	State of Nevada Department of Cultural Affairs, Division of Museums and History, Nevada State Railroad Museum/Boulder City	4/9/02	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.
C. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS				
C4	6.1	Hal Berghel	5/2/02	<p>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."</p> <p>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.</p>
C6	6.2	Richard J. Bravo	5/9/02	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.
C7	6.3	Michael W. Brueske	4/10/02	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?

TABLE 2-1-3

Comments that do not Apply to this Project

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C14	6.4	Joe Cain for Norm Greene	4/8/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
C15	6.5	Joe Cain for Bill Ferrence	4/12/02	Prefers using U.S. 95 south through Laughlin.
C16	6.6	Joe Cain for Roxanne Dey	4/12/02	Prefers a Laughlin bypass.
C37	6.7	Nicola Collins	5/10/02	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.
C56	6.8	Alfred L. Hartig	4/4/02	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.
C57	6.9	Daniel W. Hearn	4/14/02	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.
C60	6.10	Ken and Elberta Isaacson	4/5/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-3

Comments that do not Apply to this Project

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C63	6.11	Carl L. Lodjic and Frances Virginia Lodjic	No date	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
C87	6.12	Sandra Reuther	3/29/02	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.
C89	6.13	Martin S. Rihel	4/12/02	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.
C90	6.14	Sandie Rock	4/4/02	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 "only" son, and now since the September 11 th 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 "almost" 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.
C92	6.15	Mary Shope	5/10/02	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.
C100	6.16	Dr. Michelle Tusan	4/4/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-3

Comments that do not Apply to this Project

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
C104	6.17	Ruth Zeman	4/3/02	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.
C108	6.18	Ronald B. McAlister	4/29/02	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.
	6.19			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.
D. COMMENT SHEETS RECEIVED DURING OR AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING				
D13	6.1	Kenneth L. Bell	4/4/02	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?
D17	6.2	J. M. and C. V. Blackwell	4/4/02	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.
D18	6.3	Marge Blockley	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative A with truck route through Laughlin or bypassing Boulder City.
D31	6.4	Beatrice Clark	4/4/02	If not Alternative D, then just widen U.S. 95 and expand that route for trucks.
D32	6.5	Robert C. Clark	4/4/02	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.
D35	6.6	Joyce D. Cook	4/4/02	We must not go with Alternative A. Something needs to be done to alleviate the traffic over Hoover Dam.

TABLE 2-1-3

Comments that do not Apply to this Project

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D39	6.7	Ihla J. Crowley	4/4/02	Prefers Alternative A with trucks mandatorily routed south on an improved U.S. 95.
D42	6.8	Andrew Davlin, Jr.	4/4/02	First preference is for a route south to Searchlight and Laughlin.
D50	6.9	Leo Doyle	4/4/02	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.
D52	6.10	Leigh Dunn	4/4/02	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.
D54	6.11	Frank E. Ensign	4/4/02	The FHWA should pick up the cost difference between Alternative D and B or C because of their poor bridge site selection.
D56	6.12	D. V. Fagan	4/4/02	Prefers none of the alternatives. Leave the trucks on U.S. 95 and improve it.
	6.13			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.
D67	6.14	Linda Goodman	4/4/02	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!
	6.15			People in Laughlin want the traffic and the income with it. They also understand their impacts.
D71	6.16	Albert K. Hamel	4/4/02	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.
D74	6.17	Daniel Hearn	4/4/02	Recommend widening U.S. 95 to I-40. Cancel Boulder City bypass. Make U.S. 95 a truck route. Close U.S. 93 to all truck traffic except delivery services to Boulder City. Keep security enforced over Hoover permanently. A bridge down river from Hoover is too inviting to terrorist.
D83	6.18	Louis Kaboli	4/4/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-3

Comments that do not Apply to this Project

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D93	6.19	John D. Lasiewicki	4/4/02	What has Mexico done for us!
D108	6.20	Scott Meyer	4/4/02	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.
D113	6.21	Barbara J. Morris	4/4/02	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.
D114	6.22	Ken Morris	4/4/02	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.
D115	6.23	Marlene Morwick	4/4/02	If I really had a choice, it would No Build. Use route to Searchlight. However, this seems to be “out of our hands” already.
D117	6.24	Jim Murphy	4/4/02	No bridge within 10 miles of Dam – terrorism – for tactical and strategic reasons.
D125	6.25	Virginia Perkins and Jeff Dalby	4/4/02	Actually prefers not to build any highway because it will not improve Dam traffic at all. Most people go to the Dam to see the Dam. Once you are over the Dam area, there is hardly any traffic.
	6.26			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.
D135	6.27	Alfred A. Radosta	4/4/02	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.
D138	6.28	Martin S. Rihel	4/4/02	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.
D152	6.29	Russ Thompson	4/4/02	Prefers all truck traffic to continue use of U.S. 95 south.
D164	6.30	Mrs. Billie Waymire	4/4/02	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.
	6.31			U.S. 95 to Searchlight and Laughlin should be widened ASAP. It is a death trap now.
D166	6.32	Vennita J. Wilson	4/4/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-3

Comments that do not Apply to this Project

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
D175	6.33	Rebecca L. Mahaney	5/13/02	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.
	6.34			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!
	6.35			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.
D176	6.36	Michael L. Mahaney	5/13/02	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?
D177	6.37	Leslie Paige	5/10/02	The best solution is Alternative E – go south to Laughlin like they are already doing.
D37	6.38	Curtis Cornelius	5/10/02	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.
D35	6.39	Joyce D. Cook	5/10/02	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.

TABLE 2-1-3

Comments that do not Apply to this Project

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E. PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPTS				
E2	6.1	Robert J. Hartman	4/4/02	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>Anyone who drives U.S. 95, as I do daily, can tell you horror stories of near misses and accidents, particularly on holiday weekends.</p> <p>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.</p>

TABLE 2-1-3

Comments that do not Apply to this Project

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
E6	6.2	Virginia Perkins	4/4/02	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.
	6.3			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.
	6.4			I sincerely hope, in view of 9/11, that you will consider rerouting 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.
E13	6.5	Ken Isaacson	4/4/02	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.
	6.6			It's obvious that the trucking industry has tried everything in their power to push for a bridge at Sugarloaf 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. 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 wish on a permanent basis.
E15	6.7	Steve Prisem	4/4/02	My opinion is that keep it on U.S. 95 because it's being developed in the first place starting in July.
	6.8			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.

TABLE 2-1-3

Comments that do not Apply to this Project

Letter No.	Code	Commenter	Date	Comment
F. COMMENTS RECEIVED BEFORE DEIS RELEASE				
F5	6.1	Richard and Marge Phegley	9/23/01	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.

This page intentionally left blank.