

114TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 842

To amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991
to extend Interstate Route 11.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 24, 2015

Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MCCAIN) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works

A BILL

To amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency
Act of 1991 to extend Interstate Route 11.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

4 This Act may be cited as the “Intermountain West
5 Corridor Development Act of 2015”.

6 **SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

7 Congress finds that—

8 (1) Interstate Route 11 would significantly en-
9 hance for the Western United States—

10 (A) commerce;

- 1 (B) tourism;
- 2 (C) international trade;
- 3 (D) economic vitality; and
- 4 (E) competitiveness on the global stage;

5 (2) Interstate Route 11 would connect commu-
6 nities and economic systems in the States of Arizona
7 and Nevada, including—

- 8 (A) the 2 largest cities in the United
9 States without an Interstate connection;
- 10 (B) major trade hubs;
- 11 (C) existing and future domestic and inter-
12 national deep-water ports; and
- 13 (D) transcontinental roadways and railroad
14 corridors;

15 (3) Interstate Route 11 would improve safety
16 and travel time in north-south corridors of the West-
17 ern United States; and

18 (4) the establishment of Interstate Route 11
19 from the State of Arizona-Mexico border through the
20 State of Nevada and, ultimately integrating into ex-
21 isting high priority corridors of the National High-
22 way System leading to the Canadian border, would
23 enhance the economic vitality of the Western United
24 States.

1 **SEC. 3. ROUTE DESIGNATION.**

2 Section 1105 of the Intermodal Surface Transpor-
 3 tation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2031) is amend-
 4 ed—

5 (1) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph
 6 (68) (105 Stat. 2032; 119 Stat. 1213) and inserting
 7 the following:

8 “(68) The Washoe County Corridor and the
 9 Intermountain West Corridor shall generally fol-
 10 low—

11 “(A) in the case of the Washoe County
 12 Corridor, along Interstate Route 580/United
 13 States Route 95/United States Route 95A, from
 14 Reno, Nevada, to Las Vegas, Nevada; and

15 “(B) in the case of the Intermountain
 16 West Corridor, from the vicinity of Las Vegas
 17 extending north along United States Route 95,
 18 terminating at Interstate Route 80.”; and

19 (2) in subsection (e)(5)—

20 (A) in subparagraph (A) (109 Stat. 597;
 21 118 Stat. 293; 119 Stat. 1213), in the first
 22 sentence—

23 (i) by inserting “subparagraphs (A)
 24 and (B)(i) of subsection (c)(26),” after
 25 “(c)(20),”; and

1 (ii) by striking “and subsection
2 (c)(57)” and inserting “subsection (c)(57),
3 and subsection (c)(68)(B)”; and
4 (B) in subparagraph (C)(i) (109 Stat. 598;
5 126 Stat. 427), in the last sentence by inserting
6 “, and subsection (c)(68)(B), extending south
7 from the vicinity of Wickenburg to Interstate
8 Route 10 and continuing south toward the Tue-
9 son vicinity to the Nogales, Arizona region, es-
10 tablishing an international trade corridor by
11 employing Interstates in existence on the date
12 of enactment of the Intermountain West Cor-
13 ridor Development Act of 2015 or new align-
14 ments to be determined through appropriate
15 studies, and extending north from the vicinity
16 of Las Vegas along United States Route 95,
17 following alignments to be determined by fur-
18 ther study, terminating at Interstate Route
19 80,” after “subsection (c)(26)”.

○