

Questionnaires for Transportation Planners: **Las Vegas Metropolitan Area Section**

Questionnaire for Transportation Planners – Part 1: Las Vegas Metropolitan Area Section

This part of the questionnaire should be completed by transportation planners at the beginning of the transportation planning study. Please note that planners should also review Part 2 of the questionnaire to understand what additional issues will need to be considered and documented as the study progresses.

Project identification
<i>What is the name of the study? What cities and counties does it cover? What major streets or highways are covered? For corridor studies, what are the intended termini?</i>
Name of the study: I-15/Tropicana Interchange Feasibility Study Intended termini: I-15: From Hacienda Avenue to Harmon Avenue, Tropicana Avenue: From Valley View Blvd to Las Vegas Blvd
<i>Who is the study sponsor?</i>
Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT)
Briefly describe the study and its purpose.
In Nevada, I-15 is the single most important tourism and commerce corridor and the lifeblood for southern Nevada's economy. Its interchange with Tropicana Avenue is one of a few crucial points connecting I-15 motorists to the Las Vegas Strip, McCarran Airport, and UNLV. Projected increases in both passenger vehicles and commodity flows within the Las Vegas metropolitan area along I-15 and Tropicana Avenue will result in major traffic congestion. The existing Tropicana overpass bridge restricts widening of I-15 in the future. This study will assist the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and other stakeholders to identify and prioritize a range of cost-effective and workable transportation improvements needed to serve this growth and enable future improvements to I-15.

Who are the primary study team members (include name, title, organization name, and contact information)?

NDOT Project Team

Jeff Lerud, NDOT Project Manager
Amir Soltani, NDOT Chief of Project Management
Lynnette Russell, NDOT District I Assistant Chief of Project Management
Hoang Hong, NDOT Traffic Management
Chris Young, NDOT Environmental

FHWA Representatives

Abdelmoez Abdalla, FHWA NV
Greg Novak, FHWA NV
Iyad Alattar, FHWA

Local Government Representatives

Paul Judd, RTCSNV (ret)
John Penuelas, RTCSNV
Kaizad Yazdani, CCPW

Consultant Project Team

Jim Caviola, CA Group
Jack Sjostrom, CA Group
Fidel Calixto, CA Group
Vinay Virupaksha, CA Group
Anita Busch, CA Group
Sriram Balasubramanian, CA Group
John Taylor, CH2M
Mike Cooper, CH2M
Ken Gilbreth, CH2M
John Karachepone, Jacobs
Cigdem Mulazimoglu, Jacobs

Resort Corridor Stakeholders

Station Casinos
MGM Grand Properties
UNLV
McCarran Airport
Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority
Tropicana Casino
In-N-Out Burger
Golden Palm Hotel
Chevron
Hampton Inn Tropicana

Does the team include advisory groups such as a technical advisory committee, steering committee, or other? If so, include roster(s) as attachment(s).

Yes, interested public agency and private organizations were invited to participate in a **Stakeholder Partners** group that was asked to provide data and other input, and to share their opinions and ideas on decision points throughout the process.

Station Casinos

MGM Grand Properties

UNLV

McCarran Airport

Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority

Tropicana Casino

In-N-Out Burger

Golden Palm Hotel

Chevron

Hampton Inn Tropicana

The **General Public** will also have opportunities to learn about the study and share their opinions via a public meeting and individual meetings.

Have previous transportation planning studies been conducted for this region? If so, provide a brief chronology, including the years the studies were completed. Provide contact names and locations of the studies and study websites.

A number of transportation studies have been conducted focusing on I-15 as a key corridor since its construction in the 1960s. Additional local studies have been performed that utilize the I-15 and Tropicana interchange as part of their roadway network. Only recently conducted studies based on future planning have been considered and referred to use in this study.

Timeline of Corridor Studies Performed

- 2003, NDOT. Southern Nevada Transportation Study. smallurban@dot.state.nv.us (http://www.nevadadot.com/uploadedFiles/NDOT/About_NDOT/NDOT_Divisions/Planning/2003_Southern_Nevada_Transportation_Study.pdf)
- 2007, I-15 South Traffic Re-evaluation of Design Modifications to Implement the Southern Nevada HOV Plan. Jeff Lerud (775-888-7589) (http://www.nevadadot.com/uploadedFiles/NDOT/Projects_and_Programs/Programs_and_Studies/2007-0618-Southern%20Nevada%20HOV%20Report.pdf)
- 2008, FHWA NDOT and BLM. Interstate 15 South Corridor Improvement Sloan Road to Tropicana Avenue Clark County, Nevada, Environmental Assessment, FHWA-NV-EA 07.02, EA: 73215
- 2008, . Louis Berger Group. [Tropicana Avenue Corridor Study](http://www.rtcsnv.com/mpo/plansstudies/Docs/Tropicana%20Corridor%20Study%20Final%2003-03-08_small.pdf). (http://www.rtcsnv.com/mpo/plansstudies/Docs/Tropicana%20Corridor%20Study%20Final%2003-03-08_small.pdf).
- 2009, Jacobs. [I-15 Resort Corridor Study](ftp://ftp.nevadadot.com/ProjectMgmt/I15%20Resort%20Corridor%20Study/Final%20Report%20Dec%202009/Final_I-15RCSFinalReport_120109.pdf). (ftp://ftp.nevadadot.com/ProjectMgmt/I15%20Resort%20Corridor%20Study/Final%20Report%20Dec%202009/Final_I-15RCSFinalReport_120109.pdf)
- 2011, US Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration. DesertXpress High-Speed Passenger Train ROD. <https://www.fra.dot.gov/eLib/Details/L01356>
- 2013, CH2M Hill. I-15 Corridor System Master Plan (<http://www.i15alliance.org/>)
- 2013, NDOT. Connecting Nevada. Tim Mueller. (775) 888-7351 (http://www.nevadadot.com/uploadedFiles/NDOT/About_NDOT/NDOT_Divisions/Planning/Connecting_Nevada/Draft_Improvements_List.pdf)
- 2014, Lochsa, TIA, MGM-Arena.
- 2014, Jacobs. Southern Nevada HOV Plan Update. Jeff Lerud (775-888-7589) (http://ndotprojectneon.com/reference_information_documents/traffic/Southern_Nevada_HOV_Plan_Draft.pdf)

What current or near-future planning (or other) studies in the vicinity are underway or will be undertaken? What is the relationship of this study to those studies? Provide contact names and locations of the studies and study websites.

I-15 Traffic Analysis, I-215 to I-515 NEON, Jeff Lerud (775-888-7589)	NDOT	Corridor study to evaluate traffic on I-15 through I-15 South, the Gap, and Project
I-15 Tropicana to Sahara and Project NEON, Jeff Lerud (775-888-7589)	NDOT	NEPA process to select ultimate freeway project improvements to join I-15 South

Study objectives	
What are your desired outcomes for this study? (Check all that apply.)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder identification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder roles/responsibilities definition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Travel study area definition <input type="checkbox"/> Performance measures development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development of purpose and need goals and other objectives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alternative evaluation and screening <input type="checkbox"/> Alternative travel modes definition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operationally independent segments <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scheduling of infrastructure improvements over short-, mid-, and long-range time frames <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental impacts (high level) <input type="checkbox"/> Mitigation identification <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____
<i>Have system improvements and additions that address your transportation need been identified in a fiscally constrained statewide or regional long-range transportation plan?</i>	
Not at this point. The results of this study will be used to program financial resources for this and other potential projects by NDOT.	
<i>Will a purpose and need statement¹ be prepared as part of this effort? If so, what steps will need to be taken during the NEPA process to make this a project-level purpose and need statement?</i>	
<p>No. Goals and objectives will be established within the Study Document, as well as a purpose for the study and need for improvements, however a NEPA document will not be prepared.</p> <p>A more detailed, data-driven analysis of factors, such as project status, travel patterns and capacity, system linkage, population and employment growth trends, multimodal transportation demand, legislative mandates, social/economic development impacts, multimodal and intermodal relationships, safety needs, roadway deficiencies, and environmental impacts will need to be undertaken during a future NEPA evaluation.</p>	
Establishment of organizational relationships	
<i>Is a partnering agreement in place? If so, who are signatories (for example, affected agencies, stakeholders, organizations)? Attach the partnering agreement(s).</i>	
No. Agency Stakeholders will be active participants in the study, and will be able to execute required agreements during future NEPA evaluation.	
<i>What are the key coordination points in the decision-making process?</i>	
A preliminary schedule was prepared which defined key points. Decisions were coordinated and made at the study introduction, study alternatives design charrette process (goals and objectives, universe of alternatives), alternatives screening meeting, alternatives selection meeting, and initial draft study document review (purpose and need, corridor recommendations, implementation plan. Public outreach will occur throughout the process via individual meeting with corridor stakeholders, including a public information meeting, which will be held upon determination of a study recommended alternative to solicit public opinion and feedback on the potential study outcome.	
Planning assumptions and analytical methods	
<i>Is the time horizon of the study sufficiently long to consider long-term (20 years or more from completion of the study) effects of potential scenarios?</i>	
Yes, the study will evaluate existing, interim, and ultimate improvements at and in close proximity to the interchange, with initial projects completing in 2016. The time horizon is aligned with the Regional Transportation Commission's current 2035 traffic model.	
<i>What method will be used for forecasting traffic volumes (for example, traffic modeling or growth projections)? What are the sources of data being used? Has USDOT validated their use? Are the models and their output conducive for use with NEPA-related noise and air quality modeling?</i>	
NDOT and RTC provided appropriate baseline traffic forecasts based on their latest regional travel demand models.	

¹ For an explanation of purpose and need in environmental documents, please see the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA's) "NEPA and Transportation Decision-making: The Importance of Purpose and Need in Environmental Documents," <[Purpose and Need](#)>. This website provides links to five additional resources and guidance from FHWA that should be helpful in understanding the relationship between goals and objectives in transportation planning studies and purpose and need statements of NEPA documents.

<i>Will the study use FHWA's Guide on the Consistent Application of Traffic Analysis Tools and Methods²? If not, why not? How will traffic volumes from the travel demand model be incorporated, if necessary, into finer-scale applications such as a corridor study?</i>
Yes, procedures outlined in FHWA's toolbox for preparing traffic forecasts will be followed.
<i>Do the travel demand models base their projections on differentiations between vehicles?</i>
Yes. The model predicts personal vehicles and commercial vehicles (light or heavy trucks).
Data, information, and tools
<i>Is there a centralized database or website that all State resource agencies may use to share resource data during the study?</i>
Yes. There is a project SharePoint site that is used for storage of information in addition to a project ftp site which has been maintained from the start of this study. The site addresses are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SharePoint: http://www.casharepoint.com/i15trop/SitePages/Home.aspx (access restricted to participants) - ftp site: ftp://ftp.c-agroup.com/ user:i15trop pass:NDOTi15#

² FHWA November 2011 publication: <[Traffic Analysis Tools and Methods](#)>

Questionnaire for Transportation Planners – Part 2: Las Vegas Metropolitan Area Section

This part of the questionnaire should be completed by transportation planners at the end of the transportation planning study. This completed document should become an appendix to the study’s final report to document how the study meets the requirements of 23 Code of Federal Regulations § 450.212 or § 450.318.

Purpose and need for this study
<i>How did the study process define and clarify corridor-level or subarea-level goals (if applicable) that influenced modal infrastructure improvements and/or the range of reasonable alternatives?</i>
<p>The study evaluated alternatives for improvements to the I-15 and Tropicana interchange to meet future lane requirements and traffic demands at the interchange, both along I-15 and Tropicana Avenue. Meetings were held during the early part of the study to interactively formulate and build consensus. The following overall factors guided the development and evaluation of alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Physical Compatibility – does the existing facility provide for or limit future expandability of I-15 and/or Tropicana Avenue? – Capacity – Is the capacity of the present facility inadequate for the present traffic? Projected traffic? What capacity is needed? What is the level(s) of service for existing and proposed facilities?
<i>What were the key steps and coordination points in the decision-making process? Who were the decision-makers and who else participated in those key steps?</i>
<p>Key coordination milestones included the following meetings. Each coordination effort included meetings with the NDOT and Cooperating Agency Stakeholder Partners, with NDOT serving as the ultimate decision maker. These meetings occurred on a joint web-based meeting and teleconference between multiple locations. Stakeholder Partner meetings sometimes occurred jointly, or individually – depending on the meeting content. Public outreach efforts are noted by * meeting topics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Study introduction (July 2014) – Design Charrette (September 2014) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Study goals and objectives o Evaluation process/criteria and universe of alternatives – Alternatives screening results (October 2014) – Alternatives selection meeting (January 2015) – PEL Meeting with FHWA (June 2015) – Public Information Meeting (September 2015)* <p>Monthly progress meetings were held which allowed all participating agencies to provide input to the study process, progress, and direction.</p> <p>Additional coordination occurred with specific groups, as required, including but not limited to adjacent property owners and corridor stakeholders.</p>
<i>How should this study information be presented in future NEPA document(s), if applicable? Are relevant findings documented in a format and at a level of detail that will facilitate reference to and/or inclusion in subsequent NEPA document(s)?³</i>
Information from this study can be directly referenced in future NEPA documents.
<i>Were the study's findings and recommendations documented in such a way as to facilitate an FHWA or Federal Transit Administration decision regarding acceptability for application in the NEPA process? Does the study have logical points where decisions were made and where concurrence from resource or regulatory agencies, stakeholders, and the public was sought? If so, provide a list of those points.</i>
<p>FHWA (Greg Novak, Iyad Alattar) participated in the PEL meeting and discussions of how the study should be implemented and how PEL should be incorporated. Decisions were made by NDOT, with support from agency stakeholder partners. Acceptance on major decisions was sought from the stakeholders, not concurrence. Key milestones where feedback was requested are outlined above. Study findings and recommendations were acceptable to agencies and are well documented in the study documents.</p> <p>The public and stakeholder outreach is documented in the study; in-person one-on-one meetings were held with adjacent property</p>

³ For an explanation of the types of documents needed under the NEPA process and the nature of the content of those documents, please see “NEPA Documentation: Improving the Quality of Environmental Documents,” <[Documentation](#)>.

owners, as well as a single public meeting.

The study involved coordination and interviews with agencies identifying issues and understanding needs and concerns in the corridor (rather than concurrence).

Establishment of organizational relationships – tribes and agencies⁴			
Tribe or agency	Date(s) contacted	Describe level of participation	Describe the agency's primary concerns and the steps needed to coordinate with the agency during NEPA scoping.⁵
<i>Regional/Local</i>			
Clark County Public Works (CCPW)	Monthly - during progress meetings; October 15, 2014; January 29, 2015.	Agency Stakeholder	Tropicana Avenue. Included County representatives in the design charrette and each of the meetings held with NDOT.
Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC)	Monthly - during progress meetings; October 15, 2014; January 29, 2015.	Agency Stakeholder	Included RTC representatives in the design charrette and each of the meetings held with NDOT.
Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA)		Stakeholder Partner	Completion of an expanded/enhanced interchange at Tropicana and I-15. Continue to inform and update LVCVA of progress, timelines and possible/probable costs.
<i>Federal</i>			
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	Monthly – during progress meetings; October 15, 2014; January 29, 2015; June 2, 2015.	Core Agency Partner	Prioritize implementation of corridor appropriately with statewide interstate improvement priorities; continue coordination with regional MPOs in ongoing study efforts.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)	Not contacted	Stakeholder Partner	None identified.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Not contacted	Stakeholder Partner	None identified.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Not contacted	Stakeholder Partner	None identified.
<i>Public</i>			
Members of the Public	September 19, 2015	See Feasibility Study section on Public Involvement. Includes property and business owners, residents.	

**Note: Numerous stakeholders were consulted as part of this process; only participatory tribes, agencies, and municipalities are reflected in this table. Coordination with all entities involved to date should be maintained in future planning and design efforts.*

⁴ Users may add rows to this table to accommodate additional tribes and agencies. Unused rows may be deleted.

⁵ If the transportation planning study final report does not adequately document interactions (for example, meeting notes, resolutions, letters) with the relevant agencies, append such information to the end of this questionnaire and checklist.

Planning assumptions and analytical methods
<i>Did the study provide regional development and growth assumptions and analyses? If so, what were the sources of the demographic and employment trends and forecasts?</i>
Yes, the study used growth projections identified as part of the RTC's Regional Travel Demand Model to understand existing and future congestion. RTCSNV, Appendix 4 Travel Demand Model Methodology and Air Quality Conformity Analysis, pg8,20,29, 2014, http://www.rtcnv.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/the-findings-of-the-air-quality-conformity-analysis-that-was-performed.pdf
<i>What were the future-year policy and/or data assumptions used in the transportation planning process related to land use, economic development, transportation costs, and network expansion?</i>
Future-year policy and data assumptions are based on the RTC's current model year (2035). Traffic forecasts for the study were derived from the RTC's RegionalTravel Demand Model. Planning-level cost estimates were derived using NDOT's "Wizard" cost estimating tool, utilizing current item quantity costs provided by NDOT.
<i>Were the planning assumptions and the corridor vision/purpose and need statement consistent with each other and with the long-range transportation plan? Are the assumptions still valid?</i>
Yes. The study provided recommendations in accordance with and not precluding recommendations of other corridor studies. The planning assumptions are consistent with the purpose and need.
Data, information, and tools
<i>Are the relevant data used in the study available in a compatible format that is readily usable? Are they available through a centralized web portal?</i>
Yes. There is a project portal (SharePoint site) that is used for storage of information and data sharing. In addition, a project ftp site was maintained from the start of the study, which makes reports, files, and important data available to project partners and stakeholders via a password-protected link, this study will be made available to the public on NDOT's website (http://www.nevadadot.com/Projects_and_Programs/Programs_and_Studies/Studies_and_Programs.aspx).
<i>Are the completeness and quality of the data consistent with the quality (not scale or detail) of inputs needed for a NEPA project-level analysis⁶?</i>
Yes. This study process was structured to facilitate a high-level analysis for the recommended alternative(s) that would support a future NEPA project-level analysis.
<i>Are the data used in the study regularly updated and augmented? If regularly updated, provide schedule and accessibility information.</i>
NDOT and RTC update traffic and socioeconomic data regularly.
<i>Have the environmental data been mapped at scales that facilitate comparison of effects across different resources and at sufficient resolution to guide initial NEPA issue definition? If not, what data collection and/or manipulation would likely be needed for application to the NEPA scoping process?</i>
Yes, data has been mapped at scales sufficient to guide initial NEPA issue resolution.
<i>Did the study incorporate models of, for example, species/habitat locations (predictive range maps), future land use, population dynamics, stormwater runoff, or travel demand? What models were used? Did the study adequately document what models were used, who was responsible for their use, and how they were used (with respect to, for example, calibration, replicability, contingencies, and exogenous factors)?</i>
Modeling platforms were only used to project future travel demand. This was completed using the RTC's regional travel demand model. No species/habitat modeling was conducted. A review of the existing stormwater runoff was performed and is documented in the study
<i>In scoping, conducting, and documenting the planning study, participants have come across documents and leads from agency staff and other sources that NEPA specialists may be able to use in conducting their studies. List any applicable memoranda of understanding, cost-share arrangements, programmatic agreements, or technical studies that are underway but whose findings are not yet published, etc.</i>
No additional sources have been identified at this time.

⁶ For an explanation of the types of information needed to evaluate impacts in environmental documents, please see FHWA's "NEPA and Transportation Decision-making: Impacts," <[Analysis of Impacts](#)>. This website provides links to six additional resources and guidance that should be helpful in understanding the types of impacts that need to be assessed, their context, and their intensity.

Examine the Checklist for NEPA specialist, at the back of this document, for more detail about potential impacts that could be mapped. Below is an abbreviated list of resources that could occur in the study area and may be knowable at this time and at the study's various analytical scales:

Resource or issue	Is the resource or issue present in the area?	Would any future transportation policies or projects involve the issue? Would there be impacts on the resource?	Resource or issue	Is the resource or issue present in the area?	Would any future transportation policies or projects involve the issue? Would there be impacts on the resource?
Sensitive biological resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Section 4(f) ⁷ wildlife and/or waterfowl refuge, historic site, recreational site, park	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Wildlife corridors	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Section 6(f) ⁸ resource	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Wetland areas	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Existing development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Riparian areas	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Planned development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
100-year floodplain	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Title VI/ Environmental justice populations ⁹	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide or local importance	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Utilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Visual resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Hazardous materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Designated scenic road/byway	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Sensitive noise receivers ¹⁰	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Archaeological resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Air quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Historical resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Other (list) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable

⁷ Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (49 U.S. Code § 303, as amended); see <[Section 4\(f\)](#)>.

⁸ Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act

⁹ refers to Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and 1994 Executive Order 12898 on environmental justice

¹⁰ under FHWA's Noise Abatement Criterion B: picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sports areas, parks, residences, motels, hotels, schools, churches, libraries, and hospitals

Development of alternatives
<p><i>Were resource agencies, stakeholders, and members of the public engaged in the process of identifying, evaluating, and screening out modes, corridors, a range of alternatives,¹¹ or a preferred alternative (if one was identified—the latter two refer to corridor plans)? If so, how? Did these groups review the recommendation of a preferred mode(s), corridor(s), range of alternatives (including the no-build alternative), or an alternative? Were the participation and inputs of these groups at a level acceptable for use in purpose and need statements or alternatives development sections in NEPA documents? If not, why not?</i></p>
<p>Yes. The project's Stakeholder Partners were engaged in the study process from the onset and participated at monthly progress meetings. Milestone meetings included presentation and discussion of the following topics: a) Design Charrette (develop universe of alternatives, develop relevant qualitative and quantitative evaluation criteria; establish screening process); b) Alternatives Screening Meeting (share and discuss the results of screening process); and, c) Alternatives Selection Meeting, share recommended corridor alternatives for that will move forward into the NEPA process. Input was solicited from the Stakeholder Partners after each meeting. Their input was used to refine the technical documentation before moving to the next level of study.</p> <p>Additionally, an in-person public meeting was held on September 19, 2015, to share the results of the alternatives screening processes with the general public and invite comments.</p>
<p><i>Describe the process of outreach to resource agencies, the public, and other stakeholders. Describe the documentation of this process and of the responses to their comments. Is this documentation adequate in breadth and detail for use in NEPA documents?</i></p>
<p>The outreach process included monthly progress meetings, Stakeholder Partner meetings, and a public information meeting. Monthly meetings either occurred as a joint meeting of several locations via teleconference/web meeting, or they were conducted in location-specific geographies. The format of the meetings generally included a facilitated discussion on the development of alternatives and action items for the team. Meetings were held in a physical location, supplemented by a web-based teleconference that allowed input from those unable to attend the meeting in person. Discussion elements were documented in meeting summaries. Meeting participants were provided a window of time for submitting additional comments on the materials presented during the meeting. Input was utilized to refine technical documentation and/or process inputs for the study. Project team members provided responses to all comments. Outreach documentation is compiled as part of the Feasibility Study section titled Public Involvement and its appendices.</p>
<p><i>If the study was a corridor study, describe the range of alternatives or modes of transportation (if any) considered, screening process, and screening criteria. Include what types of alternatives were considered (including the no-build alternative) and how the screening criteria were selected. Was a preferred alternative selected as best addressing the identified transportation issue? Are alternatives' locations and design features specified?</i></p>
<p>As a point interchange on I-15, this was not a corridor study. However, existing transportation modes were considered in the alternatives development, and were included in the selection criteria for the recommended alternative(s). All types of alternatives were considered, the range thereof is presented in the Feasibility Study and its appendices. Screening criteria were developed as part of the Design Charrette along with the goals, objectives and purpose and need. A preferred alternative was not selected, but a recommended alternative and alternate revisions were identified to carry forward to future NEPA process. The alternatives developed are to facilitate improvements to the I-15 and Tropicana interchange, so locations and features are specified.</p>
<p><i>Also regarding whether the study was a corridor study, for alternatives that were screened out, summarize the reasons for their rejection. Are defensible, credible rationale articulated for their being screened out? Did the study team take into account legal standards needed in the NEPA process for such decisions? Did the study team have adequate information for screening out the alternatives?</i></p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are defensible, credible rationale articulated for their being screened out?</p> <p>Yes, The <i>Alternatives Screening</i> and <i>Alternatives Selection Meeting</i> presentations provided in the report appendices explain the screening process and results. Alternatives were screened out if fatal flaws were discovered, or the alternative did not meet the Goals and Objectives.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Did the study team take into account legal standards¹² needed in the NEPA process for such decisions?</p> <p>Coordination with FHWA occurred to ensure integrity of this process to lay the foundation for future NEPA actions, however coordination with FHWA's legal team did not. The legal team does not typically review planning studies.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Did the study team have adequate information for screening out the alternatives?</p> <p>Yes.</p>

¹¹ For an explanation of the development of alternatives in environmental documents, please see FHWA's "NEPA and Transportation Decision-making: Development and Evaluation of Alternatives," <[Alternatives](#)>.

¹² 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 771.123(c), 23 CFR § 771.111(d), 40 CFR § 1502.14(a), 40 CFR § 1502.14(b) and (d), 23 CFR § 771.125(a)(1); see FHWA Technical Advisory T 6640.8A, October 30, 1987, <[FHWA Technical Advisory T 6640.8A](#)>.

<i>What issues, if any, remain unresolved with the public, stakeholders, and/or resource agencies?</i>
Potential right-of-way impacts have been communicated with adjacent businesses and property owners, however, those impacts have not been finalized or resolved.

Identification of potential environmental mitigation activities
<i>Could the transportation planning process be integrated with other planning activities, such as land use or resource management plans? If so, could this integrated planning effort be used to develop a more strategic approach to environmental mitigation measures?</i>
No, the project will be a point improvement on a larger corridor. Currently there are no perceived environmental mitigations required. The recommended alternatives have been coordinated with previous and current planning studies to ensure compatibility of the improvements with the intent of the other studies' recommendations.
<i>With respect to potential environmental mitigation opportunities at the PEL level, who should NDOT consult with among federal, State, and local agencies and tribes, and how formally and frequently should such consultation be undertaken?</i>
NDOT should continue to consult with the project's Stakeholder Partners in the Las Vegas metropolitan area as this project advances into future study phases.

Formally joining PEL with the NEPA process
<i>Lead federal agencies proposing a project that will undergo the NEPA process will want to most effectively leverage the transportation planning study's efforts and results. How could a Notice of Intent (for an environmental impact statement¹³) refer to the study's findings with respect to preliminary purpose and need and/or the range of alternatives to be studied?</i>
The project's Purpose and Need will need to be established for the NEPA process based upon the Study purpose and need. The range of alternatives studied and recommended for further evaluation is documented in the Feasibility Study Report and its appendices.
<i>Could a Notice of Intent in the NEPA process clearly state that the lead federal agency or agencies will use analyses from prior, specific planning studies that are referenced in the transportation planning study final report? Does the report provide the name and source of the planning studies and explain where the studies are publicly available? If not, how could such relevant information come to the NEPA specialists' attention and be made available to them in a timely way?</i>
Yes. Technical documents prepared as part of this study and the Study Document itself cite references to prior planning studies along with hyperlinks to access the documents on public domains.
<i>List how the study's proposed transportation system would support adopted land use plans and growth objectives.</i>
The recommendations that are included in the study are in response to the needs identified in the adopted regional land use and planning documents and long-range and regional transportation planning documents (STIP/RTP).
<i>What modifications are needed in the goals and objectives as defined in the transportation study process to increase their efficient and timely application in the NEPA process?</i>
No modifications to the goals and objectives are required.
<i>Jurisdictional delineations of waters of the United States frequently change. Housing and commercial developments can alter landscapes dramatically and can be constructed quickly. Noise and air quality regulations can change relatively rapidly. Resource agencies frequently alter habitat delineations to protect sensitive species. Will the study data's currency, relevance, and quality still be acceptable to agencies, stakeholders, and members of the public for use in the NEPA process? If not, what will be done to rectify this problem? Who will be responsible for any needed updating?</i>
Yes the data will remain relevant for the NEPA process, however it should be verified that all data provided is current. NDOT will ensure through the NEPA process that the data is current.

¹³ While Notices of Intent are required by some federal agencies for environmental assessments, they are optional for FHWA. Please see "3.3.2 Using the Notice of Intent to Link Planning and NEPA," in *Guidance on Using Corridor and Subarea Planning to Inform NEPA* (Federal Highway Administration, April 5, 2011), <[Notice of Intent](#)>.

Other issues

Are there any other issues a future NEPA study team should be aware of (mark all that apply)? In the space below the check boxes, explain the nature and location of any issue(s) checked.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public and/or stakeholders have expressed specific concerns | <input type="checkbox"/> Contact information for stakeholders |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utility problems | <input type="checkbox"/> Special or unique resources in the area |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access or right-of-way issues | <input type="checkbox"/> Federal regulations that are undergoing initial promulgation or revision |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Encroachments into right-of-way | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need to engage—and be perceived as engaging—specific landowners, citizens, citizen groups, or other stakeholders | |

Adjacent property owners have expressed concerns regarding access changes to their businesses.

There are many major utilities in the interchange area that will need to be considered for relocation and or protected in place.

The project will require right-of-way in order to be constructed, this will include partial or full property takes, depending upon the location.

The Las Vegas Convention and Visitor's Authority has had a vocal representative that should remain engaged in the development of the project, as well as property owners adjoining the existing Dean Martin Drive. All desire improvement, but the adjoining business owners do not want to lose any of the existing access that is provided today.

Concurrence

By signature, we concur that the transportation planning document meets or exceeds the following criteria in terms of acceptability for application in NEPA projects:

- Public involvement (outreach and level of participation)
- Stakeholder involvement (outreach and level of participation)
- Resource agencies' involvement and participation
- Documentation of the above efforts
- Applicability of the general findings and conclusions for use, by reference, in NEPA documents

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

Assistant Director, Engineering

Nevada Department of Transportation

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

Planning Program Manager

Federal Highway Administration - Nevada

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

Assistant Director, Planning

Nevada Department of Transportation

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

Environmental Program Manager

Federal Highway Administration - Nevada

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

Director

Nevada Department of Transportation

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

Division Administrator – Nevada

Federal Highway Administration

Checklist for NEPA Specialists – Part 3: Las Vegas Metropolitan Area Section

By completing this checklist, NEPA specialists will be able to systematically evaluate the transportation planning study with regard to environmental resources and issues. It provides a framework for future NEPA studies by identifying those resources and issues that have already been evaluated, and those that have not. The role of NEPA specialists during the study's various stages is laid out in the flowchart on page 4. This role includes timely advocacy for resources and issues that will later be integral to NEPA processes.

Checklist for NEPA specialists

Resource or issue	Is the resource or issue present in the area?	Are impacts to the resource or issue involvement possible?	Are the impacts mitigable?	Discuss the level of review and method of review for this resource or issue and provide the name and location of any study or other information cited in the planning document where it is described in detail. Describe how the planning data may need to be supplemented during NEPA.
<i>Natural environment</i>				
Sensitive biological resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Wildlife corridors	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Invasive species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Wetland areas	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Riparian areas	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
100-year floodplain	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Detailed analyses should follow based on development and analysis of specific alignment alternatives. Presented in the Feasibility Study document in Section 2.4.
Clean Water Act Sections 404/401 waters of the United States	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Waters of the U.S. located in ACOE Tropicana Wash Channel area impacts dependent upon development and analysis of specific corridor alternatives. Presented in the Feasibility Study document in Section 2.4.
Prime or unique farmland	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Farmland of statewide or local importance	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	

Checklist for NEPA specialists

Resource or issue	Is the resource or issue present in the area?	Are impacts to the resource or issue involvement possible?	Are the impacts mitigable?	Discuss the level of review and method of review for this resource or issue and provide the name and location of any study or other information cited in the planning document where it is described in detail. Describe how the planning data may need to be supplemented during NEPA.
Sole-source aquifers	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Wild and scenic rivers	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Visual resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Visual resources are assumed to be present based on public input, but no research was conducted to verify, and is unknown at this time; dependent upon development and analysis of specific corridor alternatives.
Designated scenic road/byway	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Cultural resources				
Archaeological resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Historical resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) resources				
Section 4(f) wildlife and/or waterfowl refuge	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Section 4(f) historic site	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Limited review conducted; no known Section 4(f) historic sites.
Section 4(f) recreational site	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Section 4(f) park	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Section 6(f) resource	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	

Checklist for NEPA specialists

Resource or issue	Is the resource or issue present in the area?	Are impacts to the resource or issue involvement possible?	Are the impacts mitigable?	Discuss the level of review and method of review for this resource or issue and provide the name and location of any study or other information cited in the planning document where it is described in detail. Describe how the planning data may need to be supplemented during NEPA.
Human environment				
Existing development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Alternative(s) development considered all adjacent developments and impacts to them are documented in the Feasibility Study. Additional data/coordination will need to be completed during future NEPA development and action.
Planned development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Alternative(s) development considered adjacent planned developments and impacts to them are documented in the Feasibility Study. Additional data/coordination will need to be completed during future NEPA development and action.
Displacements	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Impacts unknown at this time; dependent upon development and analysis of specific corridor alternatives and possible refinements.
Access restriction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Dependent upon development and analysis of specific corridor alternatives. Certain access locations for specific parcels are restricted in the recommended alternative. Revisions to the alternative are discussed in the feasibility study, with additional revisions possible. To be coordinated further during future process.
Neighborhood continuity	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	All adjoining and adjacent properties are commercial.
Community cohesion	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Title VI/Environmental justice populations	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Physical environment				
Utilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Further analysis dependent upon development and review of specific alternative(s) and determination of necessary relocations.
Hazardous materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Unknown at this time; dependent upon development and analysis of specific alternative(s). Should ensure review of potential HazMat if Chevron property is proposed for acquisition.
Sensitive noise receivers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Analysis not conducted, but assumed to be present based on proximity of the corridor to homes. Further analysis dependent upon development and review of specific corridor alternative(s).
Air quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	Limited review conducted, to be further evaluated in future NEPA process.

Identification of potential environmental mitigation activities
<i>Off-site and compensatory mitigation areas are often creatively negotiated to advance multiagency objectives or multiple objectives within one agency. Who determined what specific geographic areas or types of areas were appropriate for environmental mitigation activities? How were these determinations made?</i>
N/A
<i>To address potential impacts on the human environment, what mitigation measures or activities were considered and how were they developed and documented?</i>
No specific mitigation actions were advanced as a result of this study.

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____

Environmental Services Division
Nevada Department of Transportation