

**The Texas Department of Transportation
El Paso District**

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project
From US 54 to Racetrack Drive
El Paso County
CSJ: 2552-04-027

**Summary of Third
Public Scoping Meeting**

Meeting Date: June 20, 2012

University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP)
El Paso Natural Gas Conference Center
Wiggins Road, El Paso, TX 79968

Prepared: September 2012

Table of Contents

Section 1 Summary of Third Public Scoping Meeting

Section 2 Comment and Response Report

Appendices

Appendix A Publications

- El Paso Times Articles & Affidavits
- El Diario de El Paso Articles & Affidavits
- Other Media Communications

Appendix B Meeting Invitations

- Sample Mailout to Elected Officials
- Mailer

Appendix C Sign-in Sheets

Appendix D Photos

Appendix E Handouts

Appendix F Exhibits

Appendix G Written Comments (Comment Forms, Letters, and Emails)

Appendix H Certified Transcript of Verbal Comments

Section 1

Summary of Third Public Scoping Meeting

Section 1

Summary of Third Public Scoping Meeting

The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) has prepared this Public Scoping Meeting Summary not in fulfillment of any specific regulatory basis, but on a purely voluntary basis.

DISTRICT / COUNTY: El Paso District / El Paso County

HIGHWAY / LIMITS: Loop 375 / US 85 (Paisano Dr.) from US 54 to Racetrack Drive

CSJ / PROJECT NUMBER: 2552-04-027

PROJECT BACKGROUND: TxDOT is developing the Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension, a project which extends Loop 375 from US 54 near downtown El Paso to Racetrack Drive near Doniphan Road. The project is located in the City of El Paso, El Paso County, Texas. The proposed project is dedicated to improving regional mobility and safety as well as providing improved connectivity on Loop 375.

STATE PROJECT; DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT LIMITS: The proposed project was originally envisioned as being federally funded and began in September 2007. However, due to the availability of state funding, TxDOT later determined to move forward with the project as a state transportation project. The proposed project limits were shortened from the original limits (US 54 to SH 20) to Loop 375/US 85 (Paisano Dr.) from Park Street to Racetrack Drive. After considering input given at the second public scoping meeting, TxDOT has further revised the project limits to US 54 to Racetrack Drive for the purpose of addressing concern about access in the downtown area. These revised limits were presented at the third scoping meeting.

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS: The proposed project would add capacity and upgrade the existing facility by providing a new four-lane, controlled access facility that may follow portions of the existing Loop 375 or US 85. The proposed project would close the gap on Loop 375 that exists from Santa Fe Street downtown to US 85. Tolling would be considered as a funding option for the primary facility; however, all current non-tolled lanes would remain non-tolled.

PROJECT NEED AND PURPOSE: The need and purpose is a key factor in determining the range of alternatives considered in an environmental document and, ultimately, the selection of the recommended preferred alternative. The need for the Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project includes:

1. **Lack of System Connectivity** – Need to complete Loop 375 to provide better connectivity around the City.
2. **Declining Mobility in the Region** – Need to provide additional infrastructure to accommodate future growth, aid in congestion relief, and improve access to the university, downtown, and medical centers.

3. **Safety Concerns** – Need to provide better incident management and provide a safer roadway in order to lower crash rates.

The purpose of the project is to improve system connectivity, to accommodate future growth by providing improved mobility and congestion relief through improved access to UTEP, downtown and the medical centers, and to improve safety and provide incident management for I-10.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT: In coordination with federal, state, and local agencies, TxDOT is preparing a State-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to identify and evaluate impacts of the various proposed solutions for the project. Through the evaluation process, a broad range of environmental issues will be studied and the findings reported, such as water quality, air quality, cultural resources, biological resources, socioeconomic conditions, community cohesion, noise, and more.

Public involvement for this project includes three public scoping meetings (held in October 2007, December 2011, and June 2012) and a public hearing. In addition, the project team is utilizing the Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) process to ensure that the design of the proposed project will fit into its physical setting and will preserve scenic, aesthetic, historic, and environmental resources, while maintaining safety and mobility.

The remainder of this report provides the details of the third public scoping meeting held in June 2012, and comments received. It is anticipated that the public hearing will be held in November 2012.

PURPOSE OF THIRD PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING: The purpose of the meeting was to provide information about the proposed project as well as to inform the public of changes since the last public scoping meeting was held in December 2011. The revised project limits as well as further access refinements in the downtown area and the New Mexico 273 area were presented. In addition, the meeting provided an opportunity for the public to review and provide comments on: the updated Need and Purpose Document, the updated Project Coordination Plan, the revised study area, the range of alternatives and corresponding evaluation criteria, the results of the alternatives screening process, and the updated recommended reasonable alternatives.

DATE OF THIRD PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING: Wednesday, June 20, 2012

MEETING LOCATION: University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP), El Paso Natural Gas Conference Center, Wiggins Road, El Paso, TX 79968

NOTICE OF MEETING: Notices were published in the following local newspapers: *El Paso Times* (English) – Sunday, May 20, 2012, and Sunday, June 10, 2012; *El Diario de El Paso* (Spanish) – Sunday, May 20, 2012, and Sunday, June 10, 2012. Copies of these notices are included in **Appendix A**.

Media coverage requests and announcements for the meeting included: a *Media Advisory*; and a *News Release* which were also distributed at the public scoping meeting to the media who attended. Copies of these notices are also included in **Appendix A**.

LETTERS TO ELECTED OFFICIALS; NOTICES TO STAKEHOLDERS AND PROPERTY OWNERS

On May 18, 2012, TxDOT – El Paso District mailed out meeting invitation letters to El Paso area federal, state, and local elected and non-elected officials as well as the cooperating and participating agency contacts. These letters provided an invitation to attend the meeting.

On May 25, 2012, a mailer that advertised the meeting was sent to over 470 property owners in the project study area and approximately 270 project stakeholders, including: nearby educational and medical facilities, neighborhood associations, community organizations, local officials, and attendees of previous scoping meetings.

An example copy of the letters to elected officials is included in **Attachment B**, as well as a copy of the mailer.

ATTENDANCE: A total of 79 people registered their attendance at the public scoping meeting. Of these, five were elected officials or representatives of elected officials, 67 were property owners, residents, and business owners, and seven were representatives of the media. Additionally, 26 project team representatives were in attendance. Copies of sign-in sheets are provided in **Appendix C**.

MEETING FORMAT: The meeting was held in an open house, come-and-go format. The meeting began at 4:00 p.m. and continued until 8:00 p.m. The open house format was utilized to allow attendees to move freely between the displayed exhibits and to discuss project details with the project team and other stakeholders.

Information packets were available at the sign-in table. The public was invited to visit a series of stations throughout the room featuring project exhibits. Stations were staffed by project team representatives who interacted with attendees and answered questions. A certified Spanish interpreter was available during the meeting to accommodate the communication needs of Spanish-speaking individuals. All exhibits were presented in both English and Spanish. No formal presentation was given.

The public was invited to submit written comments during the meeting. All attendees were informed that written comments could also be submitted at the meeting or up to ten (10) days after the meeting via mail or e-mail. Also, the public was invited to submit verbal comments; a certified court reporter was available to record verbal comments. Photos of the meeting are included in **Appendix D**.

HANDOUTS: Bilingual information packets were distributed at the meeting. Each packet contained: a Welcome Guide, a “What’s New” information page, the EIS Process and Schedule,

a Recommended Reasonable Alternatives – Segments map, and a Comment Form. Copies of the handouts provided at the public scoping meeting are included in **Appendix E**.

Media packets were also made available to members of the media present at the meeting. The media packet included the full information packet, the news release, and a CD with electronic files of all the meeting materials and exhibits, as well as the project documents including the updated Project Coordination Plan and the updated Need and Purpose Document.

EXHIBITS: Exhibits were displayed on easels and tables throughout the room, and are provided in **Appendix F**. In addition to the sign-in table and a welcome board, the following items were displayed during the meeting:

STEP ONE: Overview

- “What’s New?”
- TxDOT Mission
- “Closing the Gap” Map
- Study Area Map
- Need and Purpose
- Project Benefits
- I-10 Declining Mobility
- A document review table, featuring copies of the updated Need and Purpose Document, and the updated Project Coordination Plan
- EIS Process and Schedule

STEP TWO: Yesterday

- Project Timeline
- Public Scoping Meetings #1 – October 2007
- Three boards shown at the 2007 meeting including the Preliminary Build Alternative Tolled Concepts and the Preliminary No Build Alternatives Concepts
- Alternatives Evaluation Process
- Universe of Alternatives
- 2008 Comprehensive Mobility Plan Maps and Information
- Public Scoping Meetings #2 – December 2011
- Preliminary Build Alternatives Tolled Concepts, including the evaluation matrix and constraints maps
-

- **STEP THREE: Today**

- Updated Recommended Reasonable Build Alternatives Tolled Concepts, including constraints maps
- Focus on Western Terminus and Doniphan Extension Maps (Rail Yard B and Border B)
- Focus on Downtown Access Map
- Focus on Coles Street Interchange Map
- Project Schematics for Border A, Border B, Rail Yard A, and Rail Yard B
- Recommended Reasonable Alternatives – Segments Map

STEP FOUR: Tomorrow

- A right-of-way table
- Next Steps
- How to Comment
- Two (2) Written Comments tables
- Certified Court Reporter

STEP FIVE: Context Sensitive Solutions Process

- What is Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS)?
- How CSS Works
- Study Area and Participants Overview
- Examples of CSS Elements
- CSS Concept Evolution

COMMENTS RECEIVED: The deadline for public comment was Monday, July 2, 2012. A total of sixty (61) public comments, fifty-six (57) written and four (4) verbal, were received, as well as two similar petitions. Responses to these comments are provided in the next section of this report. Copies of all comments received within the public scoping meeting comment period are provided in **Appendix G**. The certified transcript of verbal comments given at the public scoping meeting is provided in **Appendix H**.

Attendees were generally in support of the proposed project and its schedule. Several attendees were concerned with plans in the downtown area, specifically the proposed closure of Santa Fe Street having a negative impact to businesses. Attendees noted the need for improved access along the south side of downtown. Numerous concerns were also raised regarding the proposed closed connection to New Mexico 273 and the need to maintain access to US 85 as it currently exists.

Section 2

Public Scoping Meeting Comment and Response Report

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

The following are the six questions asked in the Comment Form (please see Appendix E to view the full form).

1. For each of the updated recommended reasonable alternatives listed below, please indicate your preference by checking a box and stating any specific comments
2. Do you own/lease property within the study area?
3. Are you aware of any areas that we should avoid that are not shown on any of the exhibits? (i.e. cemeteries, hazmat sites, historic structures, etc.)
4. Do you have any comments on the updated Need and Purpose for this project?
5. Do you have any comments on the updated Project Coordination Plan?
6. Use this space to provide any additional input or concerns. Be sure to identify if your comment is related to a specific alternative.

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
1	Elizabeth Perez	<p>Alternative 1: Like Border A – Don’t interfere with Chihuahuita’s History.</p> <p>I disapprove of the exit on Campbell from the loop. Schools in the area are my main concern. Campbell is the drop off and pickup for students at Aoy Elementary.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Several options were explored in order to provide access between the proposed BHW and the El Paso Central Business District (CBD). These options sought to balance several objectives: 1) Providing fast, efficient access and reduced travel times to the CBD; 2) Implementing a high speed, limited interruption facility to complete the ‘Southern Relief Route’ to IH-10, 3) Maintain connectivity between the southern portion of the El Paso CBD and the regional transportation network.</p> <p>Designs for the BHW also have critical constraints, including rail lines, rail yards, international bridges, canals, border fence, levees, schools, public housing, and historic neighborhoods. Early comments from the City of El Paso and the Department of Homeland Security made clear that elevated facilities in the El Paso CBD, particularly in proximity to the international bridges, were not desirable.</p> <p>Schematic Concepts were developed to evaluate access to Campbell Street, Oregon</p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
			<p>Street, Mesa and Santa Fe Street. Providing access at Oregon Street was not possible as it did not provide the minimum acceleration distance due to the location of the supports for the Santa Fe Street International Bridge. While the project constraints do not allow right-in and right-out access between the proposed BHW and Santa Fe Street, the option of providing a right-in ramp from westbound BHW to Santa Fe Street was examined. However, the geometry of the ramp would not meet required design criteria for the facility.</p> <p>As a result of analyzing these design concepts and additional input from area stakeholders, TxDOT is proposing to implement downtown access via Campbell and Mesa Streets, along with construction of the Coles Street Interchange. The Coles Street Interchange would provide a pair of direct connectors between Paisano Drive and Loop 375 east of downtown. Traffic from western El Paso would be able to exit to Spur 1966, turn south onto the Spur, then turn east onto Paisano Drive to complete the trip to the CBD. The right-in at Campbell Street and the right-out access to westbound BHW at Mesa Street allows the acceleration and merging maneuvers to be accommodated within the design criteria. Downtown access was coordinated with the city of El Paso and will be further evaluated during final design of the project.</p> <p>The balancing of ingress and egress in the</p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
			downtown area through the use of a right-in at Campbell Street and a right-out at Mesa Street along with the Coles Street Interchange to access downtown from the east would remove heavy conflicts between vehicular and pedestrian traffic along Santa Fe Street and would actually allow for a more pedestrian friendly walkable community to be developed in the downtown area.
2	Genaro Solis	Alternative 1: Like More natural feel to road with least amount of interference. Alternative 3: Dislike Alternative 4: Dislike #2 Yes - Residential	Comment noted.
3	Candace Cervera-Solis	Alternative 1: Like Border A – not to interfere with Chihuahuita Neighborhood and history. Alternative 2: Like Border A Alternative 3: Dislike Alternative 4: Dislike #2 Yes - Residential #6 Close Campbell Street due to heavy traffic and very dangerous for kids from Aoy school, La Fe charter school, kids playing in the park-Boys club and Armijo.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 1.
4	Raul F. Campos	Alternative 2: Like - This is the best option. It does not split the Chihuahuita community in half. It does not affect the present businesses. Alternative 3: This option splits the Chihuahuita neighborhood in half. It puts several businesses out of commission. It also calls for demolition of a family residence. This option should not even be considered! #2 Yes - Commercial #3 Yes I operate a parking lot at 919 S. Santa Fe. Every day, hundreds of people park their vehicles on the U.S. side and walk to Juarez. We provide a necessary service. Leave parking lots where they be.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 1.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
5	Fernie Martinez	Alternative 1: Like #2 No #3 N/A #4 Expedite #5 Great Plan	Comment noted.
6	Juan M. Herrera	Alternative 1: Neutral/No Opinion Alternative 2: Neutral/No Opinion Alternative 3: Neutral/No Opinion Alternative 4: Neutral/No Opinion No-Build Alternative: Dislike #2 Yes – Industrial #3 No #4 No #5 No	Comment noted.
7	Wade Jabale	#1 Cole Street Interchange Alternative 1: Dislike – 1545-1599 Paisano in the way	Comment noted. See response to Comment 1.
8	Gene Paulk	Alternative 1: Neutral/No Opinion Alternative 2: Neutral/No Opinion Alternative 3: Neutral/No Opinion Alternative 4: Neutral/No Opinion No-Build Alternative: Neutral/No Opinion #2 No – Representing NMDOT – Impacts to NM 273 #6 The existing Rio Grande Bridge at NM273 has pedestrian access. Has the current and future pedestrian access been considered in the closing of NM 273 to US 85? I am interested in viewing comments from NM residents regarding eliminating the current access that NM 273 provides.	Comment noted. In response to public comments received at the public scoping meeting, the design concept for the western terminus of the Border Highway West (BHW) has been revised and will maintain existing access between NM 273 and US 85 through the existing Rio Grande crossing at the Corchesne Bridge. Ramps would provide connections between eastbound and westbound BHW and NM273 as well as connection to US 85. Connectivity to areas west of the BHW would be enhanced with the proposed Doniphan Drive extension.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
9	Aurora G. Esparza	<p>Alternative 2: Like – I am all for the West Extension Project however I would like for you to consider saving the Chihuahuita Neighborhood for it is a historic site and that community is very close. Some of the families have been living there for several generations.</p> <p>#2 Yes – Residential</p> <p>#3 No, but I know my house was built in 1933.</p> <p>#4 Please consider saving if not all, at least most of the properties in the Chihuahuita neighborhood.</p> <p>#5 No</p> <p>#6 I appreciate the fact that you are giving us the option to select alternatives to this project. Thank you!</p>	Comment noted.
10	McNicol Grey	Alternative 1: Like - Supports redevelopment of area adjacent to roadway the best.	Comment noted.
11	Miguel A. Rodriguez	Alternative 1: Like - This alternative will preserve Chihuahuita.	Comment noted.
12	George Salom, Jr.	<p>#2 Yes – Residential and Commercial</p> <p>#6 My concern is the negative impact a closure at Santa Fe would have on commercial activity in the downtown area, along with “closing” the west side of south downtown to and from.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>See response to Comment 1.</p> <p>The overall impacts to the downtown area are expected to be positive and will improve circulation while creating a more pedestrian friendly environment which is consistent with city redevelopment plans.</p> <p>TxDOT will continue to coordinate with the city of El Paso, the Central Business Association and other stakeholders throughout project development to maximize input on downtown mobility needs.</p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
13	T. Bory	#2 Yes – Commercial #6 We need to direct connectors to downtown at either Santa Fe, Oregon, Mesa, Kansas or Campbell from East Bound Loop 375. Also there needs to be an access road binding Santa Fe to Campbell Rather than any dead ends on the South side. Please call for clarification 532-4519.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 1.
14	No Name Provided	Alternative 1: Like – Avoid Chihuahuita exit for businesses in downtown area. #2 Yes – Residential #4 Must have exit for downtown and an axis to the border from downtown. #5 Make Kansas a two way.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 1.
15	Michelle Rodriguez	Alternative 1: Like - There are less chances of Chihuahuita being overlapped and destroyed. #2 Yes - Residential #3 Water plant #4 Avoid Chihuahuita community and giving an exit for downtown businesses. #5 I appreciate that there trying to avoid passing through Chihuahuita.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 1 and 12.
16	Blake Barrow	Alternative 2: Like – Only plan that makes sense.	Comment noted.
17	Manny’s S. Rodriguez	Alternative 1 – Like – Preserve old El Paso #2 Yes – Residential #3 Yes water treatment plant. #5 We want to thank you for all the work you have done to preserve Chihuahuita. #6 We are hoping you consider Kansas as two way for the safety of our children at Aoy and Armijo Rec.	Comments noted. See response to Comment 1.
18	El Paso Central Business Association: Dennis Melonas Director	# 2 Leader of Downtown Business Association #6 Santa Fe Street must remain open to the vehicular traffic. The <u>downtown shopping district</u> has historically <u>and</u> presently been the most economically vibrant portion of downtown. Any route that suggests a bypass of Santa Fe should not be offered by TxDOT. Anyone that comes downtown <u>historically</u> has known that Santa Fe is the Route to take to enter downtown Historically has known that Santa Fe is the route to take to enter downtown. Our downtown retail economy is at stake our 12,000 weekly shoppers attest to this.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 1 and 12.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
19	Javier Aguilera	Alternative 1: Like Great job need the relief of traffic. Alternative 2: Like Alternative 3: Like Alternative 4: Like No-Build Alternative: Like #2 No #3 N/A #4 N/A #5 N/A	Comment noted.
20	Jorge Cervera	Alternative 1: Like – Border A Border B #2 No #3 No #6 My biggest concern is the exit on Campbell St. Aoy Elementary School is located in this area. Also, there is Armijo Park & La Fe Academy School. Instead use Kansas St for the traffic going to downtown. Make the street a two way. Thank you, Jorge Cervera.	Comments noted. See response to Comment 1. See response to Comment 3.
21	Alberto Esquivel	The Loop 375 Border Highway project will not benefit traffic for our community of Sunland Park. The fact that Sunland Park Drive will be highly congested due to the fact that it will be our only exit and entrance. It won't benefit nobody instead it will just make us <u>late to work</u> .	Comment noted. See response to Comment 8.
22	Frida Porras	Time consuming routes regarding the loop can cause reckless driving which can lead to accidents. This route will delay drivers and will be a complete mess. Sunland Park community will have to take alternate routes. Drivers would end up driving the whole way around without need.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 8.
23	Darlene Esquivel	This project will cause dead end road and will leave to exit to the west. This street will be too congested and even worst with the train.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 8.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
24	Miguel Rodriguez	Alternative Border A: Best for the community of Chihuahuita. 3. Yes Chihuahuita historic structures. 4. Border A is the best option for Chihuahuita.	Comment noted.
25	Unknown	This road is the fastest way to get to the hospital during emergencies. I also don't have to worry about the train blocking the road like the way it happens a lot on Sunland Park Dr. and Racetrack Dr.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 8.
26	Unknown	I need the road McNutt to Paisano open to go to work and back.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 8.
27	Mike Calderon Landscaping	To whom it may comprehend, I Mike Calderon been in yard work for almost 25 years. I've been a resident of Sunland Park NM for the same year my line of work in El Paso, TX. I've been using this route all this time. You close this route it will affect my route of work and not only me there's a lot little businesses in this area because it is been the main route to our work and home.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 8.
28	Jesse Salom	#2 Yes – Commercial We are in support of TxDOT Border Highway and the improvements it would bring to the area. Where we are not in agreement is in the closure of Santa Fe Street. We believe this will have a truly adverse impact on business in the downtown area.	Comments noted. See response to Comment 1 and 12.
29	Alma Rosa Munoz	Alternative 2: Like – Some of the families that live in the neighborhood are elderly and it would be hard for them to start their life again somewhere else. #2 Yes - Residential (Lease Property)	Comment noted.
30	No Name Given	Alternative 1: Dislike Alternative 2: This alternative provides the smoothest connectivity from Hwy 54 to the west side. It connects to the C-D project now in progress. Allows for access to the downtown area. Alternative 3 – Neutral/No Opinion Alternative 4 - Neutral/No Opinion No-Build Alternative – Neutral/No Opinion #2 No – we need to do something in I-10 congestion.	Comments noted. See response to Comment 1. The previous I-10 Major Investment Study conducted in 1999 and subsequent Southern Relief Route Study determined that the most feasible solution to the capacity and system

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
		<p>#6 Did not see any proposals to add 1 or 2 lanes to I-10 from downtown past UTEP, ASARCO area to Las Cruces. Traffic is increasing so plans need to include more lanes.</p>	<p>connectivity issues would be to develop a southern relief route to serve as an alternate to I-10.</p> <p>The C-D Lanes project is designed to address congestion on I-10. There is also a separate, on-going TxDOT project that addresses adding a general purpose lane along I-10. The Loop 375 Border Highway Extension Project will complete Loop 375 and provide an alternate route to I-10 to balance traffic between the two facilities.</p>
31	Nelly Robles	<p>Border Highway project will complicate and delay drivers. The railroad tracks will be time consuming resulting lateness. This will affect Sunland Park Community taking different routes making us drive the whole way around.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>See response to Comment 8.</p>
32	Paloma Rodriguez and Frank Hernandez	<p>Enclosed please find 51 pages consisting of comment and 1051 signatures of people who object to TxDOT's plan to close N.M. Hwy. 273 at McNutt Rd and Paisano Dr.</p> <p>These signatures have been collected by us, Paloma Rodriguez and Frank Hernandez, who own and operate the Carousel Conv. Store.</p> <p>The closure of Hwy. 273 will destroy our business. You'll also destroy the community of Anapra, New Mexico.</p> <p>Because the residents of Anapra had no few notice of the input of TxDOT's plan on their community</p> <p>We ask that you hold a public meeting in Anapra. The parties who want to close Hwy. 273 should explain why HWY. 273 must be closed to the residents who will be damaged by this closure.</p> <p>After the public meeting, we ask that you extend the dateline for public comment.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>See response to Comment 8.</p> <p>Receipt of the petition is acknowledged. The desires of those signing the petition will be considered as the proposed project is developed further.</p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
33	Frank Hernandez	<p>My name is Frank Hernandez and I operate the Carousel Conv. Store with my wife, Paloma Rodriguez. Our business is located at 3450 Anapra Rd, El Paso, TX 79922. Your proposed closure of exit/entrance ramps at McNutt Rd. and Paisano Dr. will devastate our business since we depend on the traffic of people driving between El Paso and the Upper Valley. People from all walks of life depend on this road to go to work or to use it for leisure. So not only will it hurt us, but also all the people from El Paso and Southern New Mexico who depend on this road every day of their lives.</p> <p>The closure of this road will leave our business with no Police, Fire Dept. and 911 services. The Police, Fire Dept. and 911 services from Sunland Park New Mexico will not respond because this store is located in Texas. We know this because of experienced years back. Some kids from Sunland Park and Anapra were throwing rocks at each other in our store parking lot. We called the Sunland P.D. but they told us we were in Texas and that we had to call the El Paso Police Dept.</p> <p>We depend on this road for our business as well as the community who comprise from the El Paso and Southern New Mexico area.</p> <p>McNutt Rd, is the fastest way to get to the hospitals in case of an emergency. McNutt Rod. Is not blocked by the train like Racetrack Dr. and Sunland Park Dr. Mr. Calvo, who'll be responsible and liable if someone gets hurt with McNutt Rd and Paisano Drive are closed.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Comment 8.</p>
34	Jorge Hernandez	<p>I'm a downtown business and property owner that is in full support of the expansion of the Loop 375; however, is opposed to the street closure of Santa Fe. Santa Fe has been a lifeline to our downtown shopping district for a number of years and I feel as if this closure is going to significantly impact in a negative manner the shopping district.</p> <p>I would encourage TxDOT and the city to try to find a way to leave Santa Fe Street open. I've been in business for 30 years. Has accumulated—our family has accumulated a number of properties on South El Paso Street just recently, our two largest investments, and had we known that Santa Fe Street was going to be closed, I think our family would have been bit hesitant to make those investments</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>See response to Comment 1 and 12.</p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
		<p>in the area. So, once again, we ask that the Santa Fe Street entrance and exit of downtown into Loop 375 stay open.</p>	
35	Dennis Melonas	<p>I'm Dennis Melonas, Executive Director of the El Paso Central Business Association. I represent over 280 retail components downtown, property owners, business owners and other interested people. We've been representing the downtown merchants Santa Fe Street so I hope that our 12,000 weekly shoppers can attest to this. That's it. for over 30 years and what we want to say about this project is that Santa Fe Street must remain open to vehicular traffic. The downtown shopping district has historically and presently been the most economically vibrant portion of downtown. For the past—since the '70s. Any route—any route that suggests a bypass of Santa Fe should be offered by TxDOT. Anyone that comes downtown from the east side or west side to shop knows that they take Santa Fe to enter the district. So this will be no more if this happens. We have 12,000 shoppers a week in the downtown shopping district. Our downtown retail economy is at stake with this—with the potential bypassing of Santa Fe Street so I hope that our 12,000 weekly shoppers can attest to this.</p>	<p>Comment noted. See response to Comment 1 and 12.</p>
36	George Salom Jr.	<p>My name is George Salom, Jr. I am a property and business owner in downtown El Paso. My main concern with this project, a project that I support, is that the access for Border Highway and Santa Fe Street is not closed. It is the most important avenue for traffic, business, particularly with the revitalization projects that both the city and the business community and the residential areas of south El Paso are attempting to bring to fruition so just want to make sure that that is noted and that the conversation continues.</p>	<p>Comment noted. See response to Comment 1 and 12.</p>
37	Pastor Crespo	<p>I'm Pastor Crespo and I'm a downtown business owner right on the intersection of Santa Fe and Franklin Avenue. And the Texas DOT proposals for the closures of the Santa Fe and Border Highway existing access, to me, is not suitable. It's really unthinkable for several reasons. Right now Santa Fe is a major thoroughfare for Mexican businessmen and Mexican residents getting off the Border Highway and the international bridges onto Paisano and I-10 and vice versa, returning back to Juarez from I-10 at Paisano/Border Highway. And to limit that access is ridiculous, it hurts me as a downtown business person, it hurts downtown by reducing traffic and circumventing current downtown vehicular traffic and</p>	<p>Comments noted. See response to Comment 1. See response to Comment 30.</p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
		<p>business. That's one. It just doesn't work as a business owner, business aspect for my clientele.</p> <p>Two is, if we look at the Santa Fe area, the majority, from a dozen to a dozen-and-a-half. Street festivals are held within a three-block radius of Santa Fe and Franklin Avenue and points south down to San Antonio and San Francisco Street. These are major annual venues that occur bringing lots of traffic, lots of vehicles. Now we're closing off major egress and ingress for that area to alleviate congestion and where are they going to go? So this whole consideration doesn't work.</p> <p>My suggestion to answer both is not to exclude any current construction for the extension of 375 and not to close any egress or ingress into the area, but to include an on-and-off ramp in that area.</p> <p>Thirdly, is the city even taking into consideration this future bond issue that's coming up to vote in November? Bringing large major venues to downtown, one and although it's rumor at this point, is the arena or sports center, whatever the political term is currently that's going to occupy the spaces supposedly at city hall. How are you going to bring a major venue like a baseball stadium to the area, but you're going to limit access? So again, what are you going to do with the congestion? How are you going to alleviate it? You know, are we taking any of that into consideration.</p> <p>So we have three major issues. Me as a businessman not having the current major thoroughfare of Santa Fe, you know, which obviously brings taxes that I pay to the city. And, two is the street festivals that area all held within a three-to five-block radius of the area. What are we going to do with the congestion there? And thirdly, the downtown revitalization big bond issue. You know, limiting downtown access to Border Highway is not the answer. It's going to make congestion worse. That would be it.</p>	
38	Dennis Melonas	<p>Thank you for taking the time to come to our business luncheon on June 14th, and sharing the scope of your organization's mission. During your presentation you educated us on the Loop 375 Highway Extension West Project. We urge you to reconsider a part of the project and that would be the closing Santa Fe Street based upon the adverse ripple effect this action would have. As presented, this appears to be a great project short of one proposal item of the project. That</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See response to Comment 1 and 12.</p> <p>Receipt of the petition is acknowledged. The desires of those signing the petition will be</p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
		<p>shortfall is the prospect of having any portion of Santa Fe Street closed. A design that includes closure of Santa Fe Street would have a detrimental effect on traffic flow, mass transit, parking and most important, commerce in the downtown area. Santa Fe Street serves as a feeder /relief route for downtown, not only to customers, but employees, visitors, and local bus service, commercial transport as well as a relief route in emergency situations.</p> <p>Future plans include the potential of building a multiuse stadium or arena. Santa Fe would be vital in providing a connector to the aforementioned. Santa Fe also serves an already struggling retail market which is still reeling from other changes in downtown. A small change at one location, intersection, or street closure does have an impact blocks away. Please be cognizant of this.</p> <p>Downtown merchants are suffering, especially south of Paisano, due to the adverse factor of design changes in downtown mass transit, traffic routes, bridge inspections, and a slow retail market. A large percentage of businesses have closed.</p> <p>We ask you to revisit the plan for the extension, ingresses, and egresses, and to continue meeting with the merchants, property owners, and others impacted. Our organization will help you reach out to the people on Santa Fe, S. El Paso Street, and other streets in the area.</p>	<p>considered as the proposed project is developed further.</p>
39	Edie Zuvanich	<p>I live on the far east side. Before they started construction on the Border Highway, I drove it every day to and from work downtown. During peak hours, it was often bumper to bumper traffic, maybe 10-20% less jammed than I - 10 so it was worth doing. Then they decided to narrow it down to one lane each way in order to do the construction. Imagine cutting the number of lanes on I - 10 in half, and that's what it was like at rush hour . It actually made it worse of a drive than I - 10. So anecdotally, a lot of drivers switched over to I - 10, and others switched over to Spur 601. I personally take the Spur because it's less of a bumper to bumper mess , but it ' s longer so realistically it takes the same amount of time doing 25- 30 mph on I - 10 or 65 mph on the Spur . Meanwhile, rush hour traffic on the Border Highway is still jam packed. Now, according to what this guy said</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>See response to Comment 30.</p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
		<p>today, that traffic going to their jobs, schools, etc downtown won ' t be affected and will be able to exit at Mesa and Oregon as they a l ways have. (Santa Fe is a different story.) The real situation is at the END of the work day, when the BH is just as packed as in the morning and even WORSE on Fridays , (don ' t ask me why, something to do with the Zaragosa bridge) . Now, all the workers won ' t be able to get on the BH easily to go back east , so you'll have that huge amount of traffic trying to enter I - 10 at downtown at the 5:00 rush hour. YIKES! ! ! ! take that exit every day now as it is on my way home, since I won ' t deal with the hassle of the BH under construction, but I was hoping to get back to my slightly less hectic drive on the BH as soon as construction ended . What will happen instead is that MORE eastside commuters will try to jam onto I - 10 at downtown. Do you think they planned for that? Do we have plans to widen I - 10 from Downtown to Geronimo anytime soon? Because that will be necessary in this scenario. Got me riled up, you did! Well, there ' s my experience and comments regarding the situation . I didn't copy Mike Dipp on this because I don't have his email address.</p>	
40	Jaime Rubinstein – UETA	<p>Please accept this letter and file for record to our opposition of having any portion of Santa Fe Street closed. We have four locations in the downtown area, all in close proximity to Santa Fe Street and own property on Santa Fe Street. We have been in business and have a presence in the downtown area exceeding three decades. We recently made a significant investment in building a beautiful store at the entrance to El Paso that parallels the City of El Paso's Downtown Redevelopment plan. We believe in downtown; our associates and their families depend on the jobs we and all other downtown businesses provide. The proposed closing of Santa Fe Street will be detrimental to all downtown businesses; the impact would be of disastrous proportions. I would be glad to meet with you to discuss this matter and give you a quick tour of our stores. Respectfully, please meet with all the stakeholders in the downtown area. I am positive that a favorable option to the successful completion of this project is attainable in a win-win situation.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>See response to Comments 1 and 12.</p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
41	Monica Parra	The purpose of this email is to express my DISAPPROVAL for your plan to close off downtown and only use the Coles Street Interchange as a means to get to downtown. As a business owner, I feel that is unfair to the business owners of downtown. Wouldn't it be possible to allow some exits and entrances in and out of downtown? They do it in all other big cities.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 1 and 12.
42	Ivonne Posada	Mr. Calvo! My name is Ivonne Posada and I live in Sunland Park NM which I am a resident there for more than 30 years. I was told about the project to eliminate congestion to I-10 which is fine. What I'm against is closing down the bridge that is located on McNutt Rd. to the Border Highway. I work in El Paso TX and I travel that route every morning for many years and it would be very inconvenient if that bridge is closed down. There is MANY working people that use that route every morning to go to work. I know there is other alternatives and routes to go thru but keep in mind that those routes are very busy and hectic to take. The McNutt Rd. is much easier since it's a straight route out to get to El Paso TX. Please keep this in consideration since there is many of use that have been living here for more than 30 years and that route is a route that we would NOT like to lose.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 8.
43	Dennis Melonas	The impact of a potential closure of Santa Fe Street due to the Border Highway Extension will hurt our downtown retail market. Our El Paso shoppers have used Santa Fe would choke off our shoppers that historically come from both East West side El Paso and use the Border Highway to easily enter out shopping District. Please understand that the retail market in downtown El Paso has supported the downtown economy since the 1950's. Let's work together to make the potential closure of Santa Fe something we cannot worry about anymore. I would like to take you on a tour of the area very soon if possible. 12,000 weekly shoppers in the Downtown Shopping District is a large number that should speak volumes. Our downtown economy is at stake.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 1.
44	Brenda K. McDaniel	It has come to my attention that because of the Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension project in the works, the Anapra/McNutt Road that allows access to Paisano Drive in El Paso is going to be closed. I personally travel this road daily to go to the Carousel Convenience Store (a Texas business) and other places. The Carousel Convenience Store has been in business for 27 years. This closure	Comments noted. See response to Comment 8.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
		<p>stands to hurt or affect many that depend on this route being open for their livelihood. In this time of a distressed economy, it does not make sense to promote Government while shutting down small business.</p> <p>For convenience, the Post Office on this road is closer to me than any other in town. The others are at least 15 miles away round trip.</p> <p>Please don't make it inconvenient for Westside residents to access New Mexico & nbsp [sic].</p>	
45	Fred McDaniel	<p>I have recently heard of the McNutt Road closure (NM 273) FROM Paisano and I believe that the closure will affect many Texas residents who use this road for travel and commerce not only to Sunland park, NM but also to Santa Teresa, NM and the Santa Teresa border crossing. I live on the west side of El Paso and it would be very much out of the way to have to drive further and strain on the traffic pattern on I-10 instead of taking the more convenient route to my destinations.</p> <p>It is beyond me why the Texas Department of Transportation would want to cut off access to the city of Sunland Park on this most important route. Is the State of Texas cutting ties with southern NM especially when it is rumored that there will be a new border crossing at Sunland Park?</p> <p>I am a Past President of the El Paso County Sheriff's Posse and am frequently at our headquarters in Sunland Park for activities. The closure would be detrimental to not only our members, but also the citizens of both cities who use this road daily to travel to their destinations. This is not to mention the New Mexico church which will be at the end of the road (this Hispanic Church also serves many families from west El Paso) and a store which is in Texas will become landlocked by the closure of the bridge.</p> <p>What about the police protection of sore and church parishioners and patrons? Will TxDOT make arrangements for the police department of Sunland Park of the sheriff's office from Dona Ana County to protect Texas residents from crime? This closure should not happen.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>See response to Comment 8.</p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
46	Manuel Gameros	I attended the June 20, 2012 Public Meeting on the University of Texas, El Paso Campus. I am in favor of the Border A route for the extension of Loop 375. I also favor the Rail Yard B route for the rest of the Loop 375 Border Highway Extension project. If we must have tolls for these new roadways please install a system with no toll booths. We should have a system for the tolls to be paid on a monthly plan or tolls to be levied by using cameras	Comment noted. It has not been determined if the facility would be managed by the CRRMA or TxDOT; therefore, the applicable toll policies have not been set for the facility. TxDOT existing toll policies can be found on TxDOT's website page.
47	Jose Cadena	My name is Jose Cadena and I am a resident from Sunland Park, N.M. I am against for what you are trying to do. I like many other residents from Sunland Park use this highway every day to go to work, school at UTEP and to go downtown El Paso, Texas. This idea of doing a U-turn and leaving only one entrance to our city would create traffic chaos. I don't know where you live but if you resided in Sunland Park you would know that this highway is highly used not only by residents but for commercial trucks, and border patrol. I believe in saying "if it's working don't fix it" and I believe you are trying to destroy something this is fixed. I understand that there is going to be a meeting in regard to this matter at UTEP and I would like to know this information accurately if you don't mind. Please email me back with the meeting information and thank you for your time.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 8.
48	Robert Ardovino	I prefer Alternative 1 Border A and Border B It makes sense to me that the "Border Highway" remain as close to the border as possible, and practical. It remains an asset to the community for economic and touring purposes. I Do Not At All agree with the proposal to discontinue the entrance/exit ramps from West Paisano to/from McNutt St. Rd. 273. The connectivity it has provided for decades to the City of Sunland Park is invaluable. The neighborhood of Anapra, NM struggles daily on many different fronts and most assuredly is against discontinuing the connectivity as well. You will see the signatures to prove this. It would essential cut off the future of the neighborhood, as it would insure that no future traffic patterns flow through the community.	Comment noted. See response to Comment 8.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
		<p>It is my hope that the community will someday adopt smart-growth principals outlines in the cities 2008 Master Plan.</p> <p>As you may know the City of Sunland Park has been functioning at or below a basic level for many-many months and is unable to address this major infrastructure change in traffic patterns. I do not speak for their behalf, but do so on behalf of the 5-ish employees and the thousands clients that frequent my Restaurant, Banquet Facilities, and Farmers' Market. This connection and its convenience to UTEP, Kern Place, Rim Road, the Hospital, and downtown provide a "back way" to drive clients directly to us.</p> <p>As I have done in the past , I implore upon you not only leave the entrance/exit rams there and function, but to upgrade the entrance ramp from McNutt to insure the safety of the traveling public and uphold it to the standards of the Texas Department of Transportation.</p>	
49	Jamie Rubinstein	Please send me by email the current proposal for the above along with site maps and time-lines.	Information sent on 9/7/12.
50	Dennis Melonas	Thank you for your presentation on June 14 regarding loop 375 Highway Extension west. We want to point out that the prospect of having any portion of Santa Fe closed could have a detrimental effect on commerce downtown. We already are suffering south of Paisa no due to a large percentage of business closures. We ask you to revisit the plan for the Extension and furthermore to meet with the merchants, property owners, and others impacted. Our organization will help you reach out to the people on Santa Fe, S. El Paso Street, and other streets in the area	See response to Comment 1. Receipt of the petition is acknowledged. The desires of those signing the petition will be considered as the proposed project is developed further.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
51	Maria G. Cervera	<p>Comment submitted in Spanish; translated in English here:</p> <p>Likes Alternative 1: Prefers Borders A & B</p> <p>Traffic coming from the east to the west on Border Highway should exit at Kansas Street and not on Campbell Street.</p>	<p>Comment noted. <i>Comentario apuntado.</i></p> <p>The following is the Spanish translation to the response in Comment 1:</p> <p><i>Exploramos varias opciones para poder proveer acceso entre el proyecto BHW y el Distrito Central de Negocios (CBD, por sus siglas en inglés). Estas opciones buscan mantener el equilibrio entre varios objetivos: 1) Proveer acceso rápido y eficiente y reducir el tiempo de viaje al CBD ; 2) Implementación de una carretera de alta velocidad e interrupción mínima para completar la ‘Ruta del Sur de Libramiento’ hasta la IH-10; 3) Mantener la conectividad entre la porción sur del CBD de El Paso y la red regional de transporte.</i></p> <p><i>Los diseños del BHW también tienen restricciones críticas que incluyen líneas ferroviarias, propiedad de ferrocarril, puentes internacionales, canales, cercas en la frontera, diques, escuelas, viviendas públicas y colonia históricas. Comentarios preliminares de la Ciudad de El Paso y el Departamento de Homeland Security dejaron claro que cualquier instalación elevada en el CBD de El Paso, en particular a proximidad de los puentes internacionales, no sería deseable.</i></p> <p><i>Los Conceptos Esquemáticos fueron desarrollados para evaluar el acceso a las calles Campbell, Oregon, Mesa y Santa Fe. No se pudo proveer acceso en Calle Oregon como no existe una distancia mínima de aceleración</i></p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
			<p><i>debido a la ubicación de los soportes del Puente Internacional Santa Fe. Aunque las restricciones del proyecto no permiten acceso de entrada única y salida única entre el proyecto propuesto BHW y la Calle Santa Fe, la opción de una rampa de entrada única desde BHW hacia el oeste hasta la Calle Santa Fe fue examinada. A pesar de esto, la geometría de la rampa no conforma con el criterio de diseño requerido para la instalación.</i></p> <p><i>Como resultado del análisis de los conceptos de diseño y los comentarios adicionales de personas interesadas en el área, TxDOT propone implementar acceso al centro a través de las calles Campbell y Mesa, junto con la construcción del paso a desnivel de la Calle Coles. El paso a desnivel de la Calle Coles proporcionaría un par de conexiones directas entre la Calle Paisano y Loop 375 al este del centro. El tráfico proveniente del oeste de El Paso podría salirse para llegar a Spur 1966, voltear hacia el sur para subirse al Spur y voltear hacia el este en la Calle Paisano para completar el viaje al CBD. La entrada única en la Calle Campbell y la salida única para tener acceso al BHW hacia el este en su intersección con la Calle Mesa permiten que la aceleración y las maniobras necesarias para poder confluir con el tráfico sean representadas en el criterio de diseño. Acceso al centro fue coordinado con la Ciudad de El Paso y será examinado durante la fase de diseño final del proyecto.</i></p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
			<p><i>El equilibrio mantenido entre las entradas y salidas en el área del centro a través de la entrada única en la Calle Campbell y la salida única en la Calle Mesa, junto con el paso a desnivel de la Calle Coles para tener acceso al centro desde el este eliminaría conflictos serios entre el tráfico vehicular y peatonal a lo largo de la Calle Santa Fe. También permitiría que una comunidad que beneficia a los peatones pueda ser desarrollada en el área del centro.</i></p>
52	Laura Parras	<p><i>Comment submitted in Spanish; translated in English here:</i> I don't want Border Highway West to be closed because it would take longer to get to work and one would have to take long detours, which would waste more gas and time.</p>	<p>Comment noted. <i>Comentario apuntado.</i></p> <p>See response to Comment 51. <i>Vea respuesta al Comentario 51.</i></p> <p>The following is the Spanish translation to the response in Comment 8: <i>En respuesta a los comentarios del público recibidos en la reunión pública de consulta, el concepto del diseño para el término oeste del Border Highway West ha sido modificado y mantendrá el acceso actual entre NM 273 y US 85 a través del cruce actual sobre el Rio Grande en el Puente Corchesne. Rampas proporcionarían conexiones directas entre el BHW este y oeste y NM273, así como una conexión a US 85. Conectividad con las áreas al oeste de BHW sería mejorada con la extensión propuesta de la Calle Doniphan.</i></p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
53	Ramiro Martinez	<p><i>Comment submitted in Spanish; translated in English here:</i> I, Mr. Ramiro Martinez, do not agree with closing down the Paisano exit to the McNutt exit because that is the exit I take to go to work and that street is very important for other people. I hope it is not shut down.</p>	<p>Comment noted. <i>Comentario apuntado.</i> See response to Comment 52. <i>Vea respuesta al Comentario 52.</i></p>
54	Reynaldo Salaiz	<p><i>Comment submitted in Spanish; translated in English here:</i> I am asking please that you not shut down that part of the street, McNutt, because the population of Sunland Park, Santa Teresa, etc., etc. need to cross to take care of business. I thank you in advance.</p>	<p>Comment noted. <i>Comentario apuntado.</i> See response to Comment 52. <i>Vea respuesta al Comentario 52.</i></p>
55	Mrs. Mora	<p><i>Comment submitted in Spanish; translated in English here:</i> This road facilitates arriving without having to circle downtown El Paso, TX for those of us who live in Sunland Park, New Mexico and adjoining areas and for those who are coming from El Paso, TX to these areas of New Mexico, who also use this road. In fact, funeral processions from El Paso, TX travel this road on their way to cemeteries in Santa Teresa. For these reasons, this “road”, McNutt Road and Paisano exit/entrance should not be closed.</p>	<p>Comment noted. <i>Comentario apuntado.</i> See response to Comment 52. <i>Vea respuesta al Comentario 52.</i></p>
56	Unknown	<p><i>Comment submitted in Spanish; translated in English here:</i> The McNutt/Paisano bridge is very necessary to go to El Paso, this is the road I use to go to work, to go shopping, the hospital, Juarez. Please do not close the streets, it is very necessary.</p>	<p>Comment noted. <i>Comentario apuntado.</i> See response to Comment 52. <i>Vea respuesta al Comentario 52.</i></p>
57	Fernando P.	<p><i>Comment submitted in Spanish; translated in English here:</i> I am not in favor of this because I travel a lot on Paisano to El Paso’s downtown area. I don’t want McNutt Street to be closed down.</p>	<p>Comment noted. <i>Comentario apuntado.</i> See response to Comment 52. <i>Vea respuesta al Comentario 52.</i></p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
58	Hector S., Hector Martinez, Antonio Gonzalez, Raquel Martinez, Patricia Martinez, Moises Herrera Gallardo	<p><i>Comment submitted in Spanish; translated in English here:</i></p> <p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>This document is a protest and petition on behalf of all firms and people who are not in agreement with closing down the only crossing at McNutt Street, affecting all tenants of the Meadow Apartments and of the Carousel Restaurant, causing drivers to circle to get to Sunland Park in order to cross to the other side of the city of New Mexico.</p> <p>Petitioners' signatures: Hector S., Hector Martinez, Antonio Gonzalez, Raquel Martinez, Patricia Martinez, Moises Herrera Gallardo</p>	<p>Comment noted. <i>Comentario apuntado.</i></p> <p>See response to Comment 52. <i>Vea respuesta al Comentario 52.</i></p> <p>Receipt of the petition is acknowledged. The desires of those signing the petition will be considered as the proposed project is developed further. <i>Se reconoce recepción de la petición. Los deseos de las personas que han firmado la petición serán consideradas mientras el proyecto propuesto se continúa a desarrollar.</i></p>
59	Abel Robles	<p><i>Comment submitted in Spanish; translated in English here:</i></p> <p>2) Are you an owner or do you rent property in the study area? Yes - Is the owner of a commercial property.</p> <p>I'm in favor of improving traffic roads in the city. If this construction is done, it would affect the flow of commercial traffic to downtown El Paso, and in my case it would directly affect 8 people who would have to look for work. This source of work is 6 years old. I would prefer that this project not affect Santa Fe Street, because it is vital for this business</p>	<p>Comment noted. <i>Comentario apuntado.</i></p> <p>See response to Comment 52. <i>Vea respuesta al Comentario 52.</i></p> <p>The following is the Spanish translation to the response in Comment 12:</p> <p><i>Se anticipa que los impactos generales al área del centro serán positivos y mejorarán la circulación. Al mismo tiempo, crearán un ambiente que beneficia más a los peatones, lo cual concuerda con los planes de desarrollo de la ciudad. TxDOT continuará a coordinar con la Ciudad de El Paso, la Asociación Central de Negocios y otras personas interesadas a lo largo del desarrollo del proyecto para maximizar el tiempo en el que se puedan recibir comentarios sobre las necesidades de movilidad del centro.</i></p>

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING #3 COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

Loop 375 Border Highway West Extension Project

June 20, 2012

#	Name	Verbal/ Written Comments	TxDOT Response
60	Rodolfo Esparza	<i>Comment submitted in Spanish; translated in English here:</i> Likes Alternative 2. Comment: It's better for the neighborhood.	Comment noted. <i>Comentario apuntado.</i>
61	Amanda Esparza	<i>Comment submitted in Spanish; translated in English here:</i> Likes Alternative 2. Comment: It's better for the neighborhood.	Comment noted. <i>Comentario apuntado.</i>
62	Bartolo de Santiago	<i>Comment submitted in Spanish; translated in English here:</i> Please do not close the Sunland Park exit, I would appreciate if you took this petition into account.	Comment noted. <i>Comentario apuntado.</i> See response to Comment 52. <i>Vea respuesta al Comentario 52.</i>

Appendices available on request.