



Documentation of Public Meeting

Project Location

Farwell, Parmer County, Texas
Texico, Curry County, New Mexico

Project Limits

N. Curry Road C in Texico, New Mexico to 2ND Street in Farwell, Texas

Meeting Location

Thursday, October 17, 2024
4:30 – 6:30 p.m. (MST)
Texico Community Center
211 N. Griffin St.
Texico, NM 88135

Translation Services

No requests for translation services were received. Spanish speaking staff was present.

Presenters

Francisco Sanchez, P.E., NMDOT District 2 District Engineer
Louis Matta, P.E., NMDOT District 2 Assistant District Engineer-Engineering
Ayssa Trevino, TxDOT Lubbock District Environmental Coordinator

Elected Officials in Attendance

7

Total Number of Attendees (approx.)

54

Total Number of Commenters

2- official comment left
19-total feedback cards left

Contents

A. Comment/response matrix

Comment Response Matrix for US 70/84 Railroad Crossing Elimination Project

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment Topic	Response
1	Jackson Hurst	10/21/2024	Email	I approve and support TxDOT's/NMDOT's Farwell Railroad Bridge Project.	Both TxDOT and NMDOT appreciate the commenter's support of the project.
2	Brandon Embry	10/25/2024	Email	I would like to comment on the latest proposed design, and say I think it is an excellent compromise and should make big improvements in traffic flow and safety. It eliminates so many of the current choke points and will let the majority of traffic flow smoothly through our community. It will have minimal impact on businesses. Keeping the College St/ NM 108 intersection open will help with local residential and emergency traffic. Also there will be open land available along US 84 in south Texico for further business development.	Both TxDOT and NMDOT appreciate the commenter's support of the project.
3	Doug Dillon	11/01/2024	Email	<p>Dear Sirs.</p> <p>Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the 17, Oct. "Farwell" bridge presentations.</p> <p>As I have previously written, the best option would be to put the trains in the air. At least the 2 Amarillo tracks. Don't guess there's much chance of that happening. This letter will be talking about the 9, May and 17, Oct presentations.</p> <p>Is the 17, Oct. a better choice? Yes and no.</p> <p>Yes because the State Line Rd. now connects with the bypass.</p> <p>No because of the closing of the Garwood crossing. At least the College St. crossing remains open. The addition of traffic lights at this intersection will be an improvement. There needs to be traffic lights there now.</p> <p>The inclusion of pedestrian/bike access is also an improvement.</p> <p>The closing of the Garwood crossing creates a pedestrian hazard. People from south Texico and sw Farwell</p>	<p>Both TxDOT and NMDOT appreciate the receipt of the feedback provided.</p> <p>As mentioned in the presentation NMDOT will need to perform assessments to provide support that the traffic signals are warranted for any location tied to this project on their roadways. They are aware of this concern from the public and are looking forward to finding feasible analysis.</p> <p>Due to clearances for sight distance within AASHTO design standards, both departments of transportation agree that after further review and feedback</p>

			<p>who are walking to Stripes or Dollar General are not going to walk all the way to College St. They are going to cross the tracks in the area of the Garwood crossing. Thus pedestrians are going to be playing “dodge ball” with the passing trains to get to the store and back. Crossing 4 lanes of traffic will be its own interesting game.</p> <p>I find it interesting that even though BNSF claims this closing (70/84) is one of their highest priorities, they are putting up less than 3 million dollars. This on a 90 million dollar project. Doesn’t sound to me like they consider this to be very important. I’ll repeat my example of Bismarck ND. BNSF is paying 100 million dollars to replace a bridge themselves. There was plenty of local opposition and they just said we are doing it ourselves. So I repeat, if they are paying less than 3 million on a 90 million dollar project then this project isn’t very important to them.</p> <p>Amarillo highway traffic going to Lubbock will need to cross the crossings at the cemetery and the old DQ. What is to keep BNSF from blocking these crossings once the bypass/bridge is in place and saying traffic should just go on into Texico and take the bridge and then head east?</p> <p>In conclusion, thank you again for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>A proposal with College and Garwood crossings remaining open, State line rd. coming down to the bypass. Much more support from BNSF. That is a proposal worth looking at.</p> <p>Something from BNSF protecting the Texas FM 292 crossings from being blocked.</p> <p>The 17, Oct. proposal with the connection to State Line rd., the pedestrian/bike access that was an improvement. When you add in the closing of the Garwood crossing and the weak support of BNSF then I think it is a step backward.</p>	<p>from the May 2024 public meeting, there was best feasibility to close Garwood, leave College open, and install the new SH 348 to alleviate the closure of Garwood.</p> <p>Pedestrian enhancements are being considered and investigated. Understanding the pedestrian traffic, BNSF receives supplemental information to aid the DOT’s in the design of this project there is not solely financial contributions.</p> <p>The public is free to leave feedback to BNSF about train crossing closures at the Federal Railroad Administration Blocked Crossings Reporter online or by calling the service provider for that railway using the blue sign at the crossing location.</p> <p>This schematic is still in the preliminary stages and feedback and comments received are being evaluated to aid in a feasible design.</p> <p>Again, both DOT’s appreciate your submission.</p>
--	--	--	---	---