• Introduce project to new TAC members
• Update TAC on status
• Re-identify the Preferred Alternative
• Discuss next steps
• New Four-Lane Arterial from US 395 to Pyramid Highway
• Improve Pyramid Highway from Queen Way to Calle de la Plata
• Widen Disc Drive from Pyramid to Vista Boulevard
• Interchanges at the Following:
  • US 395, Sun Valley, Disc Drive Extension, Sparks Boulevard, other locations
## Progress Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEIS Completion</td>
<td>August 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC Meeting (ID Pref. Alt. 3)</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Traffic Review</td>
<td>March–October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Board Endorses Pref. Alt.</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations to Elected Officials</td>
<td>May–August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaffirm P&amp;N and Alternatives</td>
<td>May–Sept. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last TAC Meeting (ID Revised Alt. 3)</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pyramid Corridor:
• 3 Alignment Alternatives
Alternatives Moving Forward

Sun Valley Area:

- 2 Alignment Alternatives
- 2 Interchange Alternatives
Elements Common To All

Sparks Blvd. to Calle de la Plata:

Disc Dr. and Pyramid Hwy. to Queen Way:

US 395 and Parr Blvd. Interchanges:
# Pyramid/US 395 Connector

## Major Design Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arterial Alternative</th>
<th>US 395 Connector</th>
<th>Sun Valley Crossing</th>
<th>Sun Valley Interchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Off Alignment</td>
<td>North Crossing</td>
<td>At Sun Valley Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>On Alignment</td>
<td>South Crossing</td>
<td>At Sun Valley Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Ridge Alignment</td>
<td>South Crossing</td>
<td>West of Sun Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>On Alignment</td>
<td>North Crossing</td>
<td>West of Sun Valley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Map of Pyramid/US 395 Connector]
Preferred Alternative Identification: Discussion Process

Public Input → Environmental Factors → Other Factors → Identify a Preferred Alternative
Public Input Summary

- Draft EIS: two public meetings with about 230 attendees
- A total of 63 comments were received
- General comment themes:
  - Concern over property acquisition
  - Traffic concerns (rerouting, congestion, etc.)
  - Changes for homes adjacent to alignments

Findings – There is no clear preference for or against any particular alternative or alternative segment.
Environmental Issues: Environmental Justice (EJ)

- Relocations are greatest EJ impact (discussed below).
- Displaced mobile homes could perhaps be relocated, preferably nearby, lessening the disruption.
- High number (35) of EJ relocations from Alternatives 2 and 3 (from South Crossing of Sun Valley) would occur in one apartment complex. Average tenancy is 1 to 1.5 years.
- Alternatives 1 and 4 (North Crossing of Sun Valley) would disrupt established neighborhoods to greater extent.
- Alternatives 2 and 4 would have greater impact on EJ neighborhoods along Pyramid Highway.

Findings – No “disproportionately high and adverse impacts” but need to seek to minimize impacts.
### Environmental Issues: Relocations

#### Summary of Relocations by Arterial Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Type</th>
<th>Arterial Alternative 1</th>
<th>Arterial Alternative 2</th>
<th>Arterial Alternative 3</th>
<th>Arterial Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residence</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Residence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35*</td>
<td>35*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Business</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Relocations</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>203</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two units contain an estimated 35 apartments.*
Environmental Issues:
Biological Resources

- All Arterial Alternatives cross undeveloped BLM land. Vegetation impacts would be comparable for each.
- Mule deer and pronghorn use habitat in the project area.
  - Suitable habitat is disturbed and fragmented.
  - No substantive habitat loss for either species.
- All Arterial Alternatives cross newly-mapped Greater Sage Grouse habitat.
- No other special-status plants or animals would be affected by the Arterial Alternatives.
**Traffic Noise**: Alternatives 1 and 2 would have greater impacts compared to Alternatives 3 and 4. Impacts to noise sensitive receivers range between 255 to 280 receptors, depending on the alternative.

**Land Use**: Transportation improvements are consistent with local land use plans.

**Air Quality**: All Arterial Alternatives would improve congestion and, therefore, air quality.
**Environmental Issues:**

**Other Resources**

**Wetlands:** Very minor impacts; permanent wetland impacts less than 0.04 acre.

**Water Quality:** Increased potential for erosion and sediment to enter waterbodies. RTC will implement construction measures to minimize impacts regardless of alternative.

**Visual:** New visual elements such as:

- Retaining walls, screening walls and noise barriers
- Bridges, ramps, and cut / fill areas
- Street and vehicular lighting

Design elements with lowest overall visual impacts:

- Ridge Alignment (Alt. 3)
- West Sun Valley Interchange (Alts. 3 and 4)
- South Sun Valley Crossing (Alts. 2 and 3)
Engineering Issues:
Geometric Considerations

- No major differences among Pyramid Alignments.
- North Sun Valley crossing is less steep than a southern crossing – 5.5% compared to 6%.
- Interchange ramp grades tend to be less steep for the West Sun Valley interchange.
- South crossing with a Sun Valley Boulevard interchange very close to Dandini/El Rancho intersection.
- Additional local street improvements needed with northern crossing.
- West Sun Valley interchange has less direct connectivity to Sun Valley.

**Findings – Slight Benefit to WSV Interchange and North Crossing**
• Excess earthwork ranges from 1.3 – 2.6 million cubic yards
• All Arterial Alternatives attract similar volumes, although Alt. 1 attracts most.
• Pyramid Highway: 2035 daily traffic ranges from 18,000 vehicles south of Calle de la Plata to over 38,000 north of Disc Drive.
• US 395 Connector: 2035 daily traffic volume approx. 52,000 west of Pyramid Highway.
### Preferred Alternative Walk Through

#### Pyramid Alignments
- On-Alignment
- Off-Alignment
- Ridge Alignment

#### Sun Valley Crossings
- North Crossing
- South Crossing

#### Sun Valley Interchange
- At Sun Valley Blvd.
- West of Sun Valley Blvd.

---

**Alternative Elements**
**Step 1:** With approximately twice the relocations and no major performance benefits, the On-Alignment is not preferred compared to other Pyramid Alignments.

---

**Alternative Elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pyramid Alignments</th>
<th>Sun Valley Crossings</th>
<th>Sun Valley Interchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Alignment</td>
<td>North Crossing</td>
<td>At Sun Valley Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Alignment</td>
<td>South Crossing</td>
<td>West of Sun Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge Alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Step 2:** With greater impacts to established neighborhoods, only minor geometric benefits and no major performance benefits, the North Crossing is less desirable than the South Crossing.
• **Step 3:** Interchange at Sun Valley Boulevard:
  • Additional relocations
  • More excess material
  • Close to existing Dandini/El Rancho Intersection
  • Adversely affects LOS on Sun Valley Boulevard

**Alternative Elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pyramid Alignments</th>
<th>Sun Valley Crossings</th>
<th>Sun Valley Interchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Alignment</td>
<td>North Crossing</td>
<td>At Sun Valley Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Alignment</td>
<td>South Crossing</td>
<td>West of Sun Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge Alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preferred Alternative Walk Through

- **Step 4:**
  - Off-Alignment = larger visual impact than Ridge Alignment.
  - Off Alignment would result in more surplus earthwork than Ridge.

---

**Alternative Elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pyramid Alignments</th>
<th>Sun Valley Crossings</th>
<th>Sun Valley Interchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Alignment</td>
<td>North Crossing</td>
<td>At Sun Valley Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Alignment</td>
<td>South Crossing</td>
<td>West of Sun Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge Alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Arterial Alternative 3 is Still Preferred*
Pyramid/US 395 Connector

Arterial Alternative 3
Next Steps

Complete FEIS

Public & Agency Review and Public Meeting

FHWA Cost Estimate Review

Record of Decision
Pyramid/US 395 Connector

Arterial
Alternative 1
Pyramid/US 395 Connector

Arterial Alternative 2
Pyramid/US 395 Connector

Arterial Alternative 4
Purpose and Need Confirmation

• Provide improvements to serve existing and future growth
• Alleviate existing congestion problems on Pyramid Highway
• Provide direct and efficient travel routes to address travel inefficiencies
• Respond to regional and local plans
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Alternative 1</td>
<td>$528M to $584M</td>
<td>$133M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Alternative 2</td>
<td>$577M to $637M</td>
<td>$153M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Alternative 3</td>
<td>$510M to $564M</td>
<td>$123M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Alternative 4</td>
<td>$592M to $654M</td>
<td>$157M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>