

Planning and Environmental Linkages Questionnaire and Checklist

I-515/I-215 Henderson Interchange

Questionnaire for Transportation Planners – Part 1

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: Henderson Interchange Feasibility Study Intended termini: Interstate 515 (I-515) from Galleria Drive (northern terminus) to Horizon Drive (southern terminus) and Lake Mead Parkway/Interstate 215 (I-215) from Van Wagenen Street (eastern terminus) to Valle Verde Drive (western terminus) |
| <i>Who is the study sponsor?</i> |
| City of Henderson, with participation from the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) |
| Briefly describe the study and its purpose. |
| The City of Henderson, with participation from the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), is conducting a feasibility study for the I-11/I-515/I-215 interchange (Henderson Interchange). The purpose of the Feasibility Study is to identify improvements needed at this critical system interchange to resolve current congestion and access deficiencies and meet future traffic demand projections consistent with socio-economic and land use assumptions in the Access 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) adopted by the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC). |
| <i>Who are the primary study team members (include name, title, organization name, and contact information)?</i> |
| Tom Davy, City Project Manager, City of Henderson, 702-267-3062, thomas.davy@cityofhenderson.com James Caviola, Consultant Project Manager, CA Group, 702-685-5945, james.caviola@c-agroup.com David Bowers, Contract Coordinator, NDOT, 702-671-6672, dbowers@dot.nv.gov James Mischler, Engineering Coordinator, CA Group, 702-253-2379, james.mischler@c-agroup.com Kyle Kubovchik, Public Outreach Coordinator, Horrocks, 702-374-7150, kylek@horrocks.com |
| <i>Does the team include advisory groups such as a technical advisory committee, steering committee, or other? If so, include roster(s) as attachment(s).</i> |
| Yes, interested public agency and private organizations were invited to participate in a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) that was asked to provide data and other input, and to share their opinions and ideas on decision points throughout the process. Meeting minutes are included in Appendix 14 of the Feasibility Study. The general public had opportunities to learn about the study and share their opinions via two public meetings and individual meetings. Meeting materials are included in Appendix 10 of the Feasibility Study. |
| <i>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.</i> |
| The Henderson Interchange has been included in the following transportation studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southern Nevada Traffic Study (SNTS), NDOT, October 2018, https://www.nevadadot.com/projects-programs/southern-nevada-traffic-study • Southern Nevada HOV Plan, NDOT, July 2015, Addendum 2018, https://www.nevadadot.com/safety/roadway-safety-improvements/high-occupancy-vehicle-hov-lanes-express-lanes |
| <i>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> |
| Interstate 11 (I-11) Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement; located between US 93 near the Hoover Dam Bypass Bridge and US 95 in the vicinity of Kyle Canyon Road; David Bowers, NDOT Project Manager; http://i11study.com/ |

| 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> | |
| At present, only \$7 million is assigned to Project CL20180052 I 11/I 215/I 515/SR 564 Henderson Bowl for the NEPA phase in the draft FY21 STIP. The project will need to be included in a fiscally constrained RTP prior to NEPA clearance. | |
| <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> | |
| Yes, a preliminary purpose and need statement was developed as part of the Feasibility Study. The purpose and need statement will be refined and validated during the NEPA process. 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, and roadway deficiencies will need to be undertaken to develop the project-level purpose and need statement during the NEPA evaluation. | |
| 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> | |
| N/A | |
| <i>What are the key coordination points in the decision-making process?</i> | |
| A preliminary schedule was prepared which defined key coordination points. Decisions were made at the study introduction, the alternatives workshop (goals and objectives, universe of alternatives), the alternatives screening meetings, and initial draft study document review. Public outreach will continue throughout the project development process via individual meetings with corridor stakeholders. Two public information meetings were held, in March 2019 and December 2019, to present the alternatives and 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> | |
| The study's time horizon was aligned with the Regional Transportation Commission's 2040 Regional Travel Demand 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. | |
| <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). | |

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.

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

Data, information, and tools

Is there a centralized database or website that all State resource agencies may use to share resource data during the study?

Yes. There is a ProjectWise site that is used for storage of information: [I-515 I-215](#).

Questionnaire for Transportation Planners – Part 2:

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> |
| At the onset of the feasibility study the transportation needs of the study corridor were identified and analyzed. From this effort, a purpose and need statement was developed and is included in Appendix 3 of the study. The study process defined, as corridor-level goals, accommodating regional plans including future high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes and a future Interstate 11 corridor, as well as sub-area goals including resolving existing roadway deficiencies, restoring local connectivity, and accommodating forecasted traffic growth within the project limits. |
| <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> |
| Key coordination milestones included the meetings listed below. Public Meeting No. 1 (March 2019) Alternatives Workshop (April 2019) Round 1 Screening (May 20, 2019) Round 2 Screening (June 20, 2019) Round 3 Screening (October 1, 2019) Public Meeting No. 2 (December 2019) Monthly progress meetings were held which allowed all participating agencies to provide input to the study process, progress, and direction. Additional coordination occurred with specific groups, as required, including but not limited to adjacent property owners and corridor stakeholders. |
| <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> |
| FHWA participated in the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) kick-off meeting. Decisions were made by City of Henderson with participation by NDOT, with support from agency stakeholder partners. Study findings and recommendations were acceptable to agencies and are well documented in the study documents. The public and stakeholder outreach is documented in the study; in-person one-on-one meetings were held with adjacent property owners, as well as two public meetings. The study involved coordination and interviews with agencies identifying issues and understanding needs and concerns in the corridor. All TAC and outreach meetings, including agency interviews and transcripts of public meeting comments, are documented in Appendices 10, 13, and 14 of the Feasibility Study. |

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](#)>.

| 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 |
| Regional/Local | | | |
| Clark County Public Works (CCPW) | Monthly - during progress meetings | Agency Stakeholder | None noted |
| Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) | Not Contacted | Agency Stakeholder | N/A |
| Federal | | | |
| Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) | Monthly – during progress meetings; | Core Agency Partner | None noted |
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) | Not contacted | Stakeholder Partner | N/A |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) | Not contacted | Stakeholder Partner | N/A |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) | Not contacted | Stakeholder Partner | N/A |
| Public | | | |
| Members of the Public | March 27, 2019 December 5, 2019 | 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. https://www.rtcnv.com/projects-initiatives/transportation-planning/air-quality-conformity/ |
| <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 were based on the RTC’s current model year (2040). Traffic forecasts for the study were derived from the RTC’s Regional Travel Demand Model. Planning-level cost estimates were derived using NDOT’s “Wizard” cost estimating tool, utilizing current item quantity costs provided by NDOT. The NEPA document will rely on RTC’s 2040 Regional Travel Demand Model for all traffic-related studies. |
| <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 (ProjectWise site) that is used for storage of information and data sharing between study team members. There is also a website available to the public (hendersoninterchange.com) |
| <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> |
| This study process was structured to facilitate a high-level analysis for the recommended alternatives 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> |
| Specific land uses were mapped to facilitate comparison of potential right-of-way impacts between the alternatives considered in the Feasibility Study. Sites with recognized environmental conditions (hazardous materials/waste) in the project area were mapped and documented. No species/habitat or other resource mapping was conducted. |
| <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. |
| <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> |
| The City of Henderson has compiled numerous previous hazardous materials/waste studies conducted in the project area, specifically covering the southwest quadrant of Henderson Interchange where there is known history of site contamination from past industrial dumping and waste incineration. |

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 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 |
| 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 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 |
| Wetland areas | <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 | 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 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 | 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 type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable | Title VI/ Environmental justice populations ⁹ | <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 |
| 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 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 | Hazardous materials | <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 |
| 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 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 | 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 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 | 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

| 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 in monthly progress meetings. Milestone meetings included presentation and discussion of the following: a) Alternatives Development Workshop (develop universe of alternatives, develop relevant qualitative and quantitative evaluation criteria; establish screening process; b) Round 1 Screening; c) Round 2 Screening; and d) Round 3 Screening (share recommended alternatives 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, a public information meeting was held on December 5, 2019, to share the results of the alternatives screening processes with the general public and invite comments.</p> <p>Steering Committee and public information meeting documentation is included in the Feasibility Study in Appendices 10 and 14.</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 two public information meetings. Monthly meetings either occurred as joint meetings from several locations via tele/web conferences or they were conducted at specific locations. The format of the meetings generally included a facilitated discussion on the development of alternatives and action items for the team. Discussion elements were documented in meeting summaries. Meeting participants were provided a window of time for submitting additional comments on the materials presented. Input was utilized to refine technical documentation and/or process inputs for the study. Project team members provided responses to all comments. Outreach documentation was compiled as part of the Feasibility Study and is included in the Public Involvement section and Appendix 10.</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>N/A</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 Report</i>, provided in the Feasibility Study Appendix 3, explains the screening process and results. Alternatives were screened out if fatal flaws were discovered, or the alternative did not meet the purpose and need.</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 there was no coordination with FHWA’s legal team. The legal team does not typically review planning studies. Coordination with FHWA is ongoing.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Did the study team have adequate information for screening out the alternatives?</p> <p>Yes.</p> |
| <p><i>What issues, if any, remain unresolved with the public, stakeholders, and/or resource agencies?</i></p> |
| <p>Potential right-of-way impacts have been communicated to adjacent property owners, however, those impacts have not been finalized or resolved.</p> |

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

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](#)>.

| |
|---|
| 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> |
| N/A |
| <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 appropriate departments in the City of Henderson and the project's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) 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 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 Feasibility Study 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). The preliminary purpose and need statement includes accommodating regional and local plans. The NEPA document will reflect the 2040 RTP, based on regional land use and growth forecasts. |
| <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. The Study goals and objectives will be supplemented with current 3-year crash data to fully develop the NEPA project purpose and need. |
| <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, primarily because the NEPA process is being initiated immediately after completion of the Feasibility Study. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other - documented hazardous materials/waste contamination within project limits |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Need to engage—and be perceived as engaging—specific landowners, citizens, citizen groups, or other stakeholders | _____ |

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. |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| Natural environment | | | | |
| 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 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 | |
| Riparian areas | <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 | |
| 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 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 | |
| Clean Water Act Sections 404/401 waters of the United States | <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 | |
| 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 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 | |
| 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 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 | |
| Historical 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 | A literature review and records search, as well as a field survey, for potential historical resources will be conducted as part of the NEPA document. |
| Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) resources | | | | |
| Section 4(f) wildlife and/or waterfowl refuge | <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) 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 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable | A regional ped/bike trail passes along the north side of Acacia Park in the project area, with a trailhead in the park. |
| Section 4(f) park | <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 | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable | Acacia Park and Acacia Park Demonstration Gardens are located in the southwest quadrant. |
| Section 6(f) resource | <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 | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable | A portion of Acacia Park was constructed using Land and Water Conservation Fund Act funds. |

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 | |
| 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 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 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 | Alternatives considered would improve or restore local access. |
| Neighborhood continuity | <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 | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable | |
| Community cohesion | <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 | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable | |
| Title VI/Environmental justice populations | <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 | |
| 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 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable | Approximately three hazardous waste sites and one toxic release inventory site are located in the project area. No brownfield site or NDEP active cases were identified. Two NDEP corrective actions occur within the project area. |
| 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 interchange to residential uses. Further analysis dependent upon development and review of specific 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

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?

N/A

To address potential impacts on the human environment, what mitigation measures or activities were considered and how were they developed and documented?

No specific mitigation actions were advanced as a result of this study.

Prepared by: _____



Date: July 13, 2020

Environmental Project Manager

CA Group

Reviewed and Concurred by: _____

Date: _____

Environmental Division

Nevada Department of Transportation