

Pyramid Highway/US 395 Connection Study Public Meeting Summary

ATTENDEES: Members of the Public
Mark Gallegos/Pyramid Partnership
Leslie Regos/Pyramid Partnership
Michelle Searle/Pyramid Partnership
Cindy Potter/Pyramid Partnership
John Narigon/Pyramid Partnership
Gina McAfee/Pyramid Partnership
Steve Oxoby/Pyramid Partnership
David Dodson/Pyramid Partnership

Jim Clarke/Pyramid Partnership
Julie Maxey/NDOT
Todd Montgomery/NDOT
Dan Nollsch/NDOT
Patty Brisbin/NDOT
Doug Maloy/RTC
Michael Moreno/RTC
Hannah Visser/FHWA

FROM: Leslie Regos/CH2M HILL
Michelle Searle/CH2M HILL

MEETING DATE: April 15, 2008

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), on Tuesday, April 15, 2008, the first Public Scoping Meeting for the Pyramid Highway/US 395 Connection Study was held at the Lazy 5 Community Center, 7100 Pyramid Highway, Sparks, Nevada. Following is a summary of the meeting, including its format, a description of the informational materials provided, a summary of the questions and comments collected at the meeting, attendee rosters, presentation slides and meeting notification methods used.

1. General Meeting Summary

The Pyramid Highway/US 395 Connection Study's first public information meeting was held in an "open house" format with informational display boards and Study representatives available to discuss the Study and answer questions between the hours of 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. Approximately 100 members of the public were in attendance. A formal presentation was given at 5:30 p.m. followed by an open comment period that was recorded. A Study Fact Sheet, public comment form, study website information flier, and a study boundary map were provided to attendees as they entered the meeting room. The options to submit written comments on a comment sheet and to give verbal comment to a court reporter were made available throughout the meeting.

2. Presentation Content

Display Board Summary

The following is a list of the display boards presented during the meeting and a brief synopsis of the content for each board. Study representatives from various engineering disciplines were also on-hand to explain the various displays and answer questions.

- **History of the Pyramid Highway Corridor:** A brief historical timeline illustrating the Pyramid Highway Corridor Management Plan study highlights.
- **Draft Purpose and Need Elements:** A list of proposed transportation needs that the current study will address.
- **Alternatives Screening Process:** Graphical illustration of the alternatives screening process that will take place as the study progresses, and how the process results in a few alternatives to be studied in detail in the NEPA document.
- **NEPA Planning Process:** Outline of the steps required during the NEPA process, and where the project is currently in relation to these steps.
- **Range of Possible Alternatives:** List of possible alternatives that may be considered during the study process.
- **Pyramid Management Plan Recommendations:** Description of the preferred alternative from the Pyramid Management Plan ("Package C"), and some of the benefits of this alternative.
- **Next Steps in the Study Process:** An overview of the steps to be taken next in the NEPA process.
- **Study Team Organization:** Organizational chart showing the various groups that compose the study team, their membership make-up, and how they relate to one another.
- **Traffic Volumes:** Map portraying graphical comparisons of current and projected traffic volumes within various sections of the study corridor.
- **Environmental Resources:** Map illustrating various natural and man-made environmental resources located within the study area.
- **Project Study Boundary:** Map illustrating the study boundaries for the project.

Formal Presentation Summary

During the formal presentation, a PowerPoint slideshow was given by Doug Maloy/RTC and Leslie Regos of the Pyramid Partnership.

Doug began the presentation with a project background overview that reviewed RTC's 2001 Pyramid Highway Corridor Management Plan that determined the need to increase capacity to serve anticipated population growth, improve safety, and to provide an alternate access to existing freeway systems from the Spanish Springs area. He explained that "Package C" was determined to be the preferred alternative at the time of this study. "Package C" alternative included upgrading Pyramid Highway to a restricted access freeway, providing an outer ring freeway connecting US 395 to Vista Boulevard, and providing a possible west Sun Valley north/south route connecting to US 395 at Parr/Dandini Boulevards. He stated that the benefits of this package would include the

connecting of arterials, improvements in vehicular safety, and improvements in daily travel time for those traveling in the area.

Doug advised attendees that although “Package C” was found to be the preferred alternative during the Pyramid Highway Corridor Management Plan Study, it is the intent of the current Pyramid Highway/US 395 Connection Study to further study possible improvements along the corridor, and how these improvements would impact the surrounding communities and the natural environment. He stressed to those present that no decision has been made regarding alignments or specific improvements to be implemented. Input from the public and regulatory agencies during this process will play a large part in making these determinations and in the development and selection of alternatives.

To move this study forward, he reviewed a preliminary study development timeline as follows:

- 2007-2011 – NEPA/Preliminary Engineering
- 2011-~2015 – Final Design/Right-of-Way (depending on available funding)
- ~2015-Construction could begin (depending on available funding)

Leslie Regos of the Pyramid Partnership then provided an overview of the NEPA process, during which she stressed the importance of a clearly defined *Purpose and Need*, and how that defined *Purpose and Need* is developed. She presented a study team organizational chart, a list of coordinating agencies that will be a part of the process, and explained how the teams will work together during the process, and provide input to be incorporated within the EIS document. A preliminary *Draft Purpose and Need* elements list was presented to help facilitate discussion.

- Address existing congestion problems on Pyramid Highway
- Address existing and forecasted population growth
- Address existing safety problems on Pyramid Highway
- Address existing and future access needs
- Address existing travel inefficiencies.

The Purpose and Need will also need to be responsive to the local and regional plans for the area.

Leslie explained that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) document will address potential environmental consequences including relocation, noise, air, water, land use, wildlife, economic, social, Section 4(f), environmental justice, hazardous materials, historic properties, construction, wetlands, floodplains, farmlands, transportation and traffic.

In closing, Leslie stressed that public input is a vital component of the NEPA process, and encouraged attendees to provide verbal comments to the court reporter present at the meeting, or in writing on the comment forms available that evening. She also explained that development of solutions through this study will be managed by the RTC of Washoe County and the Nevada Department of Transportation. These agencies would be ensuring

conformance to the NEPA requirements throughout the process of developing alternatives, evaluating the associated environmental impacts, and preferred alternative selection.

3. General Public Comment Summary

The bullet points below are a general summary of the questions and comments provided at the meeting.

- Recommendation for consideration of alternative modes - transit, specifically bus service was a common interest. Rail transit was also mentioned
- Consider expanding study boundaries to consider alternatives northwest of the valley
- Safety, specifically getting on and off highway is a major concern
- Concern about rapid development and the ability to plan ahead - control the growth
- Congestion in general during the peak periods is a key concern
- Signal timing along highway is frustrating
- Location of the connection route - should it be further north?
- Timing of project - need something done now

4. Meeting Notification

Public notifications for this information meeting were distributed as follows:

- 3/11/2008 - Invitation sent to Technical Advisory Committee
- 3/19/2008 - Invitation sent to Stakeholder Working Group
- 4/1/2008 - Email reminder sent to Technical Advisory Committee
- 4/3/2008 - Email reminder sent to Stakeholder Working Group
- 4/2/2008 & 4/9/2008 - AHORA ad (Local Spanish Language Periodical)
- 3/31/2008, 4/14/2008, & 4/15/2008 - Reno Gazette Journal ad
- 4/1/2008 - Postcard mailer sent to property owners within and adjacent to study area