



Documentation of Public Meeting

Project Location

Farwell, Parmer County, Texas

Texico, Curry County, New Mexico

Project Limits

FM 292 and US 70/84 in Farwell, Texas to College St. and US 60/70/84 in Texico, NM

Meeting Information

Thursday, May 9, 2024

4:30 – 6:30 p.m. (MST)

Texico Community Center

211 N. Griffin St.

Texico, NM 88135

Translation Services

The in-person public meetings were conducted in English, with the availability for persons to utilize TxDOT staff for Spanish translation.

Total Number of Attendees (approx.)

58

Contents

A. Comment/response matrix

Comment Response Matrix for Farwell/ Texico Railroad Bridge Project

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment Topic	Response
1	Jackson Hurst	05/14/2024	Email	I approve and support TxDOT's and NMDOT's Farwell and Texico Railroad Bridge Project. The aspect that I love about TxDOT's and NMDOT's Farwell and Texico Railroad Bridge Project is that a relief route will be added which will improve safety.	Both TxDOT and NMDOT appreciate the commenter's support of the project.
2	Rob Pomper	05/15/2024	Email	<p>On behalf of the Farwell Chamber of Commerce, we would like to congratulate the TXDOT and NMDOT engineers for their most recent proposal for a bridge to help the folks in Texico and Farwell.</p> <p>We think the new plan solves a lot of problems and we believe our cities will benefit, while also understanding this will help motorists going through our area.</p> <p>After looking at the plans and discussing, there is only one request and one suggestion we have, if they can be done. The request: Much of the agricultural traffic that goes south of Texico heads down State Line Road. That road dead ends a block south of the proposed Highway 84. Is there any way we can extend that road to meet up with the highway?</p> <p>That would solve the problem of big trucks making the tight turn on Garwood Street, and it would also help with the heavy traffic on residential streets that get torn up quickly.</p> <p>The suggestion: It was proposed to have a stoplight at College Street and both of the highways. I presume that is to help the agriculture traffic go across the highway. We don't think the stop lights are necessary. Right now the trucks can get across the combined Highway 60-84 with minimal problems, and with the traffic divided between two roads, we think the light isn't necessary.</p>	<p>In evaluation of recommendations, NMDOT is evaluating those considerations. Any decisions will be brought upon in a revised design.</p> <p>At this time in the preliminary phases of project schematic development, evaluation of lighting and traffic signals, along with signage are not yet established. We will have these considerations valued into the final design once that phase is reached for a design alternative.</p> <p>Both TxDOT and NMDOT appreciate the commenter's support of the project.</p>

				Thank you again for taking this project seriously and working to help our small communities!	
3	Doug Dillon	05/25/2024	Email	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Farwell Railroad bridge project.</p> <p>The proposal presented 9, May was a surprise, in where it will be placed. Of the three proposals (Farwell cemetery, the bridge from 9th street in Farwell to College street in Texico and this one south of the tracks in Texico) this one (presented 9, May) is the better of the three.</p> <p>The best proposal would be to leave the surface streets alone and put the trains “up in the air” on a bridge. On a scale of 1 to 10, any proposal that takes out the 70/84 state line crossing is capped at a 5.</p> <p>Put the bypass in to take when the crossing is blocked. So much for the fantasy ideas.</p> <p>Of the 3 other crossings in Texico, it is my understanding Burlington want them all closed. NO. The College or Garwood crossings need to be kept open. Preferably both of them. In your planning of what crossing to keep open, please take into consideration the truck and agriculture equipment traffic. I figure you are getting tired of me asking about crossings and low clearance trailers and equipment. The idea of putting signals on 60 and 70/84 is a good idea. It will help with the frustration of trying to cross traffic.</p> <p>Bicycle and pedestrian traffic is another item to be considered.</p> <p>Otherwise it will just be people trying to cross the tracks and dodge trains. To me this is another reason to keep College and Garwood open (since College seemed preferred by the agriculture interests at the meeting).</p>	<p>At this time the two designs with determined feasibility and mobility are the Stateline Railroad Bridge and the Texico Elevated Bridge.</p> <p>BNSF has had communication with both agencies and has requested an evaluation to determine if additional crossings could be removed. With the evaluation to these feasible designs, the three proposed to be closed with the Texico Elevated Bridge are S. Curry Rd. C, Stateline Road, and S. Garwood St.</p> <p>Previously and viewed on the design currently is the closure of S. College St., with the same communication and feedback you are providing, project staff have considered the agricultural traffic and replaced the closure of S. College St. with S. Garwood St. to accommodate such traffic. NMDOT is evaluating the opportunity to replank the surface crossing of which may remain open to assist with low clearance vehicles.</p>

				<p>It has been repeated several times in the meetings how important closing the 70/84 crossing is to BNSF. They have even offered 5% help towards the project. In North Dakota, BNSF is replacing an old bridge in spite of local opposition to the project. They are paying for the project themselves. (It has been reported that the cost of the project is \$100 million) If the closing of this crossing it that important to them, there needs to be more than a 5% contribution. Put a zero after the 5 for 50% at a minimum.</p> <p>Just to repeat the 9, May 24 proposal is the “better” of the proposals to be presented. It looks to have the least impact on the business communities of both towns. Hopefully both College and Garwood crossings can be kept open. Consideration needs to be made for the truck and agriculture traffic. Also pedestrian and bicycle traffic. The signal lights on 60 and 70/84 (at Garwood and College) sounds good. Also making sure the crossings are flat for low clearance equipment. BNSF needs to “pony up” more than 5% if the closing of the crossings is as important to them as they claim.</p> <p>Thank you for the public meetings, your presentations, and the opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>At this time in the preliminary phases of project schematic development, evaluation of lighting and traffic signals, along with signage are not established. We will have that valued into the final design once that phase is reached for a design alternative.</p> <p>We have begun to evaluate pedestrian access along both alternatives, and once we reach the design stage that determination and location will be designed. We are evaluating both states pedestrian and bicycle plans.</p> <p>Both agencies thank you for your feedback.</p>
4	Harlin Obenshain	04/25/2024	Phone Call	<p>He thinks the bridge is needed for freight and commerce traffic. It is important to keep the traffic moving between the states and feels the local perspective should not be the only consideration. He lives in Farwell and doesn't care which design but wants a bridge over the railroad tracks. He also said that the train volume may be lower than in the past but the train length is 50% longer than before, so the amount of time the crossings are blocked is significant.</p>	<p>Both TxDOT and NMDOT appreciate the commenter's support of the project.</p>