The Arizona and Nevada departments of transportation are working together on the two-year Interstate 11 (I-11) and Intermountain West Corridor Study (Corridor) that includes detailed corridor planning of a possible high priority Interstate link between Phoenix and Las Vegas (the I-11 portion), and high-level visioning for potentially extending the Corridor north to Canada and south to Mexico. Congress recognized the importance of the portion of the corridor between Phoenix and Las Vegas and designated it as future I-11 in the recent transportation authorization bill, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21).

As part of the study, interested public agencies, non-profit organizations and private interests groups are invited to participate in a Stakeholder Partners group that will be asked to provide data and other input, and to share their opinions and ideas on decision points throughout the process. The first of four planned Stakeholder Partners meetings was held on September 26, 2012. Meetings were conducted simultaneously in five locations: Kingman, Arizona; Las Vegas, Nevada; Maricopa Association of Governments (Arizona); Reno, Nevada; and Surprise, Arizona. Additionally, individuals could call-in and log-on to participate in a live webinar. A total of 193 participants signed in at registration, though more attended the meetings. The following report summarizes the results of these meetings. Specific summaries for each meeting event are appended to this summary.

The comments presented in this report represent input from Stakeholder Partners that participated and will be reviewed and considered by the study team.

The purpose of the Stakeholder Partners meeting was to bring together project stakeholders from throughout the Corridor to receive input on the vision and mission for the facility. Participants were provided three handouts: I-11 and Intermountain West Corridor Study fact sheet, Corridor Vision Summary brochure, and the Preliminary Identification of Relevant Ongoing and Past Plans, Studies, and Other Documents inventory.
The meeting was guided by a detailed PowerPoint presentation viewed at all locations and online. Peggy Fiandaca, I-11 Team Member, facilitated the presentation and project co-managers Sondra Rosenberg from the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and Michael Kies from the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) provided a review of the project, vision concepts, and work plan and schedule.

Following the project overview, breakout session discussions were facilitated. Facilitators asked participants at each location to provide feedback on the following:

- Please describe the opportunities this Corridor could fulfill.
- Which transportation components should be included in the Corridor to fulfill the preliminary identified needs (e.g., freeway, passenger/freight rail, utility accommodations, others)?
- How would you define success in terms of future implementation of this Corridor?
- What are the challenges facing the implementation of this Corridor?

After an hour of breakout session discussions, Peggy Fiandaca resumed the simultaneous meeting, asking each location to provide a brief report summarizing the key points and “big ideas” that were offered. After each breakout session report, a schedule of upcoming activities was reviewed, including two public meetings scheduled for October 18 at the Henderson, Nevada Convention Center from 4 to 7 p.m., and for October 23 at the Burton Barr Central Library in Phoenix, Arizona from 6 to 8 p.m.

**Opportunities the Corridor Could Fulfill**
Participants in the various meetings provided many ideas for opportunities the corridor could fulfill. Following highlights some of the common items offered:

- Provide economic development for communities in Corridor
- Promote commerce and tourism through north-south rail (both passenger and freight)
- Improve access to imports from Canada and Mexico
- Reliever or redundant route for I-15, I-10, I-5, US-385/I-580 and I-17
- Collaborate on energy opportunities (solar development, wind farms, etc.)
- Promote tourism
- Improve safety
- Utilize common right of way corridor for multiple uses (telecommunications, transportation, etc.)

**Transportation Components that should be Included in the Corridor**
Some of the common themes offered for what components should be included in the Corridor are listed below:

- Multimodal (vehicle, freight and passenger rail, etc.)
- Telecommunications, energy and other utility components
- Efficient connections to airports

**Defining Success**
The following outlines common responses to how participants would define success when implementing this Corridor:

- Becomes a major trade corridor in North America
- Creates jobs and boosts economic development for communities
- Improves safety and system reliability and effectiveness
- Demonstrates value to all users
- Connects communities
• Becomes a fully funded Corridor
• Becomes an environmentally-friendly, “green” corridor
• Becomes a “smart” corridor, incorporating various technologies and infrastructure

Challenges facing the Corridor
Participants identified many potential challenges to implementing the Corridor. Following highlights some of the common themes offered at the meetings:
• Funding
• Right of way acquisition
• Environmental impacts
• Homeland security and safety issues
• Creating political will
• Public acceptance
Kingman, Arizona Meeting Summary Report

Mohave Community College
Neal Campus, Room 401
1971 Jagerson Ave.
Kingman, AZ

Attendees (9):
Dan Andersen, CH2M HILL; Michele Beggs, ADOT; Ammon Heier, FHWA; Gary Jeppson, City of Kingman; Michael Kondelis, ADOT; Jack Kramer, City of Kingman; Steven Latoski, Mohave County; Travis Lingenfelter, Mohave County; Lisa McCabe, Bullhead Regional Economic Dev. Authority; Rob Owen, City of Kingman; Gary Watson, Mohave County

Meeting Feedback
Following a brief PowerPoint presentation, Dan Andersen facilitated participants at the Mohave Community College in a dialogue regarding the I-11 and Intermountain West Corridor Study. The following feedback was provided by participants as part of that discussion.

Please describe the opportunities this Corridor could fulfill.

- More opportunities for alternative energy. Look at using Corridor right of way to implement on-going energy production, such as solar and wind generation. This could be a source of revenue for construction and maintenance.
- This could be a huge economic development opportunity for Mohave County. Kingman would sit at the crossroads of major north-south (I-11) and east-west (I-40) Interstate freeways—an important location for distribution logistics.
- Opportunity to increase telecommunications infrastructure.
- Could be means to “finishing what we have started” with on-going lane widening and other roadway improvements on the US 93 corridor from Hoover Dam Bridge to Wickenburg.
- Will greatly improve safety
- North/south rail (passenger and freight) excellent for commerce and tourism for northwest Arizona
- Easier access and linkages to major international airports will increase desirability of Mohave County as a place to live and work.
- Improved freight capacity
- Improved access to imports from Canada and Mexico
- The convergence of a north-south freight rail line with the east-west BNSF line through Kingman would create economic opportunities

Which transportation components should be included in the Corridor to fulfill the preliminary identified needs (e.g., freeway, passenger/freight rail, utility accommodations, others)?

- Alternative energy and utility
- Telecommunications
- Access control
- Full Interstate standards (high standards/long life)
- Dedicated commercial trucking lane(s)
We know that infrastructure for trucking appears to be more important than rail infrastructure at this time. At the Kingman Airport & Industrial Park only 18% of current tenants are using rail. However, if the corridor extended from Mexico to Canada, rail could be an important element.

- Better access to airports
- Passenger rail (need a north-south passenger route)
- Incorporate future connected vehicle infrastructure to entire corridor (minimize user costs for travel)
- Transwestern pipelines and canals for water, fuels, slurry, other

**How would you define success in terms of future implementation of this Corridor?**

- I-11 becomes a major trade corridor for the country
- Corridor Business Case metrics come to fruition relative to greater economic development.
- Safer, faster multimodal corridor
- Alternative energy running the light rail, ability to re-charge vehicles along corridor
- Lower overall user costs (both passenger and freight)

**What are the challenges facing the implementation of this Corridor?**

- Funding
- Growth opposition
- NEPA requirements take time and require costly mitigation measures
- Fear of importing international crime
- Terrain challenges
- Financial impact to local agencies associated with the need to construct access roads
- Right of way acquisition costs and jurisdictional issues

**Questions**

How will the I-11 study affect the current I-40/US 93 west Kingman study (System Traffic Interchange Design Concept Report and Environmental Studies: http://azdot.gov/highways/projects/I40_US93_WestKingmanTI/index.asp)?

*Unknown at this time (note: the current west Kingman traffic interchange will remain in place). The 3rd phase of the I-11 Study will identify corridor concepts and recommendations.*

Will an economic development plan be implemented for the entire corridor?

*The 2nd phase of the study will include the development of a Corridor Business Case; economic development focus groups will be a part of this development.*

Could this corridor potentially include a variety of transportation modes on single alignment or separated alignments?

*We don’t know yet; this will be a study component.*

Will the I-11 alignment follow the US 93 corridor as we know it today?

*There is significant momentum for I-11 to follow the US 93 alignment because of Congress’ recent action designating portions of US 93 in Arizona and Nevada as I-11, and because much of US 93 is already a 4-lane divided highway. However, the Study will need to consider alternative alignments for prudent reasons and to be compliant with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).*

**Request**

Add Unisource (electric & gas provider) and Frontier Communications to the Stakeholder Partners list.
Las Vegas, Nevada Meeting Summary Report

Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Room 108
600 S. Grand Central Pwy.
Las Vegas, NV

Attendees (40):
Vicki Adams, City of North Las Vegas; Travis Anderson, National Park Service; Darrin Badger, Focus Property Group; Richann Bender, California-Nevada Super Speed Train Commission; Mike Boyles, National Park Service; Hon. Richard Carrillo, Nevada State Legislature; Jorge Cervantes, City of Las Vegas; Bob Coyle, Republic Services; Cindy Creighton, Nevada Subcontractors Association; Debbie Dauenhauer, Southern Nevada Transit Coalition-Silver Riders; Dorothy Jean Dickey, Bureau of Land Management, Southern Nevada; Pamela Dittmar, City of North Las Vegas; Josie Eck, CH2M HILL; Tracy Fourtz, City of Henderson; Randy Fultz, City of Las Vegas; Robert Herr, City of Henderson; John Hiatt, Friends of Nevada Wilderness; Mike Jackson, Southern Nevada Transit Coalition-Silver Riders; Andrew Kjellman, RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada; Karlos LaSane, Caesers Entertainment; Telma Lopez, Southwest Gas Corporation; Peter Lowenstein, City of Las Vegas; Mary Martini, NDOT; Bardia Nezhati, CH2M HILL; Bruce Nyhuis, National Park Service; Brian O’Callaghan, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department; Fred Ohene, RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada; John O’Rourke, Nevada Highway Patrol; Joseph Pantuso, Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association (SNHBA); Aileen Pastor, RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada; Priscilla Raudenbush, NV Energy; Ingrid Reisman, Las Vegas Monorail; Jason Rogers, City of Henderson; Yvonne Schuman, NDOT; Sue Seawalt, Clark County; Michael Shannon, Clark County; Jacob Snow, City of Henderson; Amber Stidham, RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada; Angela Torres, RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada; Tim Tso, Southwest Gas Corporation; Catrina Williams, Bureau of Land Management

Meeting Feedback
Following a brief PowerPoint presentation, Bardia Nezhati facilitated participants at the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada in a dialogue regarding the I-11 and Intermountain West Corridor Study. The following feedback was provided by participants as part of that discussion.

Please describe the opportunities this Corridor could fulfill.
- Improve safety
- Improve tourism
- Accommodate truckers
- Opportunities for light rail and freight rail
- Opportunities for a bypass around Las Vegas, specially for freight to relieve the congested I-15
- Transport options for ports of Mexico
- Create economic activities along Corridor
- Opportunities for warehousing and distribution centers
- Expansion of major companies
- Opportunities for installing dark fiber (currently only exists along US-95)
• Create a scenic route
• Recreational opportunities
• Futuristic: pods / automated drive / smart signs / pavement heating elements / wind farms / carbon omission / solar

Which transportation components should be included in the Corridor to fulfill the preliminary identified needs (e.g., freeway, passenger/freight rail, utility accommodations, others)?

• All of the ideas listed in “Please describe the opportunities this Corridor could fulfill”
• Electrical distribution lines (but not transmission lines)
• Data centers (require lots of power)
• Passenger rail
• Amenities
• Apply smart growth approaches and sustainability practices
• Connectivity to public transit (HUBs)

How would you define success in terms of future implementation of this Corridor?

• Complete right of way acquisition
• Improve international commerce
• Transportation improvements from north to south
• Meeting needs of other alternative modes
• Freight relief
• Complete environmental clearances; NEPA success
• Create/promote recreational areas
• How you go through community
• Obtain public lands
• Traverse national recreation areas
• Decreased freight and passenger bottle necks
• Community buy-in; get them on board
• Avoiding negative significant environmental impacts (e.g., providing deer crossing)
• LA/LB ports (no more opportunity for deep-water ports)
• Asian goods moving to Mexico need to accommodate those frequent movements (accommodate it easterly and further north)
• Improve connectivity
• Grow commerce
• Create jobs
• Quality of life
• Opportunity to connect long distance commute
• Accommodate bicycling via trails
• How the two communities will become healthier and the overall livelihood of people—that is a sign of success
• Use of technology for homeland security/surveillance
• Nevada currently doesn’t support green technology – great opportunity to promote/incorporate

What are the challenges facing the implementation of this Corridor?

• Diverting traffic away from communities
• Archaeological resources impacts
• Resources/impact/cost (water and power)
• Impact natural resources
• More people, more impacts
• Greater mobility
• Greater homeland security issues
• Weigh-in-motion stations
• Port of entries
• Environmental challenges
• Social challenges
• Implementation and funding
• Basic energy usage
• Safety improves to a point but then it decreases
• Getting freight off I-15 from downtown Las Vegas core via a bypass route; environmental impacts associated with bypass around Las Vegas
• Opportunities for Interstate to become main street arterials (3% commercial / 97% recreational)
• New construction funding not competing with existing funding
• Opportunity to accommodate double / triple trailers
• Prioritization/segmentation
• Weather problems
• Facility shut down (resources necessary)
• Railroads operated by private companies (funding for maintenance)
• Challenging topography north out of Las Vegas and Colorado River crossing
• Total cost of ownership to build something new and the cost to maintain it
Meeting Feedback

Following a brief PowerPoint presentation, Mike Kies facilitated participants at the Maricopa Association of Governments in a dialogue regarding the I-11 and Intermountain West Corridor Study. The following feedback was provided by participants as part of that discussion.

Please describe the opportunities this Corridor could fulfill.

- The connection between Mexico and Canada provides an economic and tourism opportunity; critical emphasis should be placed on making the linkage to Nogales/Mexico
- Broader trade opportunities include:
  - Connecting Phoenix and Las Vegas metropolitan areas
  - Extension to Tucson metropolitan area
  - Multimodalism of corridor – including freight and passenger rail
- Project should include interest groups that currently use the corridor (e.g., trucking industry)
- Advantages to building the corridor include the advancement of the aerospace and energy industries, as well as the ability to bring in new manufacturing industries
- Moving forward with the Corridor provides an “image builder” to Arizona in a tough economic environment – stating that the “state is open for business”
- Corridor provides opportunities for future targeted growth
- Corridor serves as an alternative or redundant route to I-10
- Opportunity for Arizona and Nevada to collaborate on energy or solar industry development
- Development opportunities in small communities along the Corridor could increase as a result of Corridor development

Which transportation components should be included in the Corridor to fulfill the preliminary identified needs (e.g., freeway, passenger/freight rail, utility accommodations, others)?

- Proposed Hassayampa Freeway
- Passenger rail
- Freight rail – joint BNSF and UPRR corridor
- Energy (natural gas, solar, fiber optics)
- Water
- Efficient connections to airports
• Connectivity with other modes:
  o Corridor could intersect other major corridors; crossroads could serve as intermodal hubs (e.g., freight coming from Punta Colonet, rail line connectivity – Wellton Branch)
  o Commuter rail corridors
• Connection to Grand Canyon Railway
• Land component:
  o Release some federal or state land for development
  o Use as catalyst for construction of the Corridor
• Public/private partnerships could be used for implementation (e.g., Self-Monitoring, Analysis, and Reporting Technology [SMART] corridor)

How would you define success in terms of future implementation of this Corridor?
• Traveling with access to information technology (e.g., wi-fi)
• Increased economic activity
• Competitive economy
• Benefits for smaller communities
• Newer, faster, quicker
• New coalition of power/resources
• Improved economic base/tax base
• Improved image as an international trade partner
• Ensure movement in both directions (between Phoenix and Las Vegas)
• Corridor as a destination

What are the challenges facing the implementation of this Corridor?
• Create political will:
  o Commerce and residential
  o Consensus between major players
  o Create a business case
  o Line up everyone’s aspirations
• Make sure local communities understand the benefits of the Corridor
• Sell as an investment for the state’s future
• Funding – get the private sector involved
• Selling the plan to decision-makers
• Getting the stakeholders together
• Putting the plan in place
Reno, Nevada Meeting Summary Report

Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County
Board Room
2050 Villanova Dr.
Reno, NV

Attendees (18):
Amy Cummings, RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County; Mark Gallegos, CH2M HILL; Lee Gibson, RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County; Denise Inda, NDOT; Troy Martin, NDOT; Michael Moreno, RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County; Isaac Morrison, New Nevada Resources LLC; Derek Morse, CH2M HILL; Tim Mueller, NDOT; Tina Nappe, Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter; James Nugent, CC Communications/ Churchill County Communications; Coy Peacock, NDOT; Jeff Richter, NDOT; Sondra Rosenberg, NDOT; Rose Stridland, Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter; Bill Thompson, NDOT; Kevin Verre, NDOT; Steve Volk, Truckee Meadows Water Authority

Meeting Feedback
Following a brief PowerPoint presentation, Derek Morse facilitated participants at the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County in a dialogue regarding the I-11 and Intermountain West Corridor Study.

The following feedback was provided by participants as part of that discussion.

Please describe the opportunities this Corridor could fulfill.

- Jobs
- Livability
- Tourism
- Rerouting of truck traffic around communities
- Additional truck routes
- Economic benefits
- Safety improvements
- Connectivity
- Possible additional Colorado River crossing
- Access to existing telecommunications/conduits in right of way
- Holistic view of infrastructure (transportation, telecommunications, power transmission, and other needs the Corridor might be able to accommodate)
- Power corridors
- Spur new development in rural areas
- Wildlife accommodations
- New bicycle routes
- Nevada as innovator
- Advanced planning may provide opportunity for new/alternate funding streams
- Right of way for high speed and commuter rail and transit
- Public-Private Partnerships – more value with multiple uses
- Ports of Entry – revenue and enforcement
• Cost savings, operations
• Travel time reduction
• Infrastructure to support future growth
• Dedicated truck lanes
• Green truck lanes (automated/driverless trucks)

Which transportation components should be included in the Corridor to fulfill the preliminary identified needs (e.g., freeway, passenger/freight rail, utility accommodations, others)?

• Robust wildlife corridors/crossings
• Integration with community fabric
• Maintain access to grazing lands and provide for movement of agricultural equipment
• Rest stops/Visitors services
• Cultural wayfaring
• Access for mining operations and equipment movement
• Military operations and heavy equipment movement
• Preserve natural drainages, springs, and waterways
• Automated/driverless truck lanes
• ITS/traveler communications
• Maintenance considerations
• Uniform commercial vehicle types and permits

How would you define success in terms of future implementation of this Corridor?

• Safety/accident reduction
• Economic growth for Nevada
• Improved system reliability/reduced delays
• Increased freight efficiency/cost effectiveness
• Improved flow of goods and people
• Revenue from users – utilities/rest stops
• Maximizing revenue streams
• Understanding and appropriately meeting demand
• Demonstrated value to all users – taxpayers, businesses, other interests
• Consider all costs both direct and indirect
• Substantially pays for itself through user fees

What are the challenges facing the implementation of this Corridor?

• What are the lifecycle cost impacts?
• Funding
• Public acceptance
• Environmental constraints
• Is there really a need? Duplicative? (Don’t I-5 and I-15 serve this need already?)
• Industry acceptance
• Minimizing community fragmentation
• Overcoming potential Tribal concerns
• Minimizing environmental impacts
• Right of way acquisition/preservation
• Changing demographics
• Economic shifts
• Maintaining relevance
• Political shifts
• Meeting needs for 50, 100, 200 years? (electric cars, rail, etc)

Questions
Who designated US 93 as an Interstate corridor?
US 93 between Phoenix and Las Vegas was designated as Interstate 11 by the U.S. Congress. This designation does not include US 93 north of Las Vegas. The study will address potential improvements within the officially designated I-11 corridor as well as a potentially extending the corridor north to Canada and south of Phoenix to Mexico.

Is there a proposed route between Phoenix and Las Vegas?
The focus is on the existing US 93 corridor but the study team will be looking at all possible options for this segment. We may find that it would be most cost-effective to upgrade the existing US 93, but other alternatives will be evaluated to determine how to best meet the current and future needs.

Would additional bypasses be included?
The study will be evaluating the various options, including potential bypasses.

What is the study horizon?
Would depend on the specific segments. Generally speaking we are looking at a 20- to 50-year horizon.

Wouldn’t this just be an unnecessary duplication of I-15?
The segment from Phoenix to Las Vegas would work in conjunction with the I-15 system. The study will evaluate if a multimodal corridor continuing through Nevada north of Las Vegas would be a viable alternate route to potentially reduce future strain on the I-15 system.

Would the project include additional bypasses?
Possibly. The study will help to determine the current and future needs.
Surprise, Arizona Meeting Summary Report

City of Surprise Communiversity
15950 N. Civic Center Plaza
Surprise, AZ

Attendees (47):
Diane Arnst, ADEQ; Diane Arthur, City of Surprise; Brian Babiars, WACOG; Steve Boyle, Town of Wickenburg; Chris Bridges, Central Yavapai Metropolitan Planning Organization (CYMPO); Pamela Cecere, SWCA; John Cook; Sam Crissman, Town of Wickenburg; Mike Cronin, El Dorado Holdings; Kathleen Depukat, Bureau of Land Management; Jim Dickey, Arizona Transit Association; Patricia DiRoss-Coughlin, Salt River Project; Ian Dowdy, Arizona Wilderness Coalition; Mark Eckhoff, Town of Florence; Chris Fetzer, NACOG; Peggy Fiandaca, PSA; Thomas Fisher, City of Tucson; Charlene Fitzgerald, Yuma Metropolitan Planning Organization; Janeen Gaskins, City of Surprise; Woody Grantham; Skip Hall, City of Surprise; Craig Heustis, Town of Buckeye; Thomas Hulen, Friends of the Sonoran Desert National Monument; Reed Kempton, City of Scottsdale; J Kenny, El Dorado Holdings; Megan Kintner, ADOT; Bill Knowles, Arizona Game and Fish Department; Audra Koester Thomas, PSA; Diane Landis, City of Litchfield Park; Carlos Lopez, ADOT; Georgia Lord, City of Goodyear; Brian McAchran, Town of Buckeye; Christine McMurdy, City of Goodyear; John McNamara, AECOM; Jackie Meck, Town of Buckeye; Michelle Rider, WESTMARC; Thomas Ritz, City of Glendale; Karen Savage, City of Surprise; Judie Scalise, ESI Corporation; Sally Stewart, ADOT; Ray Strauss, Town of Buckeye; Timothy Tait, ADOT; Tim Wade, Arizona Game and Fish Department; Marisa Walker, CANAMEX; Sharon Wolcott, City of Surprise; Kelly Wolff-Krauter, Arizona Game and Fish Department; Larry Yount, LKY Dev. Company, Inc.

Meeting Feedback
Following a brief PowerPoint presentation, Peggy Fiandaca facilitated participants at the Surprise Communiversity in a dialogue regarding the I-11 and Intermountain West Corridor Study. The following feedback was provided by participants as part of that discussion.

Please describe the opportunities this Corridor could fulfill.

- Connecting the west valley along the corridor and ultimately connecting to Las Vegas. This will be transformational for the west valley. This corridor will allow us to be more competitive with our neighbors in California and New Mexico
- Connecting transportation and economic development produces jobs, jobs, jobs
- I-11 will bring traffic and customers from California, Utah, New Mexico and Mexico
- Finalize and connect the CANAMEX
- Tourism benefit: White Tanks
- This is a statewide benefit, not just metro Phoenix.
- Great regional project that could focus on a comprehensive approach to growth could be facilitated by Arizona Commerce Authority, Westmarc and Greater Phoenix Economic Council
- Kingman evolving into a key economic activity center
- Connect to MAG freeway system
- It’s about connectivity: connect within region; connect

Photo 3: Team members Peggy Fiandaca and John McNamara solicit feedback from participants during the breakout session in Surprise
within state; connect with other states; connect with Mexico and Canada
• Provide alternative to I-15
• Could be an alternate route to Grand Canyon (name: Grand Canyon Highway)
• Growth with jobs, jobs, jobs
• Opens up Arizona bedroom communities to Las Vegas
• Include important issues with connecting to Canada and Mexico

Which transportation components should be included in the Corridor to fulfill the preliminary identified needs (e.g., freeway, passenger/freight rail, utility accommodations, others)?
• Clearly multimodal; must accommodate alternatives
• Must be looked at as not just a road; address: tourism, towns along Corridor, environment
• Passenger rail from Phoenix to Grand Canyon; benefits all towns along the way
• Major, better freight corridor
• Right of way needs to accommodate all modes (truck, cars, rail, transit, etc.)
• New freight rail; connect BNSF to UPRR
• Light rail
• Not just an Interstate (does “Interstate” designation preclude multimodal alternatives?)
• Should be a smart corridor (telecom fiber, etc.) as identified in WACOG Study
• Many alternative energy projects planned along corridor that need a transportation corridor
• Rail connectivity to Mexico (per Yuma Rail Study)

How would you define success in terms of future implementation of this Corridor?
• Connecting communities
• Positioning Arizona as a wide open, historically-based/historically-rich state
• Not becoming a pass-through state (freight logistic centers, intermodal, etc.)
• Delivers direct and indirect jobs
• Maintain wildlife connectivity (maintaining wildlife populations, supporting tourism, etc.) and ADOT as a model for such
• Paid for/financed successfully
• Well integrated; not disturbing built or natural environments
• Healthy activity centers along Corridor
• Total environmentally-friendly “green” Corridor
• Smart corridor, incorporating all technologies
• Previous and ongoing studies fully integrated (frameworks, bqAZ, Connecting NV) into I-11 study

What are the challenges facing the implementation of this Corridor?
• Bypassing Wickenburg could be a major economic impact to the community; I-11 must support “host” communities
• Address wildlife connectivity (travel ways, habitats, etc.); species and habitat studies are always an afterthought; should be included as a part of the design
• Fulfill PEL requirements
• Maximize many uses in same corridor (smaller footprint)
• How to get across facility
• Need more “buy-in” at executive and legislative levels of state governments
• Where will entry points be to Mexico?
• Could be a scenic corridor
• Funding; potential opportunities include managed lanes, tolling, etc.
• Must be tied to an economic strategy to take advantage of opportunity
• Water impacts of induced developments
• Air quality/non-attainment areas
• Traffic investigation, pullouts
• Alternative energy generations; plug-ins for trucks
• Context sensitive solution approach; design integration
• Take advantage of best technology in planning
• Getting around Wickenburg and Vulture Mountains
• Quality of life impacts (pluses and minuses)
Webinar Meeting Summary Report

Meeting conducted via Live Meeting and teleconference

Attendees (76):
Pawan Agarwal, Bullhead City; Jennifer Albert, City of Yuma; Dana Anat, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation; Sandy Bahr, Sierra Club; Cody Beeson, City of Yuma; Steve Betts, Arizona State University; Brent Billingsley, City of Maricopa; Fausto Burruel, Pinal County; Hon. Irene Bustamante Adams, Nevada State Legislature; Lissa Butterfield, Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority; Randal Cagle, NV Energy; Craig Chenery, Maricopa Association of Governments; Jennifer Daigre, CH2M HILL; Daniel Doenges, Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization; Kelly Dole, City of Phoenix; Patricia Dross FRT; David Ebeling, City of Phoenix Aviation; Encore-Anderson; David Fanning, Nye County Nevada; Sonna Lynn Fernandez, Idaho Transportation Department; Joshua Gaboton, ADOT; Jim Garza, White Pine County; Charla Glendenning, ADOT; Jason Gray, Las Vegas Alliance; Mark Griffin, Central Arizona Association of Governments (CAAG); Kazi Haque, City of Maricopa; Bob Havlett, Las Vegas Alliance; Candice Hein, CH2M HILL; Tiffany Hesser, Clark County; Damon Hodge, NDOT; Kevin Igo, City of Phoenix; Brett Jones, Arizona Contractors Association; Timothy Kanavel, Pinal County; Michael Keeling, Keeling Law Offices; Suzanne Kinney, Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry; Jean Knight, Central Yavapai Metropolitan Planning Organization (CYMPO); Pete Konesky, Nevada State Office of Energy; Robert Lang, Brookings Mountain West; Greg LaVann, Greater Yuma; Teresa Lopez, Salt River Project; Kevin Louis, City of Casa Grande; Angie Martin, United States Postal Service; Dan Marum, Wilson & Company; Julie Maxey, NDOT; Clifton Meek, U.S. EPA, Region 9; Eric Miskow, Nevada Natural Heritage Program; John Mitchell, City of Eloy; Farhad Moghimi, Town of Sahuarita; Carolyn Mulvihill, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Gilbert Olgin, Town of Florence; Tim Oliver, Maricopa County; Tod Oppenborn, Nellis Air Force Base; Tom Peterson, Clark County Department of Aviation; Dave Pfordt, Town of Sahuarita; Giao Pham, City of Apache Junction; Tony Rivera, NDOT; Heather Roberts, City of Eloy; Kara Roberts, Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce; Lloyce Robinson, Town of Youngtown; Jack Ryan, CenturyLink; Matt Ryan, Coconino County Board of Supervisors; Thomas Sassone, CenturyLink; Sean Sever, NDOT; Bob Shriver, City of Fallon; Martin Shultz, Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck; Leah Sirmin, Federal Highway Administration, Nevada Division; Andy Smith, Pinal County; Tom Sockwell, Mohave County; Ed Stillsing, Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Division; Kevin Thomason, ALPO Gas Corp.; Kevin Thompson, Southwest Gas Corporation; Randy Travis, NDOT; David Welsh, Tucson Regional Economic Opportunities; Kevin Wilkins, Yuma County; Mike Willett, Yavapai County

Meeting Feedback
Following a brief PowerPoint presentation, Jennifer Daigre solicited feedback online regarding the I-11 and Intermountain West Corridor Study. The following feedback was provided by participants as part of that effort.

Please describe the opportunities this Corridor could fulfill.

- Connects the two largest metropolitan areas not linked by an Interstate.
- The possibilities are essentially what’s been outlined in the fact sheet.
  - Connecting communities, major trade hubs, existing and future domestic and international deepwater ports, and intersecting transcontinental roadways and railroad corridors.
  - Enhancing the economic vitality of communities connected and served by the corridor.
Improving safety and travel time reliability for the movement of people and goods throughout the Intermountain West.

Providing relief for congested north-south corridors in the Western United States, such as I-5 and I-15.

Enhancing commercial opportunities by linking trade between Mexico and the Intermountain West.

Increasing the global competitiveness of the region.

- It could facilitate economic development opportunities, specifically related to turning the Southwest into a commercial cargo hub. We anticipate a lot of development to follow be spawned by the creation of this corridor. This is key to increasing the flow of international trade through the region.
- We are very concerned about the impacts this corridor will have on the lands of western Arizona and what it will do to our state. Are these kinds of transportation plans sustainable either economically or environmentally? We do not see a great deal of opportunity here.
- Concerns with fiber optics with economic development and other services along the corridor.
- The opportunity of this corridor could be far-reaching and could have a positive impact on the entire western portion of the United States. As a state north of this corridor, I can see positive impacts for Idaho as goods and services move north to Canada and south to Mexico. Connecting high-priority corridors will strengthen our economy and ability to move products.
- Utilizing transportation and utility right of way to create common corridors has many benefits in this region and beyond.
- The bigger collaboration of agencies and partners will increase federal funding opportunities.
- Higher utilization of the Port of Entry at San Luis, AZ.
- We are seeing opportunities related to air cargo.
- Looking at future expansion in Nevada beyond Las Vegas could allow a second North-South Rail line to be developed. The SWIP power line could provide a potential alignment.

Which transportation components should be included in the Corridor to fulfill the preliminary identified needs (e.g., freeway, passenger/freight rail, utility accommodations, others)?

- Through populated areas, I think it’s important for utilities to have dedicated right of way crossings to allow facilities to extend across/under the highway structure. Perhaps every mile to two miles.
- Initially a highway and utility function. When the corridor gets to Idaho, it would seem better to switch to Boise and go north from there. If US 93 would be continued it would be awfully close to I-15.
- Freeway should be the core component. Freight rail is important as it relates to the movement of goods. Ideally, there would be smooth connectivity between these two modes to get freight to its final destination as efficiently as possible. Managing utility accommodation is critical to moving the project forward as well.
- This is the first real opportunity for a new Interstate to be developed after the construction era. We recommend that Arizona and Nevada take advantage of developing a true multimodal facility and include as much as is feasible, but make sure it is sustainable. The corridor between Las Vegas and Phoenix would be a prime location for high-speed rail. Other areas could be added to the Las Vegas high-speed rail hub as funding becomes available, such as between Los Angeles, Denver, Salt Lake City, etc. Consider including rail/freight intermodal facilities to get products on to rails and off highways.
• Better ground connectivity between hub and reliever airports along the corridor, multimodal connectivity centers (e.g. air, rail, freight, and freeway).

• It should look at how the corridor will increase carbon emissions and other pollutants and how that will impact communities and the west. What are the impacts on air quality? Freeways contribute to poor air quality time and time again. It should consider impacts on wildlife and wildlife corridors – already we are looking at trying to reconnect areas that have been negatively affected by existing freeways and highways. Overpasses or underpasses might help mitigate this in certain locations, but there would be a serious cumulative negative impact to wildlife from this proposed corridor.

• Fiber optic, rail and transmission lines should all be part of any right-of-way developed. But I would suggest the project to also lead toward development in rural communities to help support the “rural America” campaign in providing economic opportunities for rural areas to leverage projects like this to help drive population from metropolitan areas over-burdened into rural areas.

• All three currently identified (vehicle, rail, and utility). I would also add water, and as an offshoot of rail, I would note high speed rail.

• This facility should focus on the movement of cargo with rail and truck traffic with non-cargo traffic as the next level of importance. This effort should also include planning for rail/truck yards for the transfer of cargo. On the higher level discussion on connections to Mexico should include the new Port of Entry in San Luis as an alternative connection from Mexico to Phoenix.

• Freeway, along with any necessary utility accommodations (to link Vegas and Phoenix), as well as ports/freight/rail (to facilitate commerce).

• All modes and mode transition. Whenever possible, freight/truck separation. Connectivity needed to east west as well. Wildlife protection corridors needed.

How would you define success in terms of future implementation of this Corridor?

• Success would be judged by the collaboration you have begun... how well people and agencies were included throughout the planning and development process. And lastly, success will be judged by the users—how easily they can access their destination, the truckers and their ability to move products, the rail facilities being able to get product transferred, the transmission lines to areas that need services...

• City of Phoenix Aviation Department will be conducting an air cargo study beginning this November. The study will analyze the feasibility of additional air cargo development at Phoenix area airports. We see this as a possible component in this study.

• Success would be that this was not built and that we learned how to work more efficiently and effectively with what we have already built, seeking to mitigate some of the damage and thinking realistically about the impacts of climate change and real economic and environmental sustainability. This type of corridor is a very outdated way to look at transportation and is the kind of project that requires enormous amounts of capital, natural and otherwise.

• The US Postal Service would view this project as being successful if it in any way decreased the amount of time required to get from point A to point B with freight (rail or truck). We would consider this project successful if it was a divided highway, decreasing the incidence of head-on collisions for our truck drivers. The current roads are primarily one lane each way.

• The project provides critical transportation linkages in an area of the country that is currently underserved. We are better able to take advantage of the trade and commercial opportunities available. The project would include linkages to the border with Mexico and be a true North American corridor. In sum, economic development is enhanced in both urban and rural communities.
• Having diverse components will create jobs; improve our economy while connecting cities, towns, states and countries. Also this will bring international attention to the region, which spawns investment opportunities in the West.
• The project should be able to achieve its greatest success if it’s able to stay within existing BLM rights of way already in place to limit the amount of environmental disturbance but most importantly, where it can provide the most applicable uses where those uses do not exist now. Example, what right of way exists now that could use a rail line, fiber optic, power transmission and/or new highway access improvements where a current path lacks most of thoughts improvements now, still connecting Mexico to Canada as a final benefit to the line?
• Success would facilitate transportation of goods and services while protecting the environment, it would also allow increased access for recreational opportunities such as hiking and backpacking which could promote additional land preservation.
• Success would be utilizing agricultural and mining activities to move the products from the source to the eastern border of the state more efficiently.
• Interconnectivity occurs between communities throughout the state system. Mode shift from vehicle to rail (high speed) between metro areas. Easy transition (seamless) occurs between modes. Smart highway incorporated into this design. Freight distribution enhanced through state enhancing our economies. Freight delays reduced moving goods while reducing carbon footprint. Costs will not drawdown away from other communities in the State. Environmental impacts reduced.

What are the challenges facing the implementation of this Corridor?
• Funding will be the largest obstacle. The other will be meeting all environmental issues/requirements.
• The map indicates that I-11 would stop short of Phoenix and not connect to another Interstate. If this is true, I see this as a challenge.
• The key challenges will be funding and environmental compliance. Secondary challenges will be interagency cooperation.
• Funding. Developing a public-private partnership maybe necessary for implementation.
• The largest challenge would be financing and another would be right of way if existing rights of way are not used. The use of fossil fuels is a challenge, but this corridor could extend the length of the network providing for natural gas trucks and reduce the use of diesel. Look at impacts that a new Interstate has on the economics of the surrounding areas.
• Enormous costs and significant environmental impacts are two of the biggest challenges. I hate to sound like a broken record here, but should we continuing to promote a fossil fuel based transportation system when we know it is harming our health, harming the planet – remember the southwest is ground zero in North America for climate change impacts, and destroying wildlife habitat and connectivity that is even more critical in light of climate change. I would reiterate the air quality issues as well.
• The biggest challenge I see will be community approval of a corridor at different county lines and how the overall benefit of the project will outweigh the costs and potential loss of public land space. You will need to educate the community on potential job cluster developments along the corridor and how this project will improve the use of resources and reduce waste per private transportation costs. Look at the industry that leads each county and identify avenues the county can capitalize on opportunities.
• Paying for it without it drawing money needed away from other parts of the state system. Reduction of impacts to the environment, wildlife, etc. Concern about impact on economies of
areas not on this corridor. Need for linkage between east west corridors and communities. Seamless transition between modes truly coordinated. Converting mode shift from auto to rail.

Questions
How can White Pine County play an active role in expressing its interest to see the Northern Nevada Corridor be aligned with the SWIP 500kV Power Line right of way granted to NV Energy and LS Power recently and use the same right of way to produce the I-11 corridor within the 1,000 foot right of way issued by BLM from Las Vegas to Idaho as an alternative to going to Reno?

Next year in late Spring the project will initiate the study of specific segments of the corridor, including: Phoenix Metropolitan Area (Casa Grande to Wickenburg), Northern Arizona/Southern Nevada (Wickenburg to the Arizona/Nevada state line), Las Vegas Metropolitan Area (Arizona/Nevada state line to Las Vegas), Northern Nevada Future Connectivity Segment (Las Vegas Metropolitan Area and Beyond), and Southern Arizona Future Connectivity Segment (Mexico to Casa Grande). We will meet with stakeholders who have an interest in each of these segments.

How much of this project is being funded by federal dollars?
There is approximately $2.15 million of federal funds appropriated to the “planning” phase of this $2.5 million study. Although the recently enacted federal transportation legislation “Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21)” designates I-11 and recognizes the need for a future Interstate between the Phoenix and Las Vegas metropolitan areas, it does not guarantee future funding. This designation however does elevates the importance of the proposed route, improving its chances for obtaining federal funds should the project warrant further consideration.

How much is the estimate of the cost of the Las Vegas-Phoenix portion?
At this early planning stage of project, we do not have study alternatives developed yet hence we do not have estimated construction costs available. The study team anticipates having preliminary order of magnitude cost estimates for implementation of the Las Vegas-Phoenix portion developed later in the study process (anticipated in early 2014). A unique element of this project is the development of a Business Case. The goal of this Business Case is to help determine the value of the project. In addition, benefits and costs of the proposed corridor to different parties and stakeholders (e.g., private investors, freight carriers and shippers, state and local governments, residents) will be estimated using different assumptions about funding scenarios and planning options (e.g., alignment, project type). The Business Case will identify and describe projects and public policy initiatives impacting decisions, validate existing estimates of capital costs and other life cycle costs, and identify benefit and cost metrics based on a set of core objectives.
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Additional feedback provided by Stakeholder Partners through online submission

Participants (12):
Jay Aldean, Truckee River Flood Management Authority; Stuart Boggs, Valley Metro; Andrew “Butch” Borasky, Nye County; Mike Hand, RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada; Rogene Hill, City of Avondale; Damon Hodge, Nevada Department of Transportation; Joe Hornat, Town of Oro Valley; Jerry Nabours, City of Flagstaff; Dr. Joseph Pantuso, Southern Nevada Home Builders Association; Dick Powell, City of Casa Grande; Zoe Richmond, Union Pacific Railroad; Lloyce Robinson, Town of Youngtown

Feedback
The following feedback was provided by Stakeholder Partners using an online form.

Please describe the opportunities this Corridor could fulfill.
- Vital link from the Northwest Valley and Phoenix to California and Nevada
- There are very limited opportunities for Union Pacific Railroad other than perhaps bringing more business interests to the West Valley that may need rail service
- Currently for our organization, this corridor would provide additional linkage between Nevada and Arizona contractors and materials. Being in northern Nevada, I would still propose that the corridor continue heading north to Reno and Washoe County. The linkage between northern and southern Nevada would add to the overall transportation network and should be the next increment of study
- Freeway, passenger/freight rail, utility accommodation
- Corridor would link the Phoenix and Las Vegas metropolitan areas, two of the largest metro areas in the southwestern U.S. that are not linked by a direct interstate highway connection. Would contribute to the development of the CANAMEX corridor that would enhance the movement of goods between three countries, Mexico, the U.S. and Canada. Would provide the opportunity to develop multi-modal transportation options along this corridor by developing a corridor that can accommodate both road and rail modes
- Safe route to Las Vegas. Improved trade opportunities providing a north/south route from Mexico to ports north. Possible economic development opportunities for the state of Arizona
- This would be a very positive link for trade and continue new and alternate opportunities as to how and what "roads" benefit the entire area. With new corridors comes new growth: industrial, retail and homes
- Joining two major urban areas in an efficient manner. Provides economic growth opportunities
- Increased economic opportunities between Las Vegas and Phoenix and the municipalities that lie along the corridor (benefits for tourism and dialogue between stakeholders in each community). As well as the possibility of extending the corridor south to Mexico and north to Canada, thus creating a true transcontinental corridor that opens the entire Intermountain West to better movement of goods, people and services. Improved travel times with the upgrading of U.S. 93 to interstate standards (perhaps relieving congestion on heavily trafficked highways in the respective cities).
- The overall concept of the corridor connecting Mexico and points north to Las Vegas, Reno and on to Canada will influence economic development opportunities all along the corridor. Approximately 200 miles of the corridor are within Nye County's borders. Nye County commissioned a related study in 2007 that concluded the economic development potential of a north/south rail and highway corridor between Las Vegas and Reno could provide annual public
and private benefits of $2.3 billion for Nevada. The international extension of the corridor would only add to that potential

- Living in Casa Grande about 50 miles south of Phoenix, I think many are missing one of the biggest selling points for I-11. I-10 carries a tremendous amount of pass-through traffic through metropolitan Phoenix (especially truck traffic) and creates parking lot conditions often. I-11 is planned (from the information we have) to begin west of Casa Grande from I-8 to Las Vegas. The north- or west-bound Phoenix pass-through traffic can exit I-10 at the west bound entrance of I-8, then turn north on I-11 and travel on freeway to the I-10 connection west of Phoenix or continue north on I-11. It will be like having extra lanes for Phoenix. Another important aspect will be a two-way connection between San Diego and Las Vegas.

**Which transportation components should be included in the Corridor to fulfill the preliminary identified needs (e.g., freeway, passenger/freight rail, utility accommodations, others)?**

- Definitely passenger rail and a freeway
- Freeway only
- Freight and passenger travel are like “chicken and egg” scenarios. Which comes first? This is not easily answered, but at the end of the day, both are crucial and need to be explored since they are closely related – travelers follow goods, and goods follow travelers
- Freeway, passenger/freight rail, utility accommodation
- Freeway, passenger/freight rail, electric transmission line to tap into the developing solar power generating capacity in southern Arizona and the developing wind farm capacity in northern Arizona. Corridor should also include room for telecommunications conduit and possibly oil/gas transmission lines
- Freeway, passenger and freight rail lines, possibly separated tracks
- I would not object to a “toll road” for this road to assure it is built and for ongoing maintenance. However, there should be ample provision for all manner of items in the right of way, i.e. rail (freight and passenger), utility right of way, and probably a few others
- Freeway and passenger rail
- An all-of-the-above approach seems ideal – freeway, passenger and freight rail, utility accommodations, etc.
- The study should include as many intermodal components as possible, specifically, highway, rail, communications, energy (natural gas, oil, gasoline and electricity) transmission and water pipeline. Limiting the corridor study is counter intuitive. We suggest being as inclusive as possible. With regard to the proposed general routing from Las Vegas to Reno, we specifically suggest a “Las Vegas bypass” from I-15 at the California/Nevada border north to US 95 in the Lathrop Wells/Amargosa Valley area. Such a route would reduce I-15 traffic in the Las Vegas valley and enhance the flow of commerce to and through the Pahrump and Sandy Valleys

**How would you define success in terms of future implementation of this Corridor?**

- Increased activity, economy and exchange between the states and to Las Vegas
- Funding and construction
- When it is constructed. It will be utilized – it will also provide infill development in the available amount of undeveloped land along the corridor. Furthermore, establishing the corridor will prevent costly future needs to expand or develop a corridor
- Corridor is identified between Mexico and Canada, with explicit definition between Phoenix and Las Vegas. A target timeline/prioritization of segments is identified based on rational criteria (particularly volumes of freight/passenger traffic and accident history on existing segments)
• If it gets developed that would be a definition of success since funding and political support is still uncertain. Development of a truly multi-modal corridor would also be a sign of success
• Success would be its getting funded for construction and built within the next 10 years
• Seeing everyone recognizing the value and starting to turn some dirt
• More interchanges of commerce between Phoenix and Las Vegas
• Fully informed and engaged stakeholders. Positive working relationship between the core agency partners. A thorough impact assessment on the effects of the project’s construction on the environment, on travelers, on commerce and detailed plans to mitigate impacts as best as possible. Identifying and securing the funding needed to build a project that is a true transcontinental corridor. A project delivered safely, efficiently, on time and on or under budget. Safer, more enjoyable commutes between Las Vegas and Phoenix. Enhanced economic opportunities for individuals, businesses and communities along the corridor.
• Completion of the I-11 from Phoenix to Las Vegas would provide the gaming/tourist industry of southern Nevada with enhanced access to that population center. From a commerce perspective, it would complete the third leg of the Las Vegas, Los Angeles, Phoenix “golden triangle”. Completion of the Las Vegas/Reno corridor will tie San Francisco to Reno to Las Vegas and LA/Phoenix. Each of these connections will improve the flow of commerce in the Southwestern United States

What are the challenges facing the implementation of this Corridor?

• Funding, prioritization, non-competing jurisdiction, but complete cooperation
• Funding
• Numerous, including the obvious funding, geography issues. Furthermore, future development would face tremendous water challenges. Finally, political, for two fairly non-populated states
• The fact that I-17 already exists and could be improved and extended for considerably less money. The economic loss that will be suffered by the Arizona cities along I-40 east of Kingman
• Challenges can be minimized by using existing state highway corridors to the extent possible
• Funding, political support, environmental concerns, effective outreach/partnering with Native American communities. Legislative obstacles that may make it difficult to utilize State Trust land for this corridor
• The route, the environmental issues, dealing with the railroads
• I believe that aside from funding, that the environmental resistance and concerns will be overblown for a project this size and delay it years too long!
• Coordination with existing freeway systems on each end of the corridor
• The findings of the study will determine the number and extent of the challenges. For now, though, the major challenges are uncertainty about what the study will yield. This makes it hard to provide cogent answers to questions about environmental issues, project costs, construction timelines and what the corridor may ultimately look like and include.
• Funding is the obvious challenge, but as important is the acceptance of a broad and long term vision for the corridor. Our vision must be adaptive and not limit opportunities that we have yet to envision
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Fultz</td>
<td>City of Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Lowenstein</td>
<td>City of Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Landis</td>
<td>City of Litchfield Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>Billingsley</td>
<td>City of Maricopa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Kazi</td>
<td>Haque</td>
<td>City of Maricopa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Shane</td>
<td>Dille</td>
<td>City of Nogales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Arturo</td>
<td>Garino</td>
<td>City of Nogales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kissinger</td>
<td>City of Nogales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Vicki</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>City of North Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Dittmar</td>
<td>City of North Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Igo</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Ebeling</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Kempton</td>
<td>City of Scottsdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>City of Surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Janeen</td>
<td>Gaskins</td>
<td>City of Surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Skip</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>City of Surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Savage</td>
<td>City of Surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Wolcott</td>
<td>City of Surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>City of Tempe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>City of Yuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Cody</td>
<td>Beeson</td>
<td>City of Yuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Hesser</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Seawalt</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>Clark County Department of Aviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Coconino County Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Cronin</td>
<td>El Dorado Holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Kenny</td>
<td>El Dorado Holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Judie</td>
<td>Scalise</td>
<td>ESI Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Stillings</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Sirmin</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration, Nevada Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingman</td>
<td>Ammon</td>
<td>Heier</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Darrin</td>
<td>Badger</td>
<td>Focus Property Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Hiatt</td>
<td>Friends of Nevada Wilderness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Hulen</td>
<td>Friends of the Sonoran Desert National Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Dross</td>
<td>FRT?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>LaVann</td>
<td>Greater Yuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Sonna Lynn</td>
<td>Fernandez</td>
<td>Idaho Transportation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Keeling</td>
<td>Keeling Law Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Las Vegas Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Havlett</td>
<td>Las Vegas Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Kara</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>O’Callaghan</td>
<td>Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>Reisman</td>
<td>Las Vegas Monorail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Yount</td>
<td>LKY Dev. Company, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Chenery</td>
<td>Maricopa Association of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Hazlett</td>
<td>Maricopa Association of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Pryor</td>
<td>Maricopa Association of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Maricopa Association of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>Maricopa County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingman</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Latoski</td>
<td>Mohave County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingman</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>Lingenfelter</td>
<td>Mohave County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Sockwell</td>
<td>Mohave County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingman</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td>Mohave County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Fetzer</td>
<td>NACOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Boyles</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Nyhuis</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Damon</td>
<td>Hodge</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Inda</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Martini</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Maxey</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Mueller</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Coy</td>
<td>Peacock</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Richter</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Rivera</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Sondra</td>
<td>Rosenberg</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Schuman</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Sever</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Verre</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Tod</td>
<td>Oppenborn</td>
<td>Nellis Air Force Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>O'Rourke</td>
<td>Nevada Highway Patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Miskow</td>
<td>Nevada Natural Heritage Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Hon. Irene</td>
<td>Bustamante Adams</td>
<td>Nevada State Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Hon. Richard</td>
<td>Carrillo</td>
<td>Nevada State Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Pete</td>
<td>Konesky</td>
<td>Nevada State Office of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Creighton</td>
<td>Nevada Subcontractors Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td>New Nevada Resources LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Randal</td>
<td>Cagle</td>
<td>NV Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Priscilla</td>
<td>Raudenbush</td>
<td>NV Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Borasky</td>
<td>Nye County Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Fanning</td>
<td>Nye County Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Fausto</td>
<td>Burruel</td>
<td>Pinal County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Kanavel</td>
<td>Pinal County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Pinal County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Fiandaca</td>
<td>PSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Audra</td>
<td>Koester Thomas</td>
<td>PSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Lissa</td>
<td>Butterfield</td>
<td>Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Coyle</td>
<td>Republic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Hand</td>
<td>RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Kjellman</td>
<td>RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Ohene</td>
<td>RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Aileen</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Stidham</td>
<td>RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Torres</td>
<td>RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td>RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Moreno</td>
<td>RTC - Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>DiRoss-Coughlin</td>
<td>Salt River Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>Salt River Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Bahr</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Nappe</td>
<td>Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Stridland</td>
<td>Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Pantuso</td>
<td>Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association (SNHBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>Dauenhauer</td>
<td>Southern Nevada Transit Coalition-Silver Riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Southern Nevada Transit Coalition-Silver Riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Telma</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>Southwest Gas Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Southwest Gas Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Tso</td>
<td>Southwest Gas Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Cecere</td>
<td>SWCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Heustis</td>
<td>Town of Buckeye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>McAchran</td>
<td>Town of Buckeye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Meck</td>
<td>Town of Buckeye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>Strauss</td>
<td>Town of Buckeye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Eckhoff</td>
<td>Town of Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>Olgin</td>
<td>Town of Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Hornat</td>
<td>Town of Oro Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Farhad</td>
<td>Moghimi</td>
<td>Town of Sahuarita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Pfordt</td>
<td>Town of Sahuarita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Boyle</td>
<td>Town of Wickenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Crissman</td>
<td>Town of Wickenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Rui</td>
<td>Pereira</td>
<td>Town of Wickenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Lloyce</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Town of Youngtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Volk</td>
<td>Truckee Meadows Water Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Aldean</td>
<td>Truckee River Flood Management Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>Tucson Regional Economic Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Zoe</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Anat</td>
<td>U.S. Bureau of Reclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Mulvi hill</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>Meek</td>
<td>U.S. EPA, Region 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Angie</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>United States Postal Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Boggs</td>
<td>Valley Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Babiars</td>
<td>WACOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Rider</td>
<td>WESTMAR C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Garza</td>
<td>White Pine County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Marum</td>
<td>Wilson &amp; Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Willett</td>
<td>Yavapai County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Wilkins</td>
<td>Yuma County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Charlene</td>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Yuma Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encore-Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Woody</td>
<td>Grantham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Partners
Kick-off Meeting

In partnership with

Prepared by

Agenda

• Welcome and introductions
• Project overview
• Study partners, expectations, and outreach
• Vision concepts from past studies
• Work plan and schedule
• Breakout discussions
• Wrap-up
Background

• Federal transportation authorizations identified high priority corridors
• CANAMEX Corridor designated (1994)
• Corridor advanced through MAG Hassayampa and Hidden Valley Framework Studies (2006 – 2009), BqAZ (2010), NDOT/RTCSNV Boulder City Bypass (2005 and ongoing)
• CANAMEX Corridor along US 93 designated as future “I-11” in MAP-21 (2012)
• Arizona and Nevada DOTs signed an interagency agreement for a joint planning study (2012+)

What Does this Study Entail?

• Two levels of investigation:
  – Detailed corridor planning between Las Vegas and Phoenix
  – High-level visioning from Las Vegas to Canada, and from Phoenix to Mexico

• Multimodal consideration:
  – Interstate/highway, freight rail, passenger rail, and public transportation
  – Power, telecommunication, etc.
Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL)

- Serving as pilot study for both states to:
  - Identify important issues of concern early
  - Build agency, stakeholder and public understanding of the project
  - Inform the future NEPA process
    - Identify appropriate level of environmental analysis and outreach
    - Define unique study concurrence points
    - Identify when to involve resource agencies and to what extent

Previous Corridor Vision Concepts

- From past studies:
  - Provide a vital connection between Phoenix and Las Vegas
  - Promote possible intermodal linkages
  - Stimulate development of new transportation and economic development crossroads
  - Spur community and economic development in focused activity centers
  - Investigate inclusion of power, telecommunications, freight rail and passenger rail
  - Serve as the foundation of a stronger and more diversified economy for the Intermountain West
Suggested Corridor Need

• From past studies:
  – Rapidly growing population in Intermountain West which could require expanded infrastructure
  – An alternative corridor may be needed to move freight generated from expanded global trade
  – Alternative transportation choices may be needed to provide efficient and reliable travel between these two large metropolitan areas

Potential Benefits of the Corridor

• New north-south transcontinental corridor through the Intermountain West
  – Connecting communities
  – Enhancing economic vitality
  – Improving safety and travel time
  – Providing congestion relief/alternative route
  – Enhancing commercial capabilities
  – Serving the region’s businesses
Study Participants

- Stakeholder Partners meetings
  - Leadership participation
  - 4 general meetings
  - 3 geographic-specific meetings

- Focus Group meetings
  - Subject matter experts participation
  - 1 meeting per topic (follow-up as needed)

- Review and comment on key recommendations
- Be a liaison with local constituents
- Identify past planning study resources
Breakout Session - Logistics

- City of Surprise Communiversity
  Surprise, AZ
  (Facilitator: Peggy Fiandaca)

- Mohave Community College
  Neal Campus, Room 401
  Kingman, AZ
  (Facilitator: Dan Andersen)

- RTC of Southern Nevada,
  Las Vegas, NV
  (Facilitator: Bardia Nezhati)

- RTC of Washoe County
  Reno, NV
  (Facilitator: Derek Morse)

- On the Call:
  Operator Assisted Dial-In Number:
  (877) 787-5702 | Conference ID:
  30573657
  (Facilitator: Jennifer Daigre)

Breakout Questions

- Please describe the opportunities this Corridor could fulfill.
- Which transportation components should be included in the Corridor to fulfill the preliminary identified needs (e.g., freeway, passenger/freight rail, utility accommodation, others)?
- How would you define success in terms of future implementation of this Corridor?
- What are the challenges facing the implementation of this Corridor?
Breakout summaries, and follow-up questions and answers

What’s Next?

- Public meetings
  - 10/18, Henderson, NV Convention Center
  - 10/23, Burton Barr Library, Phoenix, AZ
- Focus Group meetings (early 2013)
- Stakeholder Partners meeting (Spring 2013)
- Ongoing Study Team efforts
  - Data collection
  - Draft Report: Project Understanding, Inventory, and Analysis
  - Initiate Preliminary Business Case