

Coordination and Consultation

7.1 Introduction

A Public Involvement Strategy was developed for this project. The strategy was prepared following interviews with 17 key stakeholders to assess information needs and appropriate tools for communicating information about the project and receiving input from the public. Those stakeholders are listed below.

Bill Smith, Boulder City Councilman	Cheryl Ferrance Boulder City Chamber of Commerce
Lou Sorenson, Kingman City Manager	Trish Williamson Public Relations Coordinator Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce
Larry Castillo, Mohave County Commissioner	Ray Chamberlain or Ted Scott American Trucking Association
Kevin Hill, Henderson City Councilman	Dave Berry Swift Transportation Company
Bruce Woodbury, Clark County Commissioner	Terry Smalley Executive Vice President
Kurt Weinrich, Director Regional Transportation Commission	Daryl E. Capurro, Managing Director Nevada Motor Transport Association
Randy Harness, Conservation Chair Sierra Club	David Creer, Executive Director Utah Motor Transport Association
Jim Moore Nature Conservancy	Stan Randolph, Consultant California Trucking Association
Joyce Larkin Hoover Dam Visitor Center	
Brad Benson, Chairman CAUTION	

A total of six project newsletters were distributed for public information. Public participation and comment on potential environmental concerns were encouraged through two of these newsletters, three public open houses, and by providing project-dedicated voice mail and a project web site. Three public hearings were held for public comment on the DEIS in October 1998. Appendix C contains agency correspondence. Volume II contains a detailed description of the DEIS public hearings and the comments received.

7.2 Public Scoping

Following a May 1990 Notice of Intent published in the *Federal Register*, Reclamation initiated the EIS and began the scoping process. Public scoping meetings were held in June 1990 in Kingman, Arizona, and Boulder City and Las Vegas, Nevada. In Boulder City, there was general concurrence that a new crossing was needed to remove traffic from Hoover Dam; however, the public was divided on the solution. Some preferred to have a bypass around Boulder City in addition to Hoover Dam, while others felt that any road that bypassed Boulder City would severely impact downtown businesses. A newsletter, titled *Update*, was published in January 1991 and sent to interested individuals. Interviews with numerous community members and several meetings with interested members of the public, the Boulder City Chamber of Commerce, members of the Boulder City Council, and other organizations also occurred.

7.3 Public Comment Meetings

The FHWA filed a Notice of Intent in September 1997 to announce FHWA as the new lead agency for environmental review of the project. FHWA conducted three public open houses to allow comment on the alternatives carried forward from the June 1990 scoping meetings. The public open houses were noticed in the first newsletter mailed in early October 1997 and in the following newspapers: *Las Vegas Review Journal*, *Las Vegas Sun*, *Kingman Miner*, *Arizona Republic*, and *Boulder City News*. A press release announcing the public open houses was distributed to local media outlets through NDOT and ADOT public affairs offices.

7.3.1 Kingman, Arizona, Public Open House Held October 27, 1997

The first public open house was held in Kingman. The meeting was informal, consisting of six stations with a display board at each station. The display boards included the three proposed alternatives, the project schedule, the environmental review process, and an aerial photograph of the proposed project area. Comments were noted on flip chart pads at each station, and comment sheets were provided as handouts. Comments were varied and included concern for project funding, habitat impacts, existing hazardous roadway conditions, and consideration of a north-south alternative.

7.3.2 Boulder City, Nevada, Public Open House Held October 28, 1997

The second public open house was held in Boulder City. The meeting format was the same as for the Kingman meeting. Public comments were extensive and focused primarily on considering other alternative crossings, specifically those to the south, bypassing Boulder City. Other comments related to mitigation of traffic congestion, pedestrian safety, wildlife impacts, and funding and schedule.

7.3.3 Las Vegas, Nevada, Public Open House Held October 29, 1997

The third and final public open house was held in Las Vegas. The meeting format was the same as for the Kingman and Boulder City meetings. Comments focused on pedestrian safety, truck traffic considerations, visual impacts of a new crossing, project funding, and general support for one of the three alternatives.

7.4 Public Agency Partnering Session Held October 29, 1997

A partnering session with federal, state, and local agencies was conducted early in the project. The session was to inform these agencies of the Project Management Team's direction to complete the environmental review process, discuss individual agency issues and concerns about the project, and develop a partnership and promote communications among the agencies. The session resulted in a Team Charter signed by all participants acknowledging a willingness to work together to achieve the best possible project.

7.5 Project Management Team Meetings

The Project Management Team, described in Chapter 1, met regularly to discuss the project, review interim work products, and provide guidance and direction for preparing the EIS and other permit applications. In 1998 meetings were held on January 20, March 17, and May 12. In 1999, meetings were held on February 9, April 20, June 29, and November 15. In 2000, meetings were held on April 12, June 13, July 11, October 4, and November 30.

7.6 Public Outreach

A project presentation was developed to inform and educate stakeholders and the general public. Presentations to local agencies were given, and letters were sent to local governments and entities offering to give presentations to their staffs and constituents. Copies of these letters are found in Appendix C, Correspondence.

The presentation was made to the Laughlin Town Advisory Board in a public meeting on April 14, 1998. The FHWA Project Manager also presented the project and was available for questions on a live call-in televised program, NDOT Update, broadcast on channels 42 and 63 from Las Vegas on May 15, 1998.

In addition to DEIS public hearings held on October 13, 14, and 15, 1998, presentations about the project and the EIS process were made at annual Transportation Conferences jointly sponsored by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas; the American Society of Civil Engineers; and the Institute of Transportation Engineers in October 1998 and in September 1999. Similar presentations were made at the 1998 and 1999 Annual Statewide Conferences of the Arizona Public Works Association and at the 1999 and 2000 Annual Arizona Conferences on Roads and Streets.

A project web page was developed (<http://www.hooverdambypass.org/>) to provide project information including details on alternatives, an explanation of the environmental review process, a project schedule, and information material that is developed. An e-mail address was also established (haussler@road.cflhd.gov) for users to provide feedback to the Project Management Team.

7.7 DEIS Public Review and Comment

FHWA initiated public circulation of the DEIS on September 25, 1998, with publication of the Notice of Availability in the *Federal Register*. From October 13 to 15, 1998, FHWA held DEIS public hearings on successive evenings in Kingman, Arizona, and Boulder City and Las Vegas, Nevada. Approximately 250 people attended the DEIS public hearings. The court reporter transcripts of oral comments received at the hearings are included in Volume II of the final EIS (FEIS). The entire DEIS was also made accessible on the project

web site, with an online commenting feature. By November 10, 1998, the close of the DEIS comment period, the web site was accessed over 1,500 times. There were a total of approximately 160 public and agency commenters on the DEIS, including comments received after the close of comment period. See Volume II for a full description of the DEIS public input process, the comments received, and the responses to comments.

7.8 Consultation with Native American Tribes

Amendments to the regulations implementing the NHPA were published on July 1, 1999. These new regulations required initiation of formal government-to-government consultations between FHWA, Reclamation, and NPS with Native American tribes affected by the proposed project. The new regulation requires, in part:

...the Agency Official to consult with any Indian tribe...that attaches religious and cultural significance to historic properties that may be affected by an undertaking. Such Indian tribe...shall be a consulting party. The Agency Official shall ensure that consultation in the Section 106 process provides the Indian tribe...a reasonable opportunity to identify its concerns about historic properties, advise on the identification and evaluation of historic properties, including those of traditional religious and cultural importance, articulate its views on the undertaking's effects on such properties, and participate in the resolution of adverse effects. It is the responsibility of the Agency Official to make a reasonable and good faith effort to identify Indian tribes...that shall be consulted in the Section 106 process. Consultation with an Indian tribe must recognize the government-to-government relationship between the Federal government and Indian tribes. The Agency Official shall consult with representatives designated or identified by the tribal government...(36 CFR 800.2).

FHWA, in partnership with NPS and Reclamation, began identifying additional Native American tribes with an interest in the Hoover Dam Bypass in late summer through fall 1999. These activities occurred concurrently with consultation meetings held between FHWA, NPS, and Reclamation with the Arizona and Nevada SHPOs and the ACHP; these meetings addressed both the historic preservation issues associated with project impacts on the HDNHL and the Native American tribes' cultural values. FHWA sent out invitations to representatives of 17 tribes on December 9, 1999, requesting their participation in formal consultation meetings on the project. To date, five meetings have been held with the tribal representatives: on January 11, 2000, in Laughlin, Nevada; on March 30, 2000, at the Hoover Dam Visitor Center; on May 8, 2000, in Henderson, Nevada; and on August 15 and 16, 2000, and November 15, 2000, in Boulder City, Nevada. The May 8 meeting was held with a Core Consultation Group, consisting of six tribal representatives, that was delegated by the full assembly of tribes to lead the consultation process with FHWA on their behalf. Attendance by Native American tribal representatives at the government-to-government consultation meetings has ranged from about 25 to 30 participants.

The Agency/Native American government-to-government consultation meetings resulted in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the tribes and FHWA, and in the tribes being included as invited signatories on the Programmatic Agreement (PA) for treatment of historic properties affected by the Hoover Dam Bypass. The MOU and PA stipulate that the Native American tribes will continue in a formal consultation role with the agency officials involved in the project through its design and implementation.

7.9 Permits

Permits and approvals are required to construct and operate the Hoover Dam Bypass project. Table 7-1 summarizes the agency-regulated activities and required federal, State of Nevada, State of Arizona, Clark County, and Mohave County permits and approvals anticipated to construct and operate the alternatives at Promontory Point, Sugarloaf Mountain, or Gold Strike Canyon.

Table 7-1
Permits and Approvals Anticipated for the Hoover Dam Bypass Project

Agency	Regulated Activity	Required Permit or Approval
Federal		
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Discharge of dredge or fill material into U.S. waters	Section 404 Permits
Federal ACHP	Coordination of project design and construction to minimize impacts on historic properties	Programmatic Agreement between FHWA, NSHPO, ASHPO, and ACHP (Section 106 consultation)
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	Use of additional right-of-way for roadway and bridge	Easement
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	Water use during construction	Water Use Permit
National Park Service	Acquisition of additional right-of-way for roadway and bridge	Easement
U.S. Coast Guard	Impacts on navigable waters	Section 9 Permit
U.S. EPA	Stormwater discharges	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Impacts on special-status vegetation and wildlife species	Biological Opinion
Nevada State		
Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer (NSHPO)	Impacts on cultural resources	Section 106 Review
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection	Impacts on water quality	Section 401 Water Quality Certification
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection	Construction activities disturbing more than 5 acres of land	General Stormwater Permit for Construction Activities
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection	Discharge to surface waters	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection	Approval of plans and specifications necessary prior to construction start	Design Review of Plans and Specifications
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection	Discharge to surface waters	Temporary or Permanent Discharge Permit
Nevada Division of Water Resources	Water use during construction	Water Right Permit
Nevada Department of Transportation	Coordination of project design, construction, operation, maintenance, and financing	Memorandum of Agreement between FHWA, NDOT, and ADOT
Nevada Division of Wildlife	Potential disturbance of desert tortoise	Handling Permit

**Table 7-1
Permits and Approvals Anticipated for the Hoover Dam Bypass Project**

Agency	Regulated Activity	Required Permit or Approval
Nevada Division of Wildlife	Potential impacts on common and special-status wildlife species	Permit
Nevada State Division of State Lands	Acquisition of right-of-way in vicinity of Colorado River (Gold Strike Alternative only)	Easement
Arizona State		
Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (ASHPO)	Impacts on cultural resources	Section 106 Review
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality or Arizona Department of Water Resources	Impacts on water quality	Section 401 Water Quality Certification
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality or Arizona Department of Water Resources	Construction activities disturbing more than 5 acres of land	General Stormwater Permit for Construction Activities
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality or Arizona Department of Water Resources	Discharge to surface waters	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality or Arizona Department of Water Resources	Approval of plans and specifications necessary prior to construction start	Design Review of Plans and Specifications
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality or Arizona Department of Water Resources	Discharge to surface waters	Temporary or Permanent Discharge Permit
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality or Arizona Department of Water Resources	Portable air pollution sources	Permit
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality	Classification of construction waste material and transport of solid wastes generated to an ADEQ-approved facility, at the contractor's option	May require facility approval (waste stored onsite more than 90 days)
Arizona Department of Water Resources	Water use during construction	Water Right Permit
Arizona Department of Transportation	Coordination of project design, construction, operation, maintenance, and financing	Memorandum of Agreement between FHWA, NDOT, and ADOT
Arizona Game and Fish Department	Potential impacts on common and special-status wildlife species	Permit
Clark County^a		
Clark County Health District, Air Pollution Control District	Dust emissions from construction activities	Dust Control Permit
Clark County Health District, Air Pollution Control District	Emissions from portable emissions units used at project construction site; examples include but are not limited to rock crushers, generators, and cement plants	Various Location Permit
Clark County Planning Department	Construction of aboveground structures in Clark County	Use Permit

**Table 7-1
Permits and Approvals Anticipated for the Hoover Dam Bypass Project**

Agency	Regulated Activity	Required Permit or Approval
Clark County Building Department	Construction of aboveground structures in Clark County	Building Permit
Clark County Department of Public Works and Community Development	Grading at project site	Grading Permit
Clark County Department of Public Works and Community Development	Drainage associated with grading and construction activity	Drainage Study
Mohave County^a		
Mohave County	Emissions from portable emissions units used at project construction site; examples include but are not limited to rock crushers, generators, and cement plants	Various Location Permit
Mohave County	Construction of aboveground structures in Mohave County	Use Permit
Mohave County	Construction of aboveground structures in Mohave County	Building Permit
Mohave County	Grading at project site	Grading Permit
Mohave County	Drainage associated with grading and construction activity	Drainage Study

^aThe federal government complies with county permitting requirements (personal communication, Kris Mills, Reclamation, July 2, 1998)

This page intentionally left blank.