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MEDINA COURT REPORTING
27761 County Farm Rd., Pueblo, CO 81006 (719) 948-4763

MR. DAN DAHLKE: All right, thanks everybody for coming, we're going to get started.

My name is Dan Dahlke, I'm a resident Engineer with CDOT, based out of Pueblo, I have been working on this project for about two years, and now I would like to introduce Rob (indicating).

MR. ROB FREI: So I am Rob Frei, I am the Environmental/Regional Planning Manager for this section of the State, and like Dan $I$ have been working on this project for a couple of years as well, so we'll answer your questions the best we can.

MR. DAN DAHLKE: All right. So kind of the format -- you have kind of already seen a little bit -we have got boards placed up around all over the place, so after the presentation you're more than welcome to stand up -- anyone that's part of the team please raise your hand -- you can ask any of these people a question and we'll try and get you the answer you have after this (indicating).

So we're going to do it, like I said, a brief presentation, then we're going to do public hearing. So if you would like to after the meeting you can sign up, your comment will be recorded by our court reporter. If you would like to provide a comment verbally, it's fine. Also we have a comment box in the back, you are more
than welcome to write that up, and, then, also you can e-mail them or call in on those numbers as well (indicating). And the website's on a flyer in the back. Next slide.

So project history. There was a Corridor Selection Study that happened in -- around 2000 that addressed the -- saw that we needed to improve mobility along the corridor, which then recommended that we start into the NEPA process, which we started in on the Tier EIS, which began in 2006, and actually a draft document just came out in June.

Next slide.
So as you can see, the Notice of Intent started in 2006, we had scoping and public involvement in 2006, we had an Alternatives and Environmental Analysis in 2010. Right now we're -- we're in the 45-day comment period, which is in June 2016.

After we receive all the comments and they're addressed the next step will be is we'll have a combined Tier 1 EIS and a Record of Decision -- or a ROD -- which we're expecting that will be sometime in 2017, from there we'll move on to a Tier 2 NEPA process.

So basically the Tier 1 allows us to move into a Tier 2, and a Tier 2 will all be based on funding, so we'll have smaller projects that will be
based on that.
Next slide.
So why, why did we do a Tier E -- EIS
process. Basically the project -- as you can tell, it goes all the way to Kansas, it's a huge process(sic) -or a huge project; it also gives us a better understanding of what's going to happen, both positive and negative, on all the selections that we've had.

Studying the entire corridor at once will let us set up mitigation strategies, and also using the Tiered NEPA process allows Environmental Analysis to shape the public transportation planning decisions, along with input from agencies, from the public.

Next slide.
So as you know US 50 -- the section that we're studying is down in the orange all the way from -basically I-25 all the way to the vicinity of Kansas. It's a major hub, serves as a local, regional, and national transportation hub; and also serves as the main street, as you are well aware, of nine local communities here in Southeastern Colorado.

So zooming in a little bit closer. This is our study area, so basically the whole -- that big yellow swath is what we looked at. So any -- it varied from 1 to 4 miles wide, and, you know, as I said before,

Pueblo all the way to the vicinity of Kansas state line. One big thing you want to note -- and probably we will repeat this a couple of times -- is that we excluded the Lamar reliever route, that had its own Environmental Assessment that was completed, and, so, that area we actually took -- took out of our study area.

MR. GREG KOLOMITZ: May I ask why? Or maybe not now, but later.

MR. DAN DAHLKE: Yeah. Yeah. Yes. Yeah.
MR. GREG KOLOMITZ: Okay.
MR. DAN DAHLKE: Good question. Good question, so . . .

So the purpose of the project really is -what -- what we based it on was to improve safety and mobility. As you can see with the pictures, there's -it's a multi-use highway, you know, we've got a lot of tractor -- truck traffic, tractor, farm equipment, so forth.

Safety issues along the corridor and data we compiled as part of the document from 2008 to 2012, approximately 330 crashes annually from Pueblo to the Kansas line. This crash data was actually relatively higher compared to other state av -- averages of similar corridors. Several factors that we saw was limit --
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limited passing opportunities, frequent changes in road design characteristics, and in -- and inadequate clear zones.

Next slide.
So along with that we've -- the safety part, the mobility part was inadequate mobility along the corridor has been cited as a factor that limits economic development and -- which is caused by -- a lot of it's caused by conflicting needs of the local, regional, and long-distance user, so those combined users of different types are really causing issues along that. This project seeks to improve mobility for all users by balancing mobility and access needs, all while providing flexibility to meet future -- future travel needs.

Next slide.
So the alternatives development process used, we looked at -- we looked at basically four steps. So the first step is we looked at the regional corridor location and that yellow swath that you saw in the first slides, so we looked at a north swath, which was basically 1 to 10 miles north of the existing alignment; and then we looked at the existing alignment, which was on or near the existing alignment; and we had a south option, which was basically 1 to 10 miles south of the
existing alignment. So in that first step we selected the existing location 'cause it basically better served the local and regional users.

So step two we looked at different types of transportation modes. We asked ourselves the question what types of modes of transportation improvements will meet the needs of the corridor, so we looked at rail, bus, carpooling/transportation system management, and -- and also highway. So on that one, rail, bus, and the carpooling slash transportation system management failed to address the mobility for all use -- users and provide flexibility for future traffic needs, so we selected the highway option on that.

The third step we took a look at was what type of facility, so basically using the existing highway with passing lanes, so a partial rebuild; a two-lane highway with passing lanes where we totally rebuild the whole alignment, another option where it was a four-lane with a partial rebuild; four-lane rural expressway, which was with a total rebuild; and a four-lane freeway. So looking at all of those facility types we selected the four-lane rebuild, because if we did the partial rebuild -- the -- the -- or the freeway -- there would be limited turning movements and -- with all the county roads and stuff, so local
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users trying to get across Highway 50 it would -- it would prove -- you know, not be good for them.

The fourth step that we looked at was through or around town, and, so, we asked a question what transportation improvements would be made through the communities along the corridor or around them.

So the through-town corridors were eliminated from consideration because of the impact it would have to local mobility, balance mobility for all users, and flexibility to address future traffic needs; and the around-town corridors would better meet the project's purpose and need, and minimize impacts to the community. So we're really afraid of really -- you know, put this big four-lane section through the town what would it do to the towns.

Next slide.
So the alt -- alternative analysis was conducted to determine which al -- realignment would have the least environmental impacts, so, you know, we looked through NEPA as that we always have to consider a no-build as a comparison with the build alternatives. The no-build alternative would -- includes ongoing maintenance of the pavement and bridges of the existing alignment, it also includes minor safety improvements, pro -- provisions for passing lane sections, routine
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pavement overlays, repair of any weather- or crash-related damage, and accommodates local improvements by local agencies to the US 50 corridor.

Next slide, please.
So -- and the identified preferred
alternative. The sections of preferred around-town route was (sic) also based on the Effects Analysis conducted for three environmental categories, which was the rural and agricultural, natural, community and built, and Rob will get more into that analysis next. Consideration for the quan -- quantity of the resources impacted, along with the quality, allowed the study to determine the significance of the impact. The results of the study led to recommendations on the corridor locations around each community.

So let's look at those. So we're going to do them county by county.

So in Pueblo County, just east of I-25, we had three options, one was the Pueblo Airport to the north -- sorry, I forgot the pointer -- the 47 connection, and then the existing alignment. The existing section of US 50 along Pueblo is already developed as a transportation corridor, while other alternatives would fragment agriculture and prairie habitat. Due to the significant less impacts the
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existing alignment would have compared to the other section of builds -- so on this section we actually selected the existing alignment, so you can see it's green. So the red were the two that we eliminated, and the green is our preferred; and you can't really see in the background, but the orange is kind of the existing alignment.

There's one more section which we're calling the "Fort Reynolds," which is basically the turnoff to Boone, on that one we -- we looked at going to the north and, then, swooping down into the south, and, then, building along the existing alignment. So both alignments have similar impacts to rural and agricultural environment, and the natural environment, the difference is Alternative 2 would improve safety, and minimize potential impacts to the community and built environment, so that's the one we selected on that.

And also the Fowler, so -- that was in the next county.

Next slide.
So in Otero County we had two options in Fowler, going to the north and going to the south. So one would -- basically it would be before the golf course and, then, coming back in east of town
(indicating). Alternative 1 would have fewer impacts to agricultural, while Alternative 2 would have fewer impacts to the natural environments, and each had comparative(sic) -- comparable effects on the community and built environment. Basically at this location why I put them green, both the impacts were similar, so we did not select an alternative in Fowler. So when we go to the Tier 2 we'll actually make a decision based on that. On the Manzanola same thing, we had one to the north, one to the south, we selected the north alignment. Both alternatives were fairly compare -comparable, however, Alternative 1 would result in fewer potential effects to agricultural produc -productivity, community and a built environment.

And then in Rocky Ford same thing, we had a -- a north alignment and a south alignment. You can see the south alignment basically dropped straight down and, then, headed across. So Alternative 1 was selected because it had greater potential to minimize effects to historic resources, and received greater community support during the screening process because the route is closer to the town of Rocky Ford.

Then also the same thing with Swink, you'll see we have two alternatives. This was another section where we did not make a selection because they were both
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comparable in their ability to meet the purpose and need of the project, and both have their advantages to the town of Swink. No preferred route was selected at this location, therefore, the built alternative will be carried forward -- forward until further analysis in the Tier 2.

In La Junta we actually had four alternatives, one to the north and three to the south. Basically the three to the south it just had a -different rings of trying to get around different properties and so forth. The one to the north would actually be the most environmental-damaging route because it would re -- require construction through a major floodplain, which you're all very familiar with, it was eliminated from consideration because the three other south alternatives generally lacked major adverse effects; and actually we've selected the second one, which is not quite as far to the south, it's the shortest, closest to town, and better meets the purpose and need.

And in Bent County two -- two alternatives were looked at around Las Animas, a north and a south. The Las Animas north had major access advantages that could alleviate potential social and economic effects of a bypass, combined with lesser environmental impacts, so
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of the two alternatives Alternative 1 was preferred. And then as we discussed, as you can see we've taken out the Lamar section, which was already studied as part of the $287 /$ US 50 Lamar reliever route. So we had two options in Granada as before, a north and a south, we selected Alternative 2 , which is to the south, because it has slightly less natural, and community and built environmental impacts.

And then in Holly same thing, a north and a south. Alternative 2 , which is the south alternative, was identified as the preferred alternative because it has fewer environ -- environmental impacts to the natural, and community and built environments; and, also, this alternative improves the access to 289 with 50.

All right, so benefits of the improvements. As you know we're hoping to increase safety, increase mobility for all users; we'll hopefully have increased passing opportunities, improve should -- shoulders, fewer speed reduction zones, and faster travel -- travel times.

And underneath you'll see our typical section which we preliminarily identify, which would be similar to I-25 with a 4-foot inside shoulder, two 12-foot lanes, a 10-foot shoulder, then a 12-foot clear zone is
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what we identified as our impacts.
MR. ROB FREI: Thanks, Dan.
I am going to go over the environmental resources we evaluated through this process, so kind of have them identified here in four different categories, we've got agricultural resources, community and built environment, the natural environment, and, then, other resources that don't fit into any of those other three, so I'll go through each of those in the next few slides.

But before I do that, just to give you some background on how we identify the amount of impacts to these different resources. So for resources such as rangelands, agriculture, riparian, our -- our approach was we used a 1,000-foot study area, our actual footprint would be about 250 feet, so we just assumed whatever that resource was in that corridor we'd impact 25 percent of it. So during our Tier 2 level review we would look at opportunities to either avoid, mitigate, and -- and minimize impacts to -- to -- to those types of resources. So when we move forward on these slides we'll -- it really gives you the worst-case.

The other thing to keep in mind for resources such as history, they're a lot more stagnant, don't move, if they're within the 1,000-foot corridor we just counted it. So we didn't count just the
corridor -- the cultural, archaeological -- we -- we counted up all those resources. So when we move forward you -- you'll see they'll be a little more inflated. Like I said, the -- our Tier 2 documents we'll actually be able to look at -- in this example up here pretend those would be wetlands, we might be able to squeak a route or a corridor past -- past the resources and not have any impact, so that's what we'll do during Tier 2 (indicating).

So the first ones we'll look at is agricultural impacts. This is on -- again, along the 150-mile long corridor. We have four feedlots along US 50, six produce markets, and then we have 24 canals and ditches -- irrigation canals and ditches along the corridor.

Farmlands ranges(sic) from 2,866 to 3,407(sic) -- sorry -- 3,047 acres of potential impact. And, again, the range there is due to not selecting the north or south locations at Swink and Fowler.

And then rangelands has a range between 1,790 and 2,380 acres that could potentially be impacted.

For the natural environment, wetland and riparian, we have a pretty big range there, 587 to 713 acres. Most of those are actually riparian, not wetland impacts. We looked at a very high level, we didn't do
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detailed delineations.
Wildlife habitat, 40 -- 4,287 to 4,564 acres could potentially be impacted. Keep in mind that kind of double counts your rangelands, which is(sic) wildlife habitat, it includes the wetland and riparian, and, then, it also includes a couple state wildlife areas -which we'll talk about -- we could potentially impact.

Geological and paleontological resources. There are four active mining operations along the corridor, they're all sand and gravel quarry operations, and then there's six geological formations that occur along the routes. There are no known paleontological resources identified at this level, but there's six formations that potentially could harbor paleontological resources, when we get into design or actual construction that -- that's -- when you know is when you actually hit them, so -- but we've identified six potential areas.

The next one is historic, and community and built environment. The historic resources, you've got a range from 60 to 79 historic resources. So while that's high, keep in mind that 23 to 27 -- or 20 -- 24 of these are irrigation ditches and canals which we just have determined are potentially eligible as a historical resource, so those are included there.
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We have 14 to 17 bridges on US 50 that are along the corridor that are potentially eligible as well, so that includes those.

It also includes a couple of large linear resources, the Santa Fe Trail that goes through the area, and the BNSF Railroad is also eligible as a historic resource.

The -- the remaining resources is a mix of businesses, primary residences on the routes around town, and, then, buildings associated with historic ranches, so . . .

Archaeological resources. We've got nine known archaeological sites along the corridor, those are -- really occur in two locations, one is between Pueblo and Fowler, and the other one is between La Junta and Las Animas.

And then for land use we have 13 properties that have conservation easements, and then we have 10 public properties along the corridor. The public properties include state wildlife areas, the John Martin Reservoir; a couple pedestrian trails in Holly, Granada; the Fowler golf course; and, then, it also includes indirect impacts to the Comanche National Grasslands, to Boggsville National Historic Site, and, then, Bent -Old Bent's Fort. So those could come in the form of
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change in access to those resources.
And then park lands and rec lands, a lot of repeats there. Again, it's the golf course, John Martin Reservoir, state wildlife area. There's four birding trails that use US 50 as their route. And, then again, you've got two planned trails in Granada and Holly; and then there's a small potential clip in the Granada School District as well.

Other resources that we looked at. So transportation as -- as a benefit: we would increase mobility and safety along that corridor, the whole purpose and need of -- of our project here.

Hazardous materials. We've identified 162 hazardous materials sites. What those include is -- it can include Wal-Mart, it can include fueling stations, it can include farmer co-ops, anything that holds or sells hazardous materials.

And then Section $4(f)$ is a transportation-specific law requirement that provides additional protection to public parks and recreation, historic resources, and archeological resources, so those are identified up here, they do have an added protection under the law (indicating).

And then here are the list of resources that -- that we also looked at that don't have the same
level of impact on us, so social and economic, environmental justice, water quality, climate change, aesthetics, visual, air quality, traffic noise, and energy.

So that's a summary of the broad view high level of the environmental impact, so that really concludes the -- the meat of the -- the presentation, so we'll go over the next steps again.

Comments received today and through the rest of the comment period, which ends a couple weeks from this Friday, July 29th, will be addressed in the Tier 1 Final EIS and Record of Decision, after that we'll go into looking at NEPA -- our Tier 2 NEPA projects, when we actually have construction -- so we'll actually start getting into a lot more detail, but they'll be smaller projects -- and, then, once we get that completed we'll go into project final design and -- and actual construction.

So you can provide your comments several ways. One way is to speak your public comment right after this presentation in the public hearing format. Other ways, you could speak to the -- to the transcriber privately, she'll be available here, or you can write your comments, submit it in the comment box in the back, or you can mail or e-mail those comments to us and --

MEDINA COURT REPORTING
27761 County Farm Rd., Pueblo, CO 81006 (719) 948-4763
and we will address them (indicating).
And finally -- I think finally -- how to provide your verbal comments for tonight. If you would like to stand up, speak here and have your comments noted in the public hearing format we ask that you sign in at the sign-up sheet --

MS. ANDREA GARCIA: I have that here (indicating).

MR. ROB FREI: -- it's over here, Andrea's holding it up there (indicating). We'll give you about five minutes or so to do that.

Then you guys can come up here, we'll give you three minutes time to make your comments, ask your questions, there's no deferring of your time to someone else, and, of course, please be respectful.

Also please clearly state your -- your name and -- and where you're from before beginning your comment so we know how to address your comment in the Tier 1 FEIS -- Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision.

So we'll leave this last slide up in case you want to write it down for the project website or for the e-mail -- your -- your comments to the Atkins e-mail address there.

So we'll give it about five minutes, that way
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anybody that wants to come up here and speak in a public hearing format, we'll -- we'll get started here in about five minutes.

MS. ANDREA GARCIA: Right, and I'll just put the sign-up sheet in the back on the table (indicating).

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: What about the questions, do we need to sign up?

MR. ROB FREI: Yes, so -- good -- good
question. So after we go -- get through the public hearing format, you saw the multiple CDOT and Atkins folks that are around here, we can address your question one-on-one (indicating). Anything you ask us out -- out on the floor that's not in the -- one of the formats that we've talked about won't be identified in the final document, but, yes, you're more than welcome, we're here till 2:00.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: If you want to ask a question and you want it recorded you have to do the comments.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: What about if you just want clarification, do you need to sign up?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: What about questions?

MR. ROB FREI: So questions and answers will
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not be in the public hearing format, you will -- we will have CDOT and Atkins consultants that will be roaming around that will address your comments, if you have a specific question you need to ask it on the microphone here.

MR. MARTY McCUNE: Specific questions might be relevant to everybody in the room is the point, so . . .

MR. ROB FREI: No, I absolutely agree with that, but that's the way the NEPA process works, is you can ask a question, we take our time, we address it in a public format appropriately and, then, that gets put into the actual document, the Final EIS/ROD -- Tier 1 EIS and ROD for public consumption, it becomes part of the public record.

So if you have a specific question please ask it here, you have a sign-up sheet over there; if you want something a little more off the record we'll be floating around (indicating).

If you think of a question between now and then please pick up a comment form and either e-mail it to us, mail it to us, or drop it in the drop box.

Thank you.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Question?
MR. ROB FREI: We can ask questions, we're
not going to do it in a public format here. UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: You just gave them mixed messages. I don't know, maybe I didn't hear you the second time. You gave a mixed message, we're going to take questions at the microphone, and then you said no --

MR. ROB FREI: No.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- that's a mixed message.

MR. ROB FREI: No, you can ask a question and we will answer your question in the final document that's going to be published in about six months to a year from now, if you have other questions that you don't want in the public hearing format or part of the public record we will be floating around for the next couple of hours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay.
MR. ROB FREI: Okay?
MR. KERRY FRITZ: I think everybody wants it on the public record, we want to discuss it openly and not individually and, then, have a person to respond. I have -- I have one question. Where's the money coming from?

MR. ROB FREI: That's a good question, we can talk about that after.
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MR. KERRY FRITZ: Well, I think everybody wants to know where the money's coming from. Does anybody want to know where the money's coming from?

MR. ROB FREI: We'll give you five minutes to -- I would be happy to answer that question.

MR. KERRY FRITZ: I know where the money's coming from, I want you to tell them (indicating). No, you tell them where the money's coming from. Who you are associated with.

MR. ROB FREI: I am associated with the State.

MR. KERRY FREI: No, he's associated with the same international group that's bringing in the -- the immigrants that you don't want to live beside, okay? They -- they -- apparently, according to the record, they feel guilty, the Swiss, for staying neutral in World War II. That's a bunch of crap.

I just came back from Europe, all those people that are imported here are already in Europe walking down four-lane high -- or two-lane highways as en masse. I'm talking -- I'm talking five miles back you can see people walking through Europe because someone is advertising that the Swedish women want men, okay (indicating)? Now, the Swedish women aren't -aren't advertising that they want men, other than the
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So this -- these people are not your friends. They're -- they're -- they're Colorado residents, but they're hired by international -- you don't know what's going to happen two weeks after you approve anything, they could fire these people, they're out on their cans, and you get a bunch of international forces moving in here telling you where to go.

I just got -- I'm all frickin' for the future-- (inaudible) -- I just happened to end up in this town, in this town. If you don't know where the Las Animas familius is then you look back in history. This is Las Animas, I am the Las Animas familius, in other cultures I'm called by different names.

In Russia the Santa Claus doesn't wear a red suit with an old lady, he has a green suit on with a bunch of young ladies around, okay?

You're -- you're living in a future prophecy basically --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Your three minutes is(sic) up.
(A break was taken.)
MR. ROB FREI: All right, so I have -- we have first on the list Mr. Wallace.
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MR. TOM WALLACE: Do I need to come up there, or can I just ask my question from here (indicating)?

MR. FREI: You -- you can -- I think it's -as long as you're nice and loud, I think that's fine. As long as the court reporter can hear you I think we're good, so . . .

MR. TOM WALLACE: Okay.
MR. ROB FREI: Just -- just again keep in mind we're not going to be able to answer your question here.

MR. TOM WALLACE: Right.
MR. ROB FREI: I can an -- try to answer your question afterward off the record, and then we'll formally answer it in the FEIS/Rod document.

MR. TOM WALLACE: Is this okay?
MR. ROB FREI: Perfect.
MR. TOM WALLACE: Tom Wallace, I'm a Bent County Commissioner. All I want to know right now -(applause) -- is with this expressway is there controlled access, or is it just like we are now? You know, on -- on the expressway, what kind of access is on the expressway?

MR. ROB FREI: So Dan Dahlke will be able to answer that question for you offline --

MR. TOM WALLACE: Okay.
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MR. ROB FREI: -- and then we'll answer it formally in -- in the final document.

MR. TOM WALLACE: And then my other question is what kind of build is an expressway, is it four lanes together or are they separate lane -- or directions separate (indicating)?

MR. ROB FREI: Okay.
MR. TOM WALLACE: So that -- on the width of right-of-way --

MR. ROB FREI: Okay.
MR. TOM WALLACE: -- on that. Do I need to ask him (indicating)?

MR. ROB FREI: We'll -- we'll answer your question in the formal document and then, yes, we'll be able to answer your question here in just a moment, so . . .

MR. TOM WALLACE: Thank you.
MR. ROB FREI: Thank you.
The other person $I$ have is a Mr. McCune.
MR. MARTY McCUNE: Okay, my name's Marty McCune, from La Junta, Colorado. So the question I'm curious about with these bypass routes around the town is(sic) there going to be additional efforts put in to create connections? Like, for instance, in La Junta you're going south of town, there's a highway and San
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Juan Avenue that goes south of town, I don't want either of those in their current condition to be access corridors into town unless they're improved as well, so . . .

I -- and I work across all of Southeast Colorado so I have the same question for every one of these communities, because I know -- I'm assuming that the old 50 will be a business route, but you're still going to have other connections in each of these towns that will need improvements, so . . .

MR. ROB FREI: Thank you.
Is there anyone else that -- it looks like we've got a couple more folks, so I'll just let --

MR. GREG KOLOMITZ: You want me to sign up?
MR. ROB FREI: That would be great.
I'll have the next person come up and introduce themselves. What is your name?

MS. LAURA HECKMAN: Laura Heckman, I live at McClave, and we farm, and through this we would end up losing our home and -- both homes, and also farmland, and I didn't know how you guys handle that, because, you know, the farmland --

MR. KERRY FRITZ: Bent County is a debtor, I'm the secured-party creditor, I handle whatever you -if you want to move out I'll take care of that.
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MS. LAURA HECKMAN: Okay, let me continue. And, so, I didn't know, again -- especially with farmland you're losing your income, that farmland, and, so, I didn't know how you're going to handle that. Also I was just curious why was not 287 looked at, because that's where your heavy traffic is, and $I$ could see the real benefit for that to be a four-lane because it has so much traffic on it and it's already set up to be -- you know, for carrying traffic, so that's why I was asking that question.

So -- and, then, also on historical, I know -- we have a historical schoolhouse, and would that just be -- it just -- yeah, 'cause it's going to be right in the middle of the highway 'cause it's right next to the highway, so . . .

Anyway, those are my questions.
MR. ROB FREI: Thank you.
I think we have another gentleman.
MR. GREG KOLOMITZ: Thank you. My name is Greg Kolomitz, I'm from La Junta. I live in La Junta.

First of all, I appreciate the attempt today to look at Southeast Colorado, that's a good thing I guess.

I would like to state for the record that I believe any project of this magnitude needs to include a
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Economic Impact Study in terms of what the diversion of traffic away from the existing corridors through the towns along Highway 50 -- what that diversion of traffic would mean to the communities in terms -- in terms of economic impact, I would like that to be addressed. Thank you.

MR. ROB FREI: Thank you.
Miss Pointon(sic)? Pointon?
MS. JENN POINTON: Pointon.
MR. ROB FREI: Pointon.
MS. JENN POINTON: My name is Jenn Pointon, I'm a resident of Las Animas, a life-long resident of Baca County, so . . .

One of my questions -- that has come up a couple of times from my family and stuff -- is I know that you guys are strictly for Highway 50 East in this corridor, but is the same consideration going to be done through the mountains, or is this just another way of taking the rural and just kind of taking what you want, so to speak? Because we are rural and we are a smaller community and stuff like that.

Also, how is the -- I think he kind of addressed it -- but how do you decide what the socioeconomic impact is? Because like it was stated before, we do depend on outside, of course, we can't
survive without them in these small communities, and by diverting the traffic you're going to eliminate a lot of the resources and the income that these communities depend upon.

So those are my two questions, thank you.
MR. ROB FREI: Thank you.
I have Mr. Fritz.
MS. BRITTANY PAYTON: He just left.
MR. ROB FREI: Okay.
Is there anyone else that would like to

```
    speak?
```

(No response.)
MR. ROB FREI: Okay. Well, thank you for coming.

MS. ANDREA GARCIA: Oh, and -- do you just want to say afterwards they can have a private . . .

MR. ROB FREI: Oh, yeah. So thank you for coming.

Like I said, we will be walking around, please stop us if we can answer some of the questions that were asked here tonight -- or this -- this afternoon the best we can, and then we'll address them formally in -- in the document; and then if you have a question that you want recorded you can have the transcriber -- you can sit down with her and -- and she
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    1 can take your comment, we can address that as well
```

    2 (indicating).
    3 So thank you for coming.
    4 (Presentation was concluded.)
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#### Abstract

PRIVATE COMMENTS WERE TAKEN BY COURT REPORTER AS FOLLOWS:


MR. RICK KLEIN: My name is Rick Klein --K-l-e-i-n -- and I want to first say thank you to CDOT for trying to improve Highway 50 East and making us a part of Colorado by four-laning it, it'll improve the safety, mobility, but also give us a chance economically to compete with different communities in Colorado as far as bringing companies in. We have had numerous companies that won't even give us a look because we do not have four-lane from I-25 coming out, and if we can get this between 287 and I-25 on this corridor done I believe that Southeast Colorado will be possible.

*     *         *             *                 * 

MR. MARTY McCUNE: Marty McCune from La Junta. My preference would be that if they develop the four lanes they do it in sections between the towns and do the bypasses as the last bit around each town. So basically develop the four-lane infrastructure in between the communities and then do the bypasses as the last step. That's it.
(End of private comments.)
(The proceedings were concluded at the hour of 12:20 p.m.)
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MR. DAN DAHLKE: All right, I would like to thank everyone for coming. My name's Dan Dahlke, I'm a resident Engineer with the Colorado Department of Transportation, I'm based out of Pueblo --

MS. KATHY GARCIA: Closer to the mike.
MR. DAN DAHLKE: -- I'm from Pueblo, and I'd like to introduce Rob Frei.

MR. ROB FREI: Hello, my name's Rob Frei, I'm the Regional Environmental and Planning Manager that helped with this NEPA document, I've been working on this project for about two, two-and-a-half years.

MR. DAN DAHLKE: All right, so a little bit about tonight's meeting. There's a document right over here that's for -- if you'd like to review it, if -there's also a lot of locations --
(Microphone turned on louder.)
MR. DAN DAHLKE: Thank you. Perfect. Yay.
There's a list of other locations where the document's available. It's also available on our website -- we'll post that at the end of the slide show -- where you can also go and see the document.

There's comment forms also around the table, so if you would like to comment you can provide a written comment and stick it in the -- the box over there (indicating).
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We'll also give a -- a presentation, give a -- verbal comment that will be given at the end of this presentation that the court reporter will take your comment; and also, if you don't want to give a verbal comment you will able to do that with the court reporter afterwards one-on-one if you would like to do that (indicating).

Next.
So a little bit of project history. The Corridor Selection Study was the beginning stages of develop -- developing a corridor-wide vision for the future of the highway, and was to improve safety and mobility in the Lower Arkansas Valley -- Valley. The study concluded that transportation improvements are needed along US 50, and recommended that the corridor be reviewed under a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Study, which started in 2006 .

And a little bit of the schedule. So we had a Notice of Intent in January of 2006, we had scoping and public meetings starting in February of 2006, we had an Alternate -- Alternatives Evaluation and Environmental Analysis that started in 2010, and we just published the Draft Tier 1 Environmental Impact Study in June, and currently it's under the public comment period; and the next steps after that will be to do a
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combined Final Tier E -- 1 EIS and Record of Decision -or a ROD -- which we hope to have done by mid- to end of 2017.

Next slide.
Since the corridor is 150 miles long funding will not be available all at once to implement documents for the entire corridor, so we looked at a Tiered NEPA process which allows CDOT to keep Environmental Analysis current as funding becomes available.

Study of the entire corridor at once gives CDOT a better understanding of mitigation strategies, and the ability to maximize financial investments and mitigation efforts corridor-wide.

Using a Tiered NEPA process also allows the Environmental Analysis to shape transportation planning decisions, along with input from agencies, and you, the local public.

Next slide.
As you know, US 50 is a coast-to-coast highway. This corridor study specifically looks at US 50 from just east of I-25 all the way to the Kansas border, or the proximity of the Kansas line. As you know, it's a major local, regional, and national corridor serving east/west travel through the Lower Arkansas Valley, Southern Colorado, and beyond. The
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corridor links two major north/south transpor -transportation routes of I-25 and 287. This also -- US 50 also serves as the main street for nine communities in Colorado east of Pueblo.

So zeroing in a little bit more on the -- the project study area. You can kind of see the yellow band, and that's the -- the study that we looked at, it ranged from 1 to 4 miles wide. The -- specifically the US 287/US 50 reliever route was separated out of this because it had its own environmental study as you should know. The reliever route study analyzed US 287 and 50 routes that go around the Lamar community. So that is the east section that -- we didn't study the whole section from Pueblo all the way to Kansas.

The purpose for the proposed improvements along US 50 corridor is to improve safety and mobility for all users.

Safety issues. Data compiled from 2008 to 2012 showed approximately 330 crashes annually from Pueblo to Kansas line. The crash data observed showed this corridor to be relatively higher compared to other state averages of similar corridors. Several factors are likely to contribute to this, including limited passing opportunities, frequent changes in road design and characteristics, and inadequate clear zones.
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Next.
The purpose for the proposed improvements along US 50 corridor is to improve safety/mobility for all users. The inadequate mobility along the corridor has been cited as a factor that limits ec -- economic -that limits economic development. The mobility was mostly caused by conflicting needs of local, regional -- regional, and long-distance users, and also numerous uncontrolled access points along Highway 50.

The project seeks to improve mobility for all users balancing mobility and access needs, while providing flexibility to meet future travel demands.

So -- al -- alternative screening. So we -we did four steps to complete this -- the screening process, which are outlined using four questions.

So in step one on our regional corridor location we asked at a regional level where would transportation improvements be needed. So we looked at a north regional corridor, which varied from 1 to 10 miles north of the existing alignment; we looked at an existing alignment, which basically followed on or near the existing alignment; and we also looked at a south option, which varied from 1 to 10 miles south of US 50. So under that first step we analyzed the existing corridor was selected based on the location, better
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serving local and regional users of US 50.
The next step is -- we looked at is what types of mode -- modes of transportation improvements would meet the needs of the corridor. We looked at rail, bus, carpooling/transportation system management, and highway. The rail, bus, carpooling/transportation system management failed to address the safety issues, mobility for all users, and provide flexibility for future traffic, the highway option was carried forward because it fully addressed all of the needs.

The third step we -- and the question we asked is what type of facility would meet the needs of the corridor. We looked at two-lane with passing lanes, which is a partial and total rebuild; we looked at a four-lane highway, we looked at a four-lane rural expressway, and also a four-lane freeway.

The facility types without median refuges, or basically a median, are -- the two-lane options and four-lane option would not improve the ability for local users to cross and turn left onto the highway, so -- a four-lane freeway would severely limit the number of locations/crossings that the local access would have, for these reasons a four-lane expressway was identified as a preferred facility to carry forward.

The fourth and final question we talked
about -- or discussed was either through town or around town, and what transportation improvements would be made through the communities.

The through-town corridors were eliminated from consideration because of the impact it would have to local mobility, balance mobility for all users, and flexibility to address future traffic needs; the around-town corridors would better meet the project purpose and need for -- and minimize community en masse.

So we also looked at what alternatives to be evaluated. The Alternatives Analysis was conducted to determine which of the alignments would have the least environmental impact. In accordance with NEPA a no-build alternative is included to provide a basis for comparison with the build alternatives. For this project a no-build alternative includes ongoing maintenance of pavement and bridges on the existing US 50 alignment; it also would include planning minor safety improvements, provisions for passing lane sections, routine pavement overlays, repair of any weather- or crash-related damage, and accommodates local agency improvements to the US 50 corridor.

The section of the preferred around-town was based on the Effects Analysis conducted on three environmental corridor categories: rural and
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agricultural, natural, community and built. Consideration for the quantity and resource impacted, along with the quality, allowed the study to determine the significance of the impact. The result of the study led to recommendations on corridor locations around each community. We're going to look at that next.

In Pueblo County there were two sections we looked at. There's a -- there were three alternatives looked at around Pueblo, we had Pueblo north, Pueblo existing alignment, and a Pueblo State Highway 47 connection. The existing section of US 50 in Pueblo is already developed -- a developed transportation corridor, while the other alternatives would fragment agriculture and prairie habitat. Due to the significantly less impacts the existing line would have compared to the other build alternatives the existing line is preferred along US 50 corridor.

So as you can see the green section is the preferred and the two red are the eliminated alternatives.

They're also indicated on this board, so afterwards you're more than welcome to come and take a closer look at them (indicating).

On the Pueblo to Fowler built alternatives we looked at Fort Reynolds, which is along the existing
alignment, and, then, also the realignment, so -- Fort Reynolds is also close to where the Boone turnoff is -so I guess we included that. So we looked at -- both alignments had similar impacts to rural and agricultural environment, and the natural environment, the difference to Alternative 2 would improve safety and minimize potential impacts to the community and built environment, leading this alternative to be identified as the preferred alternative.

Next in Otero County we had the Fowler built, and as you notice both of them are green. Alternative 1 would have -- so Alternative 1 is Fowler to the north, Alternative 2 is Fowler to the south. Alternative 1, or to the north, would have fewer impacts to the agricultural, while Alternative 2 would have fewer impacts on the natural environment, and each has comparable effects on the community and built environment. Since both have tradeoffs no preferred alternative was identified in Fowler, and both were -will be carried forward to the Tier 2 document.

Manzanola. Manzanola north is Alternative 1, Alternative 2 is Manzanola south. Both alternatives were fairly comparable, however, Alternative 1 would result in fewer potential effects to agricultural pro -productivity, and the community and built environment.
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In Rocky Ford we also had a north and south alignment. Alternative 1 was just to the north, would have greater potential to minimize effects to the historic resources, and received greater community support during this screening process because it's not as close to the town of Rocky Ford.

Swink is our other section that we didn't provi -- select a preferred alternative. Both alternatives were comparable in their ability to meet the purpose and need of the project, and both had their advantages to the town of Swink. No preferred route was selected at this location, therefore, both of those alternatives will be carried forward.

In La Junta we actually looked at four alternatives, we had one to the north and three to the south. Alternative 1, to the north, would result in the most environmental-damaging route because it would require construction through a major floodplain, it was eliminated from consideration because the -- the three other south alternatives generally lacked major adverse impacts. Alternative 2 is preferred because it's the shortest, closest to town, and meets the purpose and need.

Next.
In Bent County we had two alternatives around
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Las Animas, one -- I guess we're calling it to the north and one to the south. The north alternative has major access advantages that could alleviate potential social and economic impacts of the bypass, combined with lesser environmental impacts. Of the two alternatives Alternative 1 was the preferred alternative.

In Prowers County, as mentioned before US 287/US 50 reliever route study was already conducted for routes that go around the community.

In Granada we had two options, north and south, we picked the south option. Alternative 2 was identified as the preferred alternative because it has a -- slightly fewer natural, and community and built environmental impacts.

In Holly we had north -- Holly north and Holly south. Alternative 2 was identified as the preferred alternative because it has fewer environmental impacts to the natural, and community and built environments; also this improves the access from State Highway 89 to US 50, and vice-versa.

And last, benefits of the improvements. The project improvements will address the existing concerns throughout the corridor as previously mentioned, and it offers the following benefits: increased safety, mobility, passing opportunities, improved shoulders that
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will meet current standards, and fewer speed reductions with faster travel times.

Rob is up next.
MR. ROB FREI: Thanks, Dan.
So I'm going to talk about the environmental resources that we evaluated during this Tier 1 document. As you can see on that slide there we covered kind of four separate categories, agricultural, community and built environment, natural environment, and then there's other resources we looked at that didn't really fall into either one of those categories, and we'll go over that here in just a moment.

So this slide here shows kind of how we went about evaluating our impacts to the varying resources. So this graphic up here illustrates that we have a 1,000-foot wide alignment corridor, but when we actually go to -- go forward with construction we're only going to need about 250 feet of that.

So the way we assessed our impacts would be -- if -- if this was Rocky Ford, for example, here, we just calculated the acreage of -- of what was in that 1,000-foot corridor and, then, we took 25 percent of it to make up for that 250 -foot wide swath for actual construction.

So when we move forward in the next slides
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you'll see our impacts are pretty big, please keep in mind that when we actually go to that Tier 2 level document that we will be looking at avoiding those resources if possible, minimizing our impacts, and, then, mitigating for those impacts. So this is great for -- gives you an idea of how we evaluated the wetlands, agricultural resources, ranchlands, those sorts of resources.

For resources such as history, archaeological resources that fall within that 1,000 -foot corridor can't really divvy them up, give them a percentage, so we included everything, so -- and we'll be talking about that here in the next few slides.

So the first one is -- that -- that we looked at is agricultural impacts and agricultural infrastructure. So along the 150-mile corridor there is(sic) four feedlots along US 50 , six produce markets, and then 24 irrigation canals and ditches. Again, when we actually get into that Tier 2 level design and evaluation we'll look at ways to avoid, minimize, and, then, mitigate our impacts.

The next one there, on -- on farmlands you can see there's a range of 2,866 to 3,047 acres. The reason for that range is because we haven't fully identified our preferred alternative at Swink and

Fowler, so that's why there's a range there.
And then the rangelands as well, it's estimated to be between 1790 to 2380 acres of potentially impacted ranchlands. Again, it's over on a 150-mile long corridor.

The natural environment. Wetland/riparian potential impacts range from 587 to 713 acres. Most of that is estimated to be riparian. We did not do a full delineation for this level of document, that level of detail will be done during the Tier 2 level review.

And then wildlife habitat ranges from 4,287 acres to 4,564 acres. So, again, that's not really new acreage, that includes the -- the rangeland, which is wildlife habitat, it includes the wetland/riparian areas, and, then, it also includes the couple of state wildife areas that we could potentially impact along the corridor.

Also along the corridor are five -- four mining operations consisting of active sand and gravel quarries, and, then, there are six geological formations that have the potential to produce paleontological resources. No known paleontological resources are known to be impacted, but we won't know until we get into final -- final design, then -- oftentimes you don't find out you're impacting something until you actually get
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into it, so -- but we've identified what those locations are.

The next one is community and built environment. So the first one there is -- is historic, and you'll notice that it ranges from 60 to 79 historic resources could potentially be impacted. So of these resources we've got -- 24 of them are irrigation canals, which we have just determined have the potential to be historically eligible, so that's where a large percentage of that number comes from; and, then, we also had 14 to 17 bridges that would be replaced along the corridor, along the 150 miles, those -- those have been identified as being potentially eligible as well. We also have a couple of long linear resources, you have the Santa Fe Trail and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad that parallels much of US 50; and, then, the remaining historic properties include some businesses, residences, and, then, buildings associated with historic ranches.

Archaeological resources. There are nine known archaeological sites identified along the corridor, they're really -- they've been identified as really occurring only between two -- two segments, one is between Pueblo and Fowler, and the other is between La Junta and Las Animas.
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For land use there are 13 conservation easements along that corridor and then there are 10 public properties as well, and the public properties include a couple of state wildife areas, the John Martin Reservoir, the golf course in Fowler, a couple of pedestrian trails in Holly and Granada; and, then, dir -- indirect impacts to the Comanche National Grasslands, the Boggsville National Historic Site, and Bent's Fort as well, and those direct impacts would primarily be related to potential changes in access.

And then for park lands and recreational a lot of the same resources would be impacted, again John Martin Reservoir, the golf course in Fowler, a couple of state wildlife areas, the trails in Granada and Holly; and, then, also there are four birding trails that have been identified along US 50 as well.

Other resources that we looked at were transportation, hazardous materials, and Section 4(f).

So transportation, and the whole purpose of why we're doing this, is to increase mobility and safety so that when we go into construction that's the -- the benefit of -- of this project.

Hazardous materials, you see there are -- 162 hazardous material sites have been identified along that corridor. To give you an idea of what hazardous sites
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may contain it could be a Wal-Mart that actually has household chemicals that you purchase, it could be the farmer co-op, fertilizers, anything that stores hazardous materials. So it -- it's -- it's a broad range of -- fueling stations is common along the corridor as well.

Section $4(f)$ is a transportation-specific law that provides additional protection for public parks and recreation areas, it also provides additional protection to historic resources and -- and archaeological resources. So that -- that's what Section $4(f)$ is. So other resources we looked at with minimal -- minimal impact include environmental justice, water quality, climate change, aesthetics, visual, air quality, traffic noise, and energy.

Social and economic conditions are kind of hard to assess at the Tier 1 level 'cause we don't have a lot of design at this point, and we also have different community make-ups along the corridor, so we'll be taking a -- a bigger look at social and economic impacts when we get into the Tier 2 level documents.

So the next steps. So comments received tonight and throughout the rest of the comment period will be responded to and addressed in the Tier 1 Final
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EIS and Record of Decision, so public comment period extends through till July 29th.

When we get the Final EIS and ROD done we will go into the Tier 2 NEPA documents, so those could range from categorical exclusion, which are more simpler projects, those might be more appropriate before the improvements between towns in EA or a potential EIS, when we start getting into more level of detail in design it could be more appropriate for the routes around towns; and, then, once those projects get wrapped up we'll actually go into construction.

So comments tonight. You can -- after this presentation we'll take a 5, 10-minute break, let you guys -- whoever wants to give a public comment in the hearing format will be able to do that. If you want to speak your -- your comments privately, the court reporter will be available afterwards and you can do a one-on-one with her as well (indicating).

You can also submit written comments tonight. There's forms over here, and, then, you can submit those into the comment box, or you can e-mail or mail those before July 29th as well (indicating). More information on that $I$ think is in a couple of slides from here.

So for those that want to provide verbal comments in the hearing format the way it will work is
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we'll ask you to sign up over where you came in at the entrance, after that 5 to 10 minutes $I$ will call you up individually, and, then, we'll ask you to clearly state your name, where you're from, and then please give your comment.

There will be a three-minute time limit to provide your comment, deferring time to another is -- is not allowed; and please, of course, be respectful with your comments.

And then when you make your comment those will actually get formally addressed in the Tier 1 Final EIS and Record of Decision.

And, again, here's a couple of ways you can get more information either on the document, you go to the project website; you can also e-mail your comments to the Atkins e-mail there, or you can mail it to the Atkins address there (indicating).

So that will conclude this portion of it, we'll find out who wants to give a public hearing comment, here in about 5, 10 minutes we'll get started on that, and -- and, then, after that's over we will continue to be here, both CDOT staff and consultant staff, to address any additional questions you may have. Thank you.
(A break was taken.)
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21

MR. ROB FREI: Excuse me real quick. So nobody's signed up to give a public hearing comment, just want to make sure that's correct before we close this portion of the hearing. Anybody want to speak in front of everyone?
(No response.)
MR. ROB FREI: No? Okay. Thank you.
(The proceedings were concluded at the hour of 6:10 p.m.)
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| 11:2, 11:16, 12:6, | 7:22, 12:3, 12:19, | birding bit [4] - $2: 12$ | consultant contain 18:1 | Enginee | given [2] - 4:10 |
| 13:6, 18:17, 18:25, | 7:10 | :18, 5 : | continue 20:2 | entire [2]-4: | golf [2] - 17:5, 17: |
| 20:11 | accommodates | board 9:21 | contribute 5:23 | entrance 20:2 | Granada [3] - 12:10, |
| 1,000-foot [3] - 13:16, | accordance 8:13 | Boggsville 17:8 | correct 21:3 | environment [10] - | 17:6, 17:1 |
| 13:22, 14:10 | acreage [2] - 13:21, | Boone 10:2 | corridor [36] - | 10:5, 10:5, 10:8, | graphic 13:15 |
| $10[5]-6: 19$, | 15:13 | border 4:22 | $3: 15,4: 5,4: 7,4: 10$, | 10:16, $10: 18,10: 25$, | Grasslands 17: |
| 17:2, $20:$ | acres [5] - 14:23 | box [2] - 2:24, 19: | 4:20, 4:24, 5:1, 5:16, | 13:9, 13:9, 15:6, 16 | gravel 15:19 |
| 10-minute 19:13 | 15:3, 15:7, | break [2] - 19:13, | 5:21, 6:3, 6:4, 6:16, | environmental [15] | greater [2] - 11:3, |
| 11 | 15:12 | 20:25 | 6:19, 6:25, 7:4, 7:13 | 1:1, 2:9, 3:16, 3:22, |  |
| 13 17:1 | active 15 | bridges [2] - 8:17, | 8:22, 8:25, 9:5, 9:13, | $3: 23,4: 8,4: 15,5: 10$, | green [2] - 9:18, 10:11 |
| 14 16:11 | actual 13:23 | 16:11 | 9:17, 12:23, 13:16, | 8:13, 8:25, 12:5, | guess [2] - 10:3, 12:1 |
| 150 [2] - 4:5, 16:12, | additional [3] - 18:8, | broad 18:4 | 13:22, 14:10, 14:16, | 12:14, 12:17, 13:5, | guys 19:14 |
| ${ }_{\text {150-mile }}^{15} 5$ [2] - 14:16, | 18:9, 20:23 | build [2] - 8:15, 9:16 | 5:17, 15:18, | 18:13 |  |
| 15 16: ${ }^{17}$ 17:2 | address [5] - | Building 1:6 | 16:12, 16: | dal-da |  |
| 17 16:11 | 12:22, ${ }^{\text {ddressed [3] - 7:10 }}$ | buildings 16:19 | 17:25, 18:6, 18:19 | nts 12:19 |  |
| 1790 15:3 | 18:25, $20: 11$ | built [10] - 9:1, 9:24, <br> $10: 7,10: 10,10: 17$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { corridor-wide [2] - } \\ & 3: 11,4: 13 \end{aligned}$ | estimated [2] - 15:3, |  |
| 18th 22:11 | advantages [2] - 11:11, | 13, 12:18 | corridors [3] - 5:22, | evaluated [3] - 8:11, | habitat [3] - 9:14, |
|  | 12:3 |  | 8:4, 8:8 | 13:6, 14:6 ${ }^{\text {che }}$ | $15: 11,15: 14$ taven't 14:24 |
| 2 |  | Bu | Co | evaluating | azardous [5] - 17:1 |
|  | afterwards [3] - 3:6, | businesses 16:18 | $: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lluat } \\ & 4: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $17: 23,17: 24,17: 25$ |
| 2 [13] - 10:6, 10:13, | $\begin{array}{r} 9: 22,19: 17 \\ \text { agencies } \\ 4: \end{array}$ | bypass 12:4 | couple [7] | everyone [2] - 2: | hearing [6] |
| 10:15, 10:20, 10:22, | $\text { agency } 8: 22$ |  |  |  | 19:15, 19:25, $20: 19$, |
| 11:21, 12:11, 12:16, | agricultural [8] |  | course [3] - 17:5, | xample 13:20 | 21:2, 21:4 |
| (10,2, 14:19, 15:10, | 10:4, |  | 17:13, 20 | exclusion 19:5 | Hello |
| $\begin{array}{lll}18: 21, & 19: 4 \\ 2,866 & 14: 23\end{array}$ | :15, 14:7, | calculated | court [5] - 3:3, 3:5, | use 21:1 | $1 p$ |
| 2006 [3] - 3: | agricult | calling 12:1 |  | existing [11] - 6:20, | hereby $22: 5$ |
| 3:20 | a1 6:13 | can't | 20 | 6:21, 6:22, 6: | heretofore |
| 2008 5:18 | alignment [8] | canals |  |  | hereunto 22:10 |
| 2010 3:22 | 6:21, 6:22, 8:18, | :7 | $\text { crashes } 5: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 151 \\ & 12: 22 \end{aligned}$ | higher 5:21 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 2012 & 5: 19 \\ 2015 & 22: 11 \end{array}$ | 9:10, 10:1, 11:2, | carpooling/trans [2] | cross 7:20 | expressway [2] | highway [9] - $3: 12$, |
| 2016 1:4 | alignmen |  | current [2] - 4:9, 13: | 7:23 |  |
| 2017 | alignmen | carried |  | extend | 12:2 |
| 2380 15:3 | alleviate 12:3 | carry 7:24 |  |  | historic [7] - 11:4, |
| 24 [2] - 14:18, 16:7 | allowed [2] - 9:3 | categorical 19:5 |  | E | $16:$ |
| $25 \quad 13: 22$ | allows [2]-4:8, $4: 14$ | categories [3] - 8:25, |  | $\underline{L}$ | $16:$ |
| 250-foot 13 | already [2] - 9:12, | 13:8, 13:11 |  |  |  |
| 287 [2] - 5:2, 5:11 |  | cause | Dah |  |  |
| 287/US [2] - 5:9, 12:8 | Alternate ${ }^{\text {a }}$ alternative 27 - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { caused } 6: 7 \\ & \text { CDOT }[3]-4: 8,4: 11, \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{\text {2:6' }}{ }^{2: 12,}{ }^{\text {damage }}$ 8:21 | 7:17, ${ }_{\text {factor }} 6$ | 12 |
| 29th [2] - 19:2, 19:22 | 6:13, 8:14, 8:16, | 20:22 | Dan [6] - 2:1, | factors |  |
|  | 10:6, 10:8, 10:9 | certif | 2:6, | failed | hope 4:2 |
|  | 10:11, 10:12, | change | data [2] - 5:18, 5:20 | fairly 10:23 | r 21:8 |
|  | 10:13, 10:15, 10:1 | changes [2] - 5:24, | Decision [3] - 4:1, | fall [2] - 13:10, 14:10 | old |
|  | 10:21, 10:22 | 17:10 | 19:1, 20:12 | farmer 18:3 | however 10:23 |
| 3,047 14:23 | 11:2, 11:8, 11:16, | characteristics 5:25 | decisions | rmlands |  |
| 330 5:19 | 11:21, 12:2, 12:6, | chemicals | deferring 20:7 | faster 13:2 |  |
|  | $12: 6,12: 11,12: 12$, | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { cited } & 6: 5 \\ \text { clear } & 5: 25 \end{array}$ | delineation 15: demands 6:12 | Fe [2] - $16: 15,16: 16$ February 3:20 |  |
|  | alternatives [16 | clearly | Department 2: | feedlots 14:17 |  |
|  | 3:21, 8:10, 8:11, | clima | design [5] - 5:2 | fertilizers | I-25 [2] - 4:21, 5: |
|  | 8:15, | close [3 | , | fewer [6] - 10:1 | :6, 1 |
| 4 5:8 | 9:20, 9:24, 10:22, | 21:3 [2] 2:5, 9 , | 19:9 ${ }^{\text {1 }}$ | 10:15, 10:24, 12 | identified $10: 8,10: 19,12: 12$, |
| 4(f [3] - 17:18, | 11:9, 11:13, 11:15, | closer [2] - 2:5, 9:23 | detail [2] - 15:10 | 12:17, $13: 1$ | $12: 16,14: 25,16: 1 \text {, }$ |
| 18:11 | 11:20, 11:25, 12:5 <br> Analysis [5] - 3:22, | closest 11:22 | $19: 8$ | $\text { final }[7]-4: 1,7: 25$ | 16:13, 16:21, 16:22 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 4,287 & 15: 11 \\ 4,564 & 15: 12 \end{array}$ | Analysis [5] - 3:22, $4: 8,4: 15,8: 11,8: 2$ | ```co-op 18:3 coast-to-coast 4:19``` | determine [2] - 8:12, 9:3 | 15:24, 15:24, 18:25, $19: 3,20: 11$ | $17: 16, \quad 17: 24$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4,564 \\ & 47 \quad 9: 10 \end{aligned}$ | analyzed [2] - 5:11, | Colorado [6] - | determin | financial 4:12 | illustrates 13:15 impact [8] - 1:1, 3: |
|  | 6:24 | 2:3, 4:25, 5:4, 22:2, | develop 3:11 ${ }^{3} 11$ | five 15:18 [3] - 6:12 | $\begin{aligned} \text { impact }[8] & -1: 1, \\ 3: 23, & 3: 5, \\ 3: 13, & 9: 4, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\underset{16: 25}{\text { Animas }[2] ~-~ 12: 1, ~}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 5 \\ & \text { Comanche 17: } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { developed [2] - 9:12, } \\ & 9: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { flexibility [3] - 6:1 } \\ & 7: 8,8: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $15: 16,18: 13$ |
|  |  | combined [2] - |  | flo, | impacted [5] - 9:2, |
|  | appropriate [2] | 12:4 | development 6:6 | followed 6:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 4, \\ & 7: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 5 [3] - 19:13, 20:2, | :9 | es 16:10 | difference 10:5 | Ford [3] - 11:1, 11: |  |
| 20:20 | approximately $5: 19$ | coming $2: 2$ | dir 17:7 | $13: 20$ |  |
| 50 [20] - 3:15, $4: 19$, | archaeological [4] - | comment [16] - $2: 22$, | direct 17:9 discussed dit | foregoing 22:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { impacts }[21],-9: 15, \\ & 10: 4,10: 7,10: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 4: 21, & 5: 3, \\ 5: 16, & 6: 3, \\ 5: 9, & 5: 11, \\ \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 9,16: 20,16: 21, \\ & 18: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $2: 23,2: 24,3: 2,3: 4$ $3: 5,3: 24,18: 24$, | discussed 8:1 ditches 14:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { formally } 20: 11 \\ & \text { format }[2]-19 \end{aligned}$ | $10: 16, \quad 11: 21,12: 4,$ |
| 7:1, 8:18, $8: 22,9: 11$, | areas [5] | 19:1, 19:14, 19:21 | divvy 14:11 | $19: 25$ | $12: 5,12: 14,12: 18 \text {, }$ |
| 9:17, 12:8, 12:20, | 5:16, 17:4 | 20:5, 20:7, 20:10, | document [8] - 2:10 | formations 15:20 | 3:14, 13:19, 14:1, |
| 14:17, 16:17, 17:16 | 18:9 | 20:20, 21:2 | 2:13, 2:21, 10:20, | forms [2] - 2:22, 19:20 | $14: 21,15: 7,17: 7 \text {, }$ |
| 587 | $\underset{\substack{\text { Arkansas } \\ 4: 25}}{ }$ [2] - 3:13, | comments [7] - 18:2 | $13: 6,14: 3,15: 9,$ | Fort [3] - 9:25, 10:1, | 17:9, 18:21 |
|  |  | $19: 25, \quad 20: 9, \quad 20: 15$ |  | forth 22:6 | implement ${ }^{\text {a }}$ :6 |
| 6 | $\underset{8: 23}{\operatorname{around} \text {-town [2] - 8:8, }} \underset{8}{ }$ | common 18:5 | [3] - | forward [6] - 7:9, | improve [6] - 3:12, |
|  |  | ities [2] - 5:3, |  | $7: 24,10: 20,11: 1$ | $5: 16,6: 3,6: 10,$ |
|  | assessed |  | Draft [2] - 1:1, 3:2 | 13:17, 13:25 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lr} 60 & 16: 5 \\ 610 & 1: 6 \end{array}$ | associated 16:19 Atkins [2] - 20:1 | community [15] - $1: 6$ $5: 12,8: 9$, $9: 1, ~$ | Due 9:14 | four-lane [6] - 7:15, | improved ${ }^{\text {improvements }}$ [11] - |
| 6:10 21:9 | $\begin{aligned} \text { Atkins } \\ 20: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $10: 7,10: 17,10: 25 \text {, }$ |  | $7: 21, \quad 7: 23$ | 3:14, $5: 15,6: 2,6: 18$, |
| 6:30 1:5 | available [5] - 2:19, | 11:4, 12:9, 12:13, | F | fourth 7:25 | $7: 3,8: 2,8: 19,8: 22$, |
| 6 th | 2:19, $4: 6,4: 9,19: 17$ | 2:18, 13:8, 16:3, |  | Fowler [9] - 9:24, | 12:21, 12:22, 19: |
|  | averages 5: | 18:19 ${ }^{\text {1 }}$ [ 31 - 10:17 |  | $0: 10,10: 12,10: 13$ | inadequate [2] - 5:2 |
| 7 | avoid 14:20 avoiding | comparable [3] - 10:17, | e-mail [3] - 19:2 <br> 20:15, 20:16 | $10: 19,15: 1,16: 24,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { inadequate }[2]-5: 2 \\ & 6: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | compared [2] - 5:21 | EA 19:7 | fragment 9:13 | 4] |
|  |  | 9:16 | easements 17:2 | freeway [2] - 7:16, | $16: 18,17: 4,18: 13$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll}713 & 15: 7 \\ 79 & 16: 5\end{array}$ | B | comparison | $\underset{5: 13}{\text { east }[3]-4: 21,5: 4, ~}$ | 7:21 | included [3] - 8:14, 10:3, 14:12 |
|  |  | compiled $5: 1$ complete $6: 1$ | east/wes | [6] - 2:7, | includes [4] |
|  | balance 8:6 | concerns 12:22 | ec 6:5 [5] - 6:5 | frequent 5:24 | 15:13, 15:14, 15: |
| 8 | balancing 6:11 | conclude 20:18 | economic [5] - 6:5 | front 21:5 | including 5: |
|  | band 5:7 <br> basically [2] - 6:21, | concluded [2] - 3:1 | $6: 6,12: 4,18: 16$, $18: 21$ | fueling 18 | increased |
| $\begin{aligned} & 81052 \quad 1: 7 \\ & 89 \\ & 89 \end{aligned}$ | 7:18 | conditions 18:16 | effects [4] - 8:24, | $\text { fully }[2]-7: 10,14: 24$ | indicated 9:2 |
|  | omes | conducted [3] - 8:11, | 10:17, 10:24, 11:3 | funding [2]-4:5, 4:9 | indicating [6] - 2 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { beginning } \quad 3: 10 \\ & \text { benefit } 17: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 24,12: 8 \\ & \text { conflicting } 6: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { efforts } 4: 13 \\ & \text { EIS [5] - } 4: 1,19: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { future }[4]-3: 12 \text {, } \\ & 6: 12,7: 9,8: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 7,9: 23,19: 18, \\ & 19: 22,20: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
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| indirect 17:7 | 12:23 | period [3] - | reason 14 | significantly 9:1 | turn 7:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| individually 20:3 | Microphone 2:16 | 18:24, 19:1 | reasons 7:23 | similar [2] - 5:22, | turned 2:16 |
| information [2] - | mid 4:2 | picked 12:11 | rebuild 7:14 | 10:4 | off |
| 19:22, 20:14 | mike $2: 5$ | planning [3] - 2:9, | received [2] - 11:4, | simpler 19:5 | two-and-a-half $2: 11$ |
| infrastructure 14:16 | miles [5] - 4:5, 5:8, | 4:15, 8:18 | 18:23 | Site 17:8 | two-lane [2] - 7:13, |
| input 4:16 | 6:20, 6:23, 16:12 | please [3]-14 | recommendations | sites [3] - 16:21, | 18 |
| Intent 3:19 | mind 14:2 | 20:4, 20:8 | recommended 3:15 | 17:24, 17:25 | type 7:12 |
| interested 22:9 | minimal [2] - 18:13, | point 18:18 | Record [3] - 4:1, 19:1 | six [2] - 14:17, 15:20 | types [2] - 7:3, 7:17 |
| introduce 2:7 | 18:13 | points 6:9 | 20:12 | slide [5] - 2:20, 4:4, | typewritten 22:6 |
| investments 4:12 | minimize [4] | portion [2] - 20:18, | recreation 18: | 4:18, 13:7, 13:13 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { irrigation }[2]-14: 18, ~ \\ 16: 7 \end{gathered}$ | $10: 6, \quad 11: 3, \quad 14: 20$ minimizing 14:4 | $\begin{array}{ll} 21: 4 \\ \text { possible } & 14: 4 \end{array}$ | recreational 17:1 <br> red 9:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { slides }[3]-13: 25, ~ \\ & 14: 13,19: 23 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| is(sic 14:17 | mining 15:19 | post 2:20 | reduced 22:6 | slightly 12:13 |  |
| issues [2] - 5:18, 7:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { minor } 8: 18 \\ & \text { minutes }[2]-20: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { potential [9] }-10: 7, \\ & 10: 24,11: 3,12: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reductions } 13: 1 \\ & \text { refuges } 7: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { social [3] - } 12: 3, \\ & 18: 16,18: 20 \end{aligned}$ | controlled 6: |
|  | 20:20 | 15:7, 15:21, 16:8, | regional [8] - 2:9, | sorts 14:8 | tanding 4: |
|  | mitigate | 17:10, 19:7 | 4:23, 6:8, 6:8, 6:16, | south [12] - 1:6, 6:22, | $\text { sers }[8]-5: 17,6:$ |
|  | mitigating 14:5 | potentially [4] - 15:4, | $6: 17,6: 19,7: 1$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 6: 23, & 10: 13, \\ 10: 22, \\ 11: 1 & 11 \end{array}$ | $7: 20,8: 6$ |
| January 3:19 |  | prairie 9:14 | relatively 5:21 | 12:2, 12:11, 12:11, | using [2] - 4:14, 6: |
| John [2] - 17:4, 17:12 July | mobility [11] - 3:13, | preferred [13] - 7:24, | reliever [3] - 5:9 | 12:16 |  |
| July [4] - 1:4, 19:2, $19: 22,22: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 16,6: 4,6: 6,6: 10, \\ & 6: 11,7: 8,8: 6,8: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 23, \quad 9: 17,9: 19, \\ & 10: 9, \quad 10: 18, \quad 11: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 11,12: 8 \\ & \text { remaining } 16: 1 \end{aligned}$ | Southern 4:25 <br> speak [2] - 19:16, 21:4 | $V$ |
| June 3:24 | 12:25, 17:20 | 11:11, 11:21, 12: | repair 8:20 | specifically [2] - |  |
| Junta [2] - 11:14, | mode 7:3 | 12:12, 12:17, 14:25 | replaced 16:11 | 4:20, 5:8 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 16: 25 \\ & \text { justice } 18: 13 \end{aligned}$ | modes | presentation [3] - 3:1, | reporter [5] - | speed 12 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { alley } \\ 3: 13, & 4: 25] \end{array}$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { moment } & 13 \\ \text { mostly } & 6: \end{array}$ | previously |  |  | varied [2] - 6:19, 6:2 |
|  | move 13:25 | primarily 17:10 | require 11:18 | 20:23 |  |
|  |  | Priscilla [2] - 22:4, | Reservoir [2] - 17:5, | stages 3:1 | verbal [3] - $3: 2$, $19: 24$ |
|  | N | privately 19:16 | residences 16:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { standards } \\ & \text { start 19: } \end{aligned}$ | ice-versa 12:20 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Kansas [4] - } 4: 21 \text {, } \\ 4: 22,5: 14,5: 20 \end{gathered}$ | N | pro 10:24 | resident 2:3 | started [3] - 3:17, | vision $3: 11$ <br> visual $18: 14$ |
| KATHY 2:5, | f [2] - 22:4, | proceedings [4] - 21:8, | resource 9:2 | $3: 22,20: 20$ |  |
| known [3] - 15:22, | name's [2]-2:2, $2: 8$ | process [4] - 4:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { resources [20] - } 11: \\ & 13: 6,13: 10,13: 14 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { starting } 3: 20 \\ & \text { state }[9]-5: 22,9: 10, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 15:22, 16:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { national }[3]-4: 23 \text {, } \\ & 17: 7,17: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 4:14, 6:15, 11:5 | $14: 4,14: 7,14: 8 \text {, }$ | $12: 19,15: 15,17: 4 \text {, }$ |  |
|  | natural [7] | produ <br> 15:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | $22$ |  |
| $\pm$ | 0:5, 10:16, 12:13 | productivity | :20, 17:12 | Statement 1:1 | wants [2] - 19:14 |
|  | 12:18, 13:9, 15:6 | Professional [2] | 17:17, 18:10, 18:11 | stations 18: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wants } \\ & 20: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| La [2] - 11:14, 16:25 | needed [2] - 3:15, 6:18 $\text { needs }[6]-6: 7,6: 11 \text {, }$ | 22:4, $22: 13$ project [10] | 18:12 respec | step [4] - 6:16, 6:24, | ways [2] - 14:20, 20:13 |
|  | 7:4, 7:10, 7:12, 8:7 | project $3: 9,5: 6,6: 10, ~$ $8: 8,8$, | respectful responded 18:8 20, | $\text { steps [3] - } 3: 25,6: 14$ | we'll [12] - 2:20, 3:1, |
| Lamar [3] $5: 12$ | NEPA [5] - $2: 10,4: 7$, | 8:16, 11:10, 12:22, | response 21:6 | 18:23 | 18:20, 19:11, 19:13, |
| lands 17 | 4:14, 8:13, 19:4 | 17:22, $20: 15$ | rest 18:24 | stick 2:24 | 20:1,' 20:3, $20: 1$ |
| lane 8:19 | neutral nine [2] | projects [2] - 19:6, | result [3] - | stores 18: | 20:20 |
| lanes 7:13 | nine no-build [ | 19:10 | 10:24, $11: 16$, | strategies street | we're [4] - 9:6, 12:1, |
| Las [2] - 12:1, 16:25 | 8:16 | properties [3] - 16:18, $17: 3, \quad 17: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { review [2] - } 2: 14 \\ & 15: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { street [2] - 1:6, 5:3 } \\ & \text { submit [2] - 19:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 13:17, 17:20 |
| law leading 10:8 | nobody's 21:2 | proposed [2] - 5:15 | reviewe | $19: 20$ | we've [2] - 16:1, 16:7 weather 8:21 |
| least 8:12 | noise 18:15 $\begin{aligned} & \text { north [15]-6:19, }\end{aligned}$ |  | Reynolds [2] - 9:25, | supervision $22:$ | website [2] - 2:20, |
| led 9:5 | north $6: 20, ~ 9: 9, ~$ a | protection [2] - 18:8, | 10:2 ${ }_{\text {riparian 15:8 }}$ | support 11:5 | 20:15 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { less } \\ \text { lesser } & \text { 9:15 } \\ 12: 4\end{array}$ | 10:14, 10:21, $11: 1$, | 18:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { riparian } \\ & \text { road } 5: 24 \end{aligned}$ |  | welcome 9:2 |
| level [9]-6:17, 14:2, | 11:2, 11:15, 11:16, | provide [5] | Rob | 11:11, 14:25 | wetland/riparian [2] 15:6, 15:14 |
| 14:19, 15:9, | 12 | $7: 8,8: 14,19: 24,20: 7$ | 2:8, 13:3, 13:4, | system [2] - 7:5, 7:7 | wetlands |
| $15: 10,18: 17,18: 21$ | north/south | provides [2] - 18: |  |  | WHEREOF 22:10 |
| 19:8 ikely 5 | Northern 16:16 | providing | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rocky [3] } \\ & 13: 20 \end{aligned}$ | T | hoever 19:14 |
| limit [2] - 7:21, 20:6 | Notary [2] - 22:4, | provisions 8:19 | R |  | whole [2]-5:13, |
| limited 5:23 | notice [3] - 3:19, | Prowers 12:7 | route [5] - 5:9, 5:11 |  | 23 |
| limits [ 2 ] - 6:5, 6:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { notice }[3]-3: 19, \\ & 10: 11,16: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { proximity } 4: 22 \\ & \text { public [13] }-1: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 11,11: 17,12: 8 \\ & \text { routes }[4]-5: 2,5: 12 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { table } 2: 22 \\ & \text { taken }[2]-20: 25,22: 5 \end{aligned}$ | wildlife [5] - 15:11 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { linear } & \text { 16:14 } \\ \text { links 5:1 } \end{array}$ | numerous 6:9 | public $3: 20,3: 24,4: 17$, | routes [4] - 5:2, 5:12, <br> 12:9, 19:9 | taking 18:20 | 15:14, 15:16, 17 <br> 17:14 |
| local [8] - 4:17, 4:23, |  | 17:3, 17:3, 18:8 | routine $8: 20$, | thank [4] - 2:2, 2:17 | within [2] - 14:10 |
| 6:7, 7:1, 7:19, 7:22, |  | 14, 20:1 | rural [3] - 7:15, 8:2 | Thanks 13: | 22:4 |
| 8:6, 8:21 location [3] |  | published 3:23 |  | there's [9]-2:13, | WITNESS 22: won't 15:23 |
| 6:25, 11:12 | observed 5:20 | Pueblo [14] - $2: 4,2: 6$, |  | $2: 15,2: 18, ~ 2: 22, ~$ $13: 9,8,14: 23,15: 1$, | wrapped 19:10 |
| locations [4] - 2:15, | occurring 16:23 | $\begin{aligned} & : 4, ~ 5: 14, ~ 5: 20, ~ 9: 7, ~ \\ & : 9, ~ 9: 9, ~ 9: 9, ~ 9: 10, ~ \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 9 \\ & 19: 2 \end{aligned}$ | written [2] - 2:24, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2:18, 9:5, 16:1 } \\ \text { locations/crossi } \end{gathered}$ | offers 12:24 | $: 24$ |  | therefore |  |
| long-distance 6:8 | imes 15 | 22:3 | safety [8] - | they're [2] - 9:21, |  |
| looking 14:3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { one-on- } \\ 19: 18 \end{gathered}$ | purchase 18:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 16,5: 18,7: 7,8: 1 \\ & 10: 6,12: 24, \quad 17: 20 \end{aligned}$ | th | $Y$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { looks } & 4: 20 \\ \text { louder } & 2: 16\end{array}$ | ongoing 8:16 |  |  | $\text { third } 7: 11$ |  |
| louder ${ }^{\text {low }}$ Lower [2] - $3: 13,4: 24$ | onto 7:20 | 6:2, $11: 22,917: 19$ | sand 15:19 | three-minute 20:6 |  |
| Lower [2] - 3:13, 4:24 | operations 15:19 | 11:22, 17:19 | Santa [2] - 16:15, | $\text { through-town } 8: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yay } 2: 17 \\ & \text { yellow } 5: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | opportunities [2] - <br> 5:24, 12:25 |  | $16: 16$ | throughout [2] - 12:23, | you'd 2:14 |
| $\mathbf{M}$ | option [4] - 6:23, 7:9, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { schedule } 3: 18 \\ & \text { scoping } 3: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { Tier [14] - } 1: 1,3: 16 \text {, }$ | you'll [2] - 14:1, 16:5 |
|  | 7:19, 12:11 |  | screening [3] - 6:13, | 3:23, 4:1, 10:20, |  |
| mail [2] - 19:21, | options [2] - 7:18, 12:10 | quality [3] - 9:3, | 6:14, 11:5 | 13:6, 14:2, 14:19, | Z |
|  | Otero 10:10 | $18: 14, \quad 18: 15$ | section [9] - 5:13, | 15:10, 18:17, 18:21 |  |
| maintenance $8: 17$ | outcome 22:9 | quantity $9: 2$ | $5: 14$, $8: 23$, <br> $9: 18,11$  <br> $11: 7,17$  | 18:25, 19:4, 20:11 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{major}[5]-4: 23,5: 1, \\ & 11: 18,11: 20,12: 2 \end{aligned}$ | outlined 6:15 | quarries 15:20 <br> quick 21:1 | $\begin{array}{ll} 9: 18, & 11: 7, \\ 18: 7, & 18: 11 \end{array}$ | Tiered [2] - 4:7, 4: <br> till 19:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { zeroing } 5: 5 \\ & \text { zones } 5: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| make-ups 18:19 | overlays 8:20 |  | sections [2] - 8:20, | tonight [3] - 18:24, |  |
| management [2] 7:7 |  | R |  | tonight's 2:13 |  |
| Manager 2:9 |  |  | segments 16: | total 1914 |  |
| Manzanola [3] - 10:21, |  | rail [2] - 7:5, 7 | select 11:8 | town [5] - 8:1, |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 10:21, } & 10: 22 \\ \text { markets } \\ 14: 17\end{array}$ | p.m [2] - 1:5, 21:9 | Railroad 16:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { selected [2] - 6:2 } \\ & 11: 12 \end{aligned}$ | towns [2] - 19:7, 19:10 |  |
| markets 14:17 | paleontological [2] | ranches 16:19 | Selection 3:10 | tradeoffs 10:18 |  |
| 17:13 | parallels 16:16 | ranchlands [2] - | separate 13:8 | traffic [3] - 7:9, 8:7, |  |
| masse 8:9 ${ }^{\text {material }} 17.24$ | park 17:11 | $\text { range }[6]-14: 23 \text {, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { separated } \\ & \text { serves 5:3 } \end{aligned}$ | Trail 16:15 |  |
| material $17: 24$ materials |  | 14:24, 15:1, 15: | serving [2]-4:24, 7:1 | trails [3]-17:6, |  |
| 17:23, 18:4 | partial <br> party 22: | 18:5, 19:5 | Several 5:22 | 17:14, 17:15 |  |
| maximize 4:12 | passing [4] - 5:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ranged } 5: 8 \\ & \text { rangeland } 15: 13 \end{aligned}$ |  | anscript 22: |  |
| median [2] - 7:17, 7:18 | 7:13, 8:19, 12:25 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { rangeland } \\ \text { rangelands } & 15: 13\end{array}$ | shape 4:15 <br> shortest 11:22 | transpor 5:1 <br> transportation [10] - |  |
| $\underset{22: 13}{\operatorname{Medina}[2]-22: 4,}$ | $\underset{8}{\text { pavement }}$ [2] - 8:17, | ranges [2] - 15:11, | shortest shorthand 11:22 $22: 5$ | transportation [10] - $2: 4,3: 14,4: 15,5: 2 \text {, }$ |  |
| meet [6] - 6:12, 7:4, | pedestrian 17: | 16:5 real 21:1 | oulders 12:25 | $6: 18,7: 3,8: 2,9: 12$ |  |
| 7:12, 8:8, 11:9, 13:1 | percent 13:22 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { real } 21: 1 \\ \text { realignment } & 10: 1 \end{array}$ | showed [2] - 5:19, 5:20 shows 13:13 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lc} \text { meeting } & 2: 13 \\ \text { meetings } & 3: 20 \end{array}$ | percentage [2] - 14:11, 16:10 | really [5] - 13:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shows } 13: 13 \\ & \text { sign } 20: 1 \end{aligned}$ | transportation-s 18:7 travel [3] - 4:24, |  |
| meets 11:22 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 16:10 } \\ \text { Perfect } & 2: 17\end{array}$ | 14:11, 15:12, 16:22, | signed 21:2 | 6:12, 13:2 |  |
| mentioned [2] - 12:7, | Perfect 2.17 |  | significance 9:4 | true 22:7 |  |
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MR. DAN DAHLKE: My name's Dan Dahlke, I'm a resident Engineer with the Colorado Department of Transportation out of Pueblo, and I'm going to give a brief presentation.

I'll let Rob introduce himself (indicating).
MR. ROB FREI: Hello. Thank you for coming. My name is Rob Frei, I'm the Region Environmental and Planning Manager, so we -- Region 2, and that's Southeastern Colorado.

MR. DAN DAHLKE: All right. So you see the boards in the back, we're going to give a brief presentation, after the presentation there will be a public comment period, Rob is going to go over that a little bit more, but after you are more than welcome to come back to the boards, we'll have lots of staff back there to answer your questions if you have more questions (indicating).

If you want to provide a comment there will be some ways to do it. There's a comment form in the back, in the back kitchen, you're more than welcome to write out a comment there as well (indicating).

Like I said, we'll have a public comment period, so we'll give you some time to give a public comment that will be recorded by our court reporter. Also, if you don't want to give a public comment in
front of everyone there will be some one-on-one time available afterwards.

> All right, next slide.

So a little bit of history. The Corridor Selection Study was the beginning stages for developing a corridor-wide vision for the future of the highway to improve safety and mobility in the Lower Arkansas Valley. The study concluded that the transportation improvements are needed along U.S. 50, recommend that the corridor be environmentally reviewed under a Tier 1 level Environmental Impact Assessment. The Tier 1 Assessment began in 2006 .

Schedule. The Notice of Intent for the pro -- project was published in January of 2006, we did scoping and public meetings starting in February of 2006, and an Alternatives Evaluation was conducted and documented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, which was released in June of 2016.

The public will review and comment on the document for a 30-day period beginning in June, which ends July 29th.

The decision in the combined Tier 1 Final E -- EIS and Record of Decision, once approved by the Federal Highway Administration, will complete the Tier 1 EIS. As funding becomes available for projects within
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the corridor the Tier 2 NEPA documents will be prepared.
Why did we do a Tiered EIS process. Since the corridor is over -- or approximately 150 miles long funding will not be available all at once to implement all of the improvements needed along the corridor, the Tiered NEPA process allows CDOT to keep Environmental Analysis current as funding becomes available. Studying the entire corridor at once gives CDOT a better understanding of mitigation strategies, and the ability to max -- maximize financial investment for mitigation efforts corridor-wide.

Using the Tiered NEPA process Environment -or allows Environmental Analysis to shape the transportation planning decisions, along with input from agencies and the local public.

A little bit more about the corridor. The corridor that this studies is from east of Pueblo to approximately the Kansas state line, which is, like I said before, 150 miles long. It's a major local, regional, national corridor serving east/west travel through the Lower Arkansas Valley, Southern Colorado, and beyond. The corridor links two major north/south transportation routes of I-25 and 287, and also currently serves as main street for nine communities. The Tier 1 NEPA study used a study area
approximately 1 to 4 miles wide for the entire 150 -mile Pueblo to Kansas state line. The 287/US 50 reliever route was studied separately as the US 287 Lamar Reliever Route Environmental Assessment, so that section around Lamar, when you look at the maps, was excluded. Next.

Purpose for the project. The purpose for the proposed improvements along US 50 corridor is to improve safety and mobility for all users. Data compiled from 2008 to 2012 showed approximately 330 crashes annually from Pueblo to the Kansas state line. This crash data observed showed relatively higher compared to other corridors of similar size. Several factors are likely to contribute to this, including limited passing opportunities, frequent changes in road design characteristics, and inadequate clear zones.

The project need. The pur -- the purpose for the proposed improvements along US 50 corridor is to improve safety and mobility for all users. Inadequate mobility along the corridor has been cited as a factor that limits economic development. Inadequate mobility is likely caused by conflicting needs of local, regional, and long-distance users, and numerous uncontrolled access points. This project seeks to improve mobility for all users by balancing mobility,
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access needs, all while providing the flexibility to meet future travel demands.

The alternative development process involved using transportation engineering and environmental criteria to develop potential transportation solutions. Each of the criteria was directly related to the purpose and need of the project.

The screening process followed four steps which are out -- outlined through the following questions. The first one was at a regional level where would transportation improvements be made. We looked at a north corridor, which was 1 to 10 miles north of the existing alignment, we looked at the existing alignment, and we also looked at a southern(sic) -- southern option, which was 1 to 10 miles south of the existing alignment. The existing corridor was selected based on location better serving local and regional users of US 50.

The next question we asked is what types and modes of transportation improvement needs -- would meet the needs of the corridor, so we looked at rail improvements, bus improvements, carpooling/transportation systems, and also the highway. Rail, bus, carpooling and transportation safety management strategies failed to address safety issues,
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mobility for any user, and provide flexibility for future traffic needs, the highway option was carried forward because it fully addressed all the needs.

The third step was facility type, what type of facility would meet the needs of the corridor. We looked at a two-lane highway with passing lanes, both partial and total rebuild; four-laning the highway, a four-lane rural expressway, and a four-lane freeway.

Facility types without med -- median refuge -- refuges. Two-lane options and four-lane highway option -- the first two -- would not improve the ability for local users to cross or turn left onto the highway, a four-lane freeway would severely limit the number of location crossings or local access, for these reasons the four-lane expressway was identified as a preferred facility type to be carried forward.

The fourth step we took was what transportation improvements would be made through communities along the corridor or around them. The through-town corridors were eliminated from consideration because of the impact it would have to the local mobility, balance mobility for all users, and flexibility to address future traffic needs; the around-town corridors would better meet the project needs with purpose and need, and minimize community
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impacts.
So eval -- the alternatives we evaluated. In accordance with NEPA a no-build alternative is included to provide a basis for comparison with the build alternatives. For this project the no-build alternative includes ongoing maintenance of pavement and bridges on the existing US 50 alignment; it also includes planning minor safety improvements, provision of passing lanes, routine pavement overlays, repair of any weather- or crash-related damages, and also accommodates local agency improvements to the corridor.

Se -- selection of the preferred around-town route was based on the Effect Analysis conducted for the three environmental cor -- categories listed, rural and agricultural, natural, and then community and built. Consideration for the quantity of the resource impacted, along with the quality, allowed the study to determine the significance of the impact. The results of the study led to recommendations on corridor locations around each community.

We're going to look at Pueblo County first. So in Pueblo County we had three alternatives, we had a north, what we call the "North Airport," the existing alignment, and the State Highway 47 connector. The existing section of US 50 is already a developed
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transportation corridor, while the other al -alternatives would fragment agricultural and prairie habitat. Due to the significantly less impacts the existing alignment would have compared to the other build alternatives the existing alignment is the preferred along the US 50 section. So when you look at this you'll see the two red were eliminated and the green line is our preferred, and in the background -you can't quite see it -- but it's -- yellow is the existing alignment (indicating).

For Fort Reynolds, or -- which is also the Boone turnoff -- we had two alignments, which was the existing alignment, and, then -- which we call the "Fort Lyons"(sic) alignment was our other alternative. Both alignments have similar impacts to rural and agricultural environment, and the natural environment, the difference between Alternative 2 would improve safety and minimize potential impacts to the community and built environment leading to this alternative to be the preferred alternative.

In Otero County we had a Fowler north and a Fowler south. As you notice, there is -- sorry. Alternative 1 would have fewer impacts on agricultural, while Alternative 2 would have fewer impacts to the natural environment, and each has comparable effects on
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the community and built environments. Since both have tradeoffs no preferred alternative has been identified in Fowler, or both will be carried forward to a Tier 2 analysis.

At Manzanola we had a Manzanola north and a Manzanola south, both alternatives were fairly comparable, however, Alternative 1, which is to the north, would result in fewer potential effects to agricultural pro -- productivity, and the community and built environment.

The Rocky Ford alternative, we also had a Rocky Ford north and a Rocky Ford south. So the Rocky Ford north has greater potential to minimize effects to historic resources, and received greater community support during the screening process because the route is closer to the town of Rocky Ford.

In Swink we had two alternatives as well, both alternatives were comparable in their ability to meet the purpose and need of the project, and both had their advantages to the town of Swink. No preferred alternative was selected at this location, therefore, both alternatives will be carried forward to the Tier 2 analysis.

In La Junta we actually had four alternatives, we had La Junta north and, then, we had

MEDINA COURT REPORTING
27761 County Farm Rd., Pueblo, CO 81006
(719) 948-4763
three to the south, and each one just got further and further away around the -- the town. La Junta north would result in the most environmentally-damaging route because it required construction through a major floodplain, it was eliminated from consideration because the three other south alternatives generally lack major adverse impacts. Alternative 2 is preferred because it's the shortest, closest to town, and better meets the purpose and need of the project.

In Bent County we had Las Animas north and Las Animas south. Las Animas north has major access advantages that could alleviate potential social economic effects by the bypass. Combined with the lesser environmental impacts in the two alternatives, Alternative 1 is the preferred alternative.

In Prowers County, as mentioned before the US 287/US 50 reliever route study was already conducted for the routes that go through the community, however, we did have two build alternatives in Granada, a Granada north and south. Alternative 2, or to the south, was identified as a preferred alternative because it has slightly fewer natural, and community and built impacts.

In Holly we had a north and a south as well. We selected the south on that one because it was identified -- it had fewer environmental impacts to the
natural, and community and built environments; it also connect -- connects State Highway 89 to US 50, and vice versa, better.

So benefits of the improvements. We're going to have increased safety, increased mobility, in -increased passing opportunities with two lanes in each direction, improved shoulders that will meet current FHWA standards, and fewer speed reduction zones, and faster travel times.

Rob is going to take over.
MR. ROB FREI: Thanks, Dan.
So here in -- in front of me you have the four different categories of environmental resources that we looked at during this Tier 1 level document review. So the first one up there is -- is agriculture, and we've got community and built environment, natural environment, and then other for resources that didn't fit well into those other categories, and I'll go through at a higher level each -- each one of those.

But before $I$ do that to give you kind -- a little bit of background on how we assess, at least at this Tier 1 level, the potential environmental impact. The alignment that we've chosen is a 1,000-foot wide corridor, what we really need for the full build-out is 250 feet, so we would put that -- during Tier 2 level
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design we would con -- design it within that 1,000-foot corridor.

So you can see in this graphic up here, if this was farmland or a wetland, the way we determine the potential amount of impacts was to just simply identify -- we'll say, for example, this is wetlands, we just identified the amount of wetlands within the corridor and then just multiplied it by . 25 percent to get to that 250 -foot width (indicating). So that works well for -- for rangelands, agriculture, and -- and wetlands, and other resources.

For historical resources, if it was within that 1,000-foot corridor or even adjacent -- we'll talk about that here in a minute -- we -- we just included it. So when we actually get into that Tier 2 level review we will look at avoiding, first, impacts to all these resources, if we can't do that we'll -- we'll minimize it, and then we'll look at mitigation for it, so please keep that in mind when we move forward.

So the first one we'll talk about is agricultural impact. So along the 150-mile long corridor there's four feedlots, six produce markets, and then there's 24 irrigation canals and ditches along the corridor.

For farmlands -- this is a -- an estimate --
so it's between 2,866 to 3,047 acres -- again, that's over a 150-mile long corridor -- and we would try to avoid as much as possible. The reason there's actually a range is because we did not determine the north or south alignments at Swink and Fowler, so that's why there's a range at -- at those locations.

Range -- rangelands, 1790 to 2380 acres could potentially be impacted along this corridor as well. Natural environment, 587 to 713 acres of potential wetland and riparian habitat could be impacted. Most of that is actually riparian habitat. We did not at this level do a full wetland delineation or even wildlife habitat review at a, you know, detailed level, that will be done at Tier 2. And, again, we would try to avoid as much as -- as possible within that 1,000-foot corridor where we can.

Wildlife habitat, it's kind of double counting some of the other impacts we've had already, so it includes rangelands, it includes wetlands, and also includes a few state wildlife areas along the corridor that we could potentially impact as well.

Geological and paleontological resources. There are four mining operations along the corridor consisting of sand and gravel quarries, there are six known geological formations along the 150-mile section.
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No known paleontological sources would be impacted, however, with paleontological resources you really don't know until you start digging, so we've identified where the high potential to run into potential paleontological resources are.

Historic resources. So we have 60 to 79 potential historic properties along the corridor, so these consist of between 23 to 27 -- I want to make sure I have the number right here, hold on.
(Reviewed document.)
Actually we have 24 irrigation canals along the corridor and we just have identified those as being potentially eligible, so that -- that's a big chunk of it; and then we have 14 to 17 bridges along the corridor that would need replacement as well. Fourteen to 17 of those are potentially eligible structures as well.

Then we have a couple other linear resources, we have the Santa Fe Trail and we also have the BNSF Railroad that are both eligible, or are listed resources; and then the remaining is a mix of businesses, primary residences, and buildings associated with potentially eligible ranches.

There are nine archaeological sites along the corridor, those sites are located between two sections. So the section between Pueblo and Fowler is -- is one
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area where there's a concentration of archaeological sites, the other is between La Junta and Las Animas.

And, then, moving down we -- for land use there are 13 conservation easements along the corridor, and then there are 10 public properties that could potentially be impacted, so these include several state wildife areas along the corridor, the John Martin Reservoir, the Fowler golf course, a couple pedestrian trails in Holly and Granada; and, then, it also includes some indirect impacts to other resources, including the Comanche National Grasslands, the Boggsville Historic Site, and, then, Old Bent's Fort. Those indirect impacts could be changes to -- to access getting to those areas.

And then park lands and recreational, there are 15 parks and recreational resources along the corridor. Again, many of those are the same, again John Martin Reservoir, several state wildlife areas, the two trails that I mentioned in Holly and Granada, the golf course in Fowler; and then there's four birding trails that use US 50 that have been identified by Colorado Division of Wildlife.

Other impacts along the corridor. We did look at transportation, it's our whole purpose and need, so we'd have a positive impact on -- on transportation,
we'd increase mobility and safety, which Dan talked about.

Hazardous materials along the corridor. We've identified 162 hazardous material sites. So that sounds high, but keep in mind it's any facility that harbors, or sells, or maintains hazardous materials, so that could be your Wal-Mart, it's your fueling stations, it's your farmer co-ops, places like that along the corridor. So that will be updated as we move forward, too.

And then Section 4(f) is a
transportation-related law, it provides additional protection to public parks and recreational areas, historic and archaeological resource sites, so it's -it's a redundant, but it's a separate resource that we looked at during the NEPA review.

So other resources along the corridor in -that have minimal impacts is environmental justice, water quality, climate change, aesthetics, air quality, traffic noise, and energy.

Social and economic conditions. We'll actually do a further review during the 2 Tier analysis, it's difficult to do it at this level of review because we don't actually have design at -- at the Tier 1 level, so that will -- further review on social and economic
conditions will be done at the 2 Tier level, so . . . So that's a high level overview of the environmental resources we looked at.

So, again, we'll go over the next step. So comments received tonight throughout the review period will be con -- considered and responded to in the Tier 1 Final EIS/Record of Decision, we expect that here -like Dan pointed out -- next year, about mid-2017.

After we get the FEIS/ROD completed we'll start looking at projects as they become avail -- as funding becomes available to go into the Tier 2 NEPA process and actually get in -- into the de -- design. Some of those Tier 2 level documents could be categorical exclusions, so those would be your smaller projects, maybe passing lanes, to get toward that final design -- or to that final product, or it could be an EA or potentially an EIS for any around-town routes; and, then, once that review is completed we'll actually go into a full project design and construction after the NEPA Tier 2 is -- is completed.

So comments tonight. Dan went over this, we'll go over it again. After I'm done with this presentation we'll give about a 5-, 10-minute break -- I know there's a list of folks that have already signed up to give a public hearing statement or comment, so we'll
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have a 5, 10-minute break, make sure everyone that signed up signed up and, then, we'll call you up.

Did you just skip one?
MR. LUKAS SCHROEDER: No.
MR. ROB FREI: No? Okay.
Oh, yeah. You can also speak your comments privately to the court reporter here if you don't want to do it in a public format (indicating).

You can also submit your written comments tonight. When you came in, on the back table there's a comment box there with comment forms, if you need additional time, or you have additional comments after tonight those can be mailed or e-mailed, and we'll give information here in just a moment -- moment.

So the public comment period ends on July 29, so please get your comments in before two weeks from this Friday.

And quickly going over verbal comments tonight. So those that actually want to stand up here and give a formal public hearing comment I will go through that list, I will call you up individually, please wait to be recognized. When you do come up we ask that you clearly state your full name and -- and where you're from.

There's a three-minute limit for -- for the
verbal comments, deferring verbal comment time is not going to be allowed; and, of course, please be respectful with your -- with your comments.

Here's additional information, there's more information on our project website down there (indicating).

You can also e-mail your comments at the atkinsglobal.com web address -- or e-mail address, and then there's also an address to mail your comments to (indicating).

So that concludes our -- our presentation, we're going to give it 5, 10 minutes, if you want to sign up to give an actual public hearing statement comment we'll -- we'll do that in just a moment. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Can we ask a question?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Can we ask a ques -- question as far as the technical on the -- on the EIS? I --

MR. ROB FREI: So -- real quick -- so the -the format tonight is if you have a public statement comment that will get addressed in the Final EIS and ROD in about a year from now, please come up here and make that statement in front of the microphone in about 5 to

10 minutes; if you have additional questions there will be folks milling around that you can ask additional questions to (indicating).

So thank you.
(A break was taken.)
MR. ROB FREI: Hey, folks, we're going to start the public hearing portion. Folks, we're going to start the public hearing portion of -- of this hearing, the public comment, so if you guys --

MR. CHRIS TOMKY: (Slapped chair.)
MR. ROB FREI: Thank you. We'll try that one more time.

If everyone could either take a seat or keep conversations low we're going to have folks that have signed up give a three-minute verbal comment, and we'll do that here in just a minute. So we're going to put up here on the screen to help you with your time kind of a countdown so you'll know where you're at in the comment process (indicating).

So, again, if you're not up here making a verbal comment, there's a comment that you want actually addressed in the Tier 1 EIS document, there are other ways to do it, just make sure you either submit a comment in one of the forms that -- that we talked about earlier tonight.

So we'll -- we'll just start into this.
Miss Kathy Davis. Thank you.
MS. KATHY DAVIS: Hi, I'm Kathy Davis from La Junta, and the only comments that I have are going to be brief.

So from 2006 -- at that time there has been 40 years studying on this, and, then, environmental study came in 10 years from that the last time that we did that, so the problem is -- that I have, you're not addressing -- the main problem area that I see on this that needs to be addressed pretty quickly is the area from Fowler to Pueblo where there's a lot of accidents happening in that stretch, because it is two lane the truckers are having a hard time, you know, with the people passing them and that's when the crashes are occurring. So that's one of the main problems that I -I see coming up, okay? That's it.
(Applause.)
MR. ROB FREI: Thank you.
Priscilla Aragon. Miss Aragon here?
(No response.)
MR. ROB FREI: Okay. Mike Franklin.
MR. MIKE FRANKLIN: Yeah, my name is Mike
Franklin, I live in La Junta. I have a business that is -- would be taken over by this thing right on the
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highway, I've got three homes that will be taken over by this deal on the highway right through my property, the exits have been put in years ago, and quite a bit of pastureland for my cows (indicating).

My business, I depend on everybody from the road to get my business from, but if they're coming to get bait from me at my bait shop, Hook, Line \& Sinker, they come to me whether they go through La Junta or whether they'll go around.

If they want to come see Comanche Grasslands, they'll pull into La Junta, they'll go.

I'm all for selling my property for this deal because I've seen lots of places in Texas that do bypasses, it brings people, it brings jobs, it brings lots of things, and my stuff will be for sale to them if they want it.
(Applause.)
MR. ROB FREI: Miss Norma Carne(sic).
MS. NORMA CANNON: Cannon.
MR. ROB FREI: Cannon. I'm sorry. Thank you.

MS. NORMA CANNON: I'm Norma Cannon, and I live in La Junta. This supposedly newest alternative to bypassing La Junta would go right through my property. Like Mr. Franklin I have lots of property right along
that right-of-way, but $I$ do not want a highway through that property.

Now, 50 years ago when they started this project I built a home out there at about the same time, then there was my house and two other houses between me and Higbee, and maybe two or three between me and the City of La Junta, since that time we have acquired numerous neighbors, including a rather large actually development, so I don't see these things taken into consideration on any of these maps.

And since they saw fit to list Highway 109, which has been moved sin -- from my house since probably 15 years ago to another location, I would like to see more specific maps and recommendations before we would proceed with such a project.
(Applause.)
MR. ROB FREI: Mr. Chuck Hanagan.
MR. CHUCK HANAGAN: I'm Chuck Hanagan, and I'm here today as a -- as a resident of the Town of Swink. My family's been involved in agriculture for well over a hundred years, I guess we've been involved in this project since four or five years ago when you guys started.

I'm not here today to speak out against improvements, I think we all agree that safety and
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mobility is a -- is a major concern, what I am against is I disagree with the limits of -- that this project is needed because we limit -- we currently limit economic development. We have economic development here, we have agriculture here, our number one concern in this area is agriculture. Producers in this area fight day to day on daily attacks to the agriculture in our area, whether it be our water, our land, water to the -- to the Front Range, water to Kansas, it's hard to farm in this area (indicating).

A lot of the problems with -- with this document that they've come out with -- and I don't have enough ink to print it and I don't have enough paper to print it, but fortunately they got a copy back there -if you'll take a look at it they talk about footprints, they're talking about the economic impact of what's under the pavement, they're not talking about the economic impact of when they put a -- put a farm -- or a road across somebody's farm, it impacts the other side of the highway, you can't get to that farm (indicating).

They're putting -- these are green lines now, four years ago it was yellow lines, they put that over the top of you it never goes away, that -- that Highway 50 probability someday is on -- is on top of your ground so you have to deal with that, that adversely affects
the proper -- your value of your property, it has to. Anybody that says it doesn't is an idiot.

I guess -- they talk about the economic input(sic) -- impacts, they're talking about the loss of productivity, they -- what they're using for figures in -- in economic loss is the dollars of a ton of alfalfa. I spend a hell of a lot of money -- all of these farmers spend a hell of a lot of money raising these crops. That money is spent down at the tire shop, at the auto parts shop, buying a new pickup, across the street at Benito's, wherever, that money is spent in our economy, and it's rolled -- county commissioners, I've talked to them -- somewhere between five and seven times that rolls.

They're only taking what's -- what's right underneath the pavement. There's going to be huge economic, significant impacts to our community with -if this goes through.

The other thing is this is just a general and potential document, if -- if -- you know, general and potential, it's been around for 50 years, damn well before that I've seen it, they're going through with this, at some point in time we've got to knock out the ridiculous of a freeway or expressway.

We do need improvements, we need to look at
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what's reasonable and -- and -- and justifiable. We need to add some practicality back into this project and not raise fear.

I know that there's a lot of money being put into these project -- or into these studies and things, and these guys have jobs to do, but let's -- let's be practical about this, so . . .

Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. ROB FREI: Mr. Tom Tomky.
MR. TOM TOMKY: Yes. My name's Tom Tomky, I'm -- live on a farm south of Rocky Ford here (indicating). I'm a community banker and a farmer, I deal with businesses up and down this whole corridor on a very frequent basis, all you have to do is -- is look at where the interstate highways went across rural America, look at the dying towns that they created (indicating). I do not want to see that happen to our beautiful Arkansas Valley.

They're talking about a -- a multi-decade project, you know, I'm not going to be around to see it, but I got a son right there that's a third generation farmer; I got grandkids right there, I hope they're going to be fourth generation farmer; and their kids are going to be farmers, and $I$ hope it's going to be right
here, but if our towns die they don't have a future (indicating).

And I -- I don't know where -- where this thing come(sic) from. I remember, like Norma Cannon, four years ago all the people in Southeastern Colorado asked for was a four-lane highway, we don't want you moving them out of our town (indicating).

You can go from Pueblo four lanes, you go down in the Valley, yeah, Fowler's two lanes going through town, Manzanola's four lanes, it's four lanes all the way from Manzanola through Rocky Ford, La Junta, you know, outside of La Junta it -- it ends, it picks up again four lanes through Las Animas, out towards Hasty it's four lanes, picks up again at Wiley, it's four lanes through -- through Lamar (indicating).

We don't need a mega, mega project funded by the taxpayers, and I don't know if this will ever happen, but I'm strongly against it.

And I think this format that you -- you got right now doesn't work (indicating). People want to be able to ans -- ask questions and hear the answers. If I go back there and talk to somebody and ask one question, somebody else has got questions, I don't know what their questions are, I -- I don't learn anything by -- by not having a question and answer before, so I'm strongly
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against this. Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. ROB FREI: All right, next is J.M.

```
Geringer(sic) -- Geringer.
```

(No response.)
MR. ROB FREI: From Rocky Ford. G-e-r-i-n-g-e-r.
(No response.)
MR. ROB FREI: Okay. Carol -- I can't read the last name, I apologize -- from La Junta. Is there a Carol from La Junta?

MS. CAROLYN EHRLICH: Is it Carol or Carolyn?
MR. ROB FREI: It could -- Carolyn, yes.
MS. CAROLYN EHRLICH: Carolyn Ehrlich from La Junta, Colorado. I'm retired. I just have -- my question is, is this going to be a true interstate or is it going to be a roa -- road like 287 that goes from Amarillo to Wichita Falls? That's . . .
(Applause.)
MR. ROB FREI: Miss Rebecca Goodwin.
MS. REBECCA GOODWIN: I am going to speak primarily from a more technical standpoint, but first I'd like to say -- I'd like to request that the review and comment period for this DEIS be extended. This is a massive document, we have had very little time to truly
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review it, and as somebody that has reviewed every one of the EISes having to do with Pinon Canyon, it takes time, so I would like to request that be considered, 'cause this is not a reasonable review and comment period.

Second I would like to say that there was a Programmatic Agreement -- this has to do with the historic cultural resources -- that we developed for this initial part of the Tier 1 and Tier 2, I'd like to request two things, a copy of the historic context that was to be developed under that, and also a copy of the draft of Relative Effects Report that is specified within that Programmatic Agreement, so that those can be reviewed in conjunction with this Draft -- Draft EIS.

Now, I understand that this Tier 1 is a broad overview, but you have looked at the very -- very different aspects -- the environmental, the water, the air, the cultural -- and you have segmented those to the standpoint they're standing in little silos (indicating). For an EIS that cannot be done, you have to look at that greater intermingling of those impacts, and, so, that certainly can be done in this -- in this Tier 1 , but it definitely must be done in that Tier 2 so that they're not segmenting those issues. Having been through the experience of that again with the Pinon

MEDINA COURT REPORTING
27761 County Farm Rd., Pueblo, CO 81006 (719) 948-4763

Canyon, an EIS was drawn up by the federal court because of that, so you need to look at that.

Secondly, as far as -- especially having to do with our agricultural lands, and something that we've worked so hard for the last 10 years -- for many years to protect, you should be considering the Cultural Landscape Approach, as required by the National Historic Preservation Act, to look at these farms and ranches and at their impacts, because that pulls together all those different approaches.

And you also need to consider -- Chuck mentioned this -- we have some -- a number of Centennial farms and ranches that will be impacted by this, these are ranches that have been in families -- by the same family for over a hundred years -- and my family happens to be one of those -- and those are significant resources, those needs to be considered.

Just one other thing. On your 4(f) evaluation -- I realize that you started this process nearly 10 year ago -- but it states that there's little physical evidence of where the Santa Fe Trail existed. Nearly six years ago a project was started to document the Santa Fe Trail and do National Register of Nominations on federal lands and on some of the lands of -- privately-owned lands of people that wanted to do
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that -- John Martin is certainly one of the areas where there are National Registered segments that have been identified -- I would suggest, considering that that was started over six years ago, that CDOT talk with the SHPO's office and be familiar with the work that's been done, 'cause that was started over six years ago.

And that's(sic) my main comments at this point, but $I$ would ask that you extend the review period, please.
(Applause.)
MR. ROB FREI: Mr. Chris Tomky.
MR. CHRIS TOMKY: Hi, my name's Chris Tomky, I'm a fourth generation Colorado farmer, and my fifth generation is sitting right there (indicating). I've lived in Rocky Ford my whole life, and my family and I have spent a lifetime improving the infrastructure of our farms and ranches, and when you take a highway and run it right through the middle of that and you get paid for the land that they take, well, that's fine, but they don't take into consideration now you're cut in half and everything that you worked your life for is now divided, and if there's an exit every mile -- which would be generous -- it's going to double the labor inputs and the cost of production, and it's just going to rip a hole right through this Valley
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(indicating).
And I can tell the thought that they had put into this by cramming us all in the baggage room of the depot instead of giving us the dignity of the community building, which is right over there (indicating).

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah. (Applause.)

MR. CHRIS TOMKY: And I do own farms and ranches that the highway is going to go through, but it's beyond that, it's for the entire Valley. I get gas at Loaf 'N Jug in my pickup and there's a lot of times that if -- you can't even get in there to get fuel, and that's a good thing, and I don't even recognize anybody who's there, it's all people passing through, and if there's a four-lane highway bypassing everything they're just going to keep their cruise control set and go around into Pueblo, they're not going to take an exit to nowhere, and it's just going to kill this entire Valley that everybody here has worked to preserve. That's all. (Applause.)

MR. ROB FREI: Mr. Randall Robertson.
MR. RANDALL ROBERTSON: My name is Randall Robertson, I'm from La Junta, I'm a commercial banker in town there.

My concerns are similar to everybody else's
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here. I guess you guys gave some statistics as far as the number of crashes and things like that, and this is to make things safer. I guess I'd like to know where the -- where the crashes are concentrated at, because unless they're right in the middle of our towns I don't see the purpose in bypassing all that, the four-lane will get -- get accomplished --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Right.
MR. RANDALL ROBERTSON: -- what you want to accomplish that way.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: That's right. Yeah.

## (Applause.)

MR. RANDALL ROBERTSON: The other thing is, is the timesaving to the amount of speed that you can cover the 150 miles in, nowhere here does it estimate what the timesaving is. I can't imagine what it is when you still got to go around the towns instead of going through them to get there, so that's a concern of mine.

And, like I say, it -- I'm kind of like everybody else, this thing just jumped up out of nowhere, for all the time that it took for the studying to get to this meeting tonight the public knowledge of it was not very forthcoming on this.

Let me get here to see the other questions.
(Reviewed document.)
I guess I want somebody to define what mobility is to me, I'm -- I'm having difficulty with that, the mobility part. We got -- we got highways just like everybody else does, I don't know what makes them any less mobile than the others. You continually showed tractors there, and things like that, maybe that's the total issue, I don't know. If it is, that's part of the -- the thing around here, if you put a four-lane through obviously that would resolve that issue also.

You're going to be taking away the tax base -- of whatever land you're taking out there, whether it be ranchland or farmland, you're taking away the tax base, who's going to maintain the roads that are left? Is that a CDOT thing still, or is it not? You're just adding expense on top of insult to us here in the towns.
(Reviewed document.)
And the -- you know, I'd just like to say, some of the statistics that you guys are using, you know, they're -- they're -- you're pulling them out of nowhere. If you don't have a concentration of where these accidents are occurring you're making us think that it's in this whole stretch here -- down here through our -- through 50 miles here, and I have -- I
have -- I have difficulty believing that.
You guys came and spent a couple of million dollars -- I don't have any millions -- out here on 71, never improved. If that's your guys' ideas of improving safety you did not accomplish one thing out there. UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: That's right.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Woo-hoo.
(Applause.)
MR. RANDALL ROBERTSON: So once you've lost our trust in something like that -- and I don't know if there was any public comment or anything known, or if that was just something that jumped out of nowhere, but, you -- like I say, the accidents haven't ceased there at all, you -- you accomplished nothing, spent millions, and my guess is that's what this is going to amount to, too.

But we thank you for your time coming down, next time get the community building next-door. Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. ROB FREI: All right, a Mr. Keith Goodwin.

MR. KEITH GOODWIN: My name is Keith Goodwin, Commissioner of Otero County, and I had one concern
about the format tonight that I wanted to capitalize on while here, is after this is over and you go back and ask a lot of questions we're all going to lose the answers, and, so, what I'd ask is that the questions that's asked to be sure to write them down so that those answers can be included in the report that's done so we know what the answers are and what the questions were, otherwise we're losing that information. Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. ROB FREI: Okay, that's all the names I have on my list right now, is there anybody else that wants to come up that I haven't called yet? She just raised her hand, I'll call you forward. There's one individual.

Please come up, I think it's George.
MR. GEORGE PFAFF: Yeah. Hi, I'm George Pfaff and I'm from Rocky Ford, and I -- I agree with a lot of naysayers here, I think that we -- the -- the transportation through the area $I$ think is adequate, I mean, I travel up and down there all the time and -- and I never occur any traffic problems or any -- any real major mishaps. Accidents are going to happen whether you want them to or not. I think increasing the -- to a four-lane highway and all these bypasses is only going to create possibly more traffic, and actually more
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accidents and more fatalities at that rate.
I look at these things that are going around town and stuff, that's got to affect the towns and it's going to make it a -- a dead area again, and that -- we want to build instead of take away. And I think people will skip the areas, just like I do when I'm on an interstate, I'll skip areas, too.

And the other thing, too, about bypasses, that you got a long mileage down there and that's got to increase the fuel consumption that we're going to be using, and the idea should be to decrease that, or -- or it -- so we're not using so much gas and oil and what have you.

And I think another thing, too, is we do have these four lanes going through Manzanola and Rocky Ford, Swink, and all of this, it's already existing, the thing -- we want to increase to four lanes between Pueblo and Fowler, that's fine, but it's -- and I don't mind that at -- at all there, but I -- I -- with the towns where you have to slow down -- you actually are controlling your traffic a little bit when you have these general slowdowns so that traffic is not too speedy, and -- and you can actually probably in -decrease the amount of fatalities and accidents and things like that, I think we do need that kind of
control.
I mean, to go around town going 75-, 80-mile-an-hour, I don't see the advantage of that -- of that, but -- and I think it really should be looked into, especially economic impact $I$ think is going to be very negative to this if we're going to go bypassing the towns.

Like I said, we have the four lanes already existing from Manzanola to just past La Junta, I don't see why they can't use that and just do what they need to do in between. Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. ROB FREI: Kimmi Lewis.
MS. KIMMI LEWIS: Hello, my name is Kimmi
Lewis, and I live south of La Junta.
And Mrs. Cannon is right, we need some common sense, we don't need any more taking of private property where she lives. Where the Cannon place is is a very nice property, and she doesn't need to be giving it up for a new expressway around the small towns that need the economic development, that need the people to stop.

And I'll guarantee you it's just like the town of Boise City, Oklahoma, when you go down to Amarillo, people do not stop there, they go right on by, buzz right by, and they don't stop downtown, and that's
what's going to happen here.
So four lanes work, if we need more four-lanes then let's look at that for safety, but let's have some common sense.

And we do need an extension of time for the comments, and I will make sure that other people ask for that as well, and that's something that you can do, you can write a comment to the DOT and ask for an extension of time.

I'm running for House District 64, and I'll guarantee the first thing I will do when I get to the capital is ask for an audit of the DOT. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Woo-hoo.
(Applause.)
MR. ROB FREI: Come on up.
MR. GEORGE HANZAZ: Thank you. My name is George Hanzaz, I grew up in Rocky Ford, lived in Stockton, California, for 23 years, moved back here, it's a great place to live.

I've traveled around. I remember back in the '60s, '70s, and into the early '80s High -- Interstate 25 bypassed Las Vegas, Nevada. It was complete everywhere else except Las Vegas, Nevada. They had some pow -- someone with power in the state legislature that held that up. So why I'm telling you is Las Vegas,

Nevada had a lot of through traffic, everyone went through there, they made money, once you go around -and I've seen this, Interstate 40 through Arizona, a lot of towns have dried up.

It's great, it's great to have a better way to get through, four-lane highways are good, but once you bypass towns you start -- from my experience what I've seen you start to take away economic activity.

The most important question you can ask tonight is who has the final say about this. These -the -- the company and the DOT people who are here tonight, they do not have the final say, it belongs to either the governor's office, state legis -- or the state legislature, they decide whether the money's spent or not, those are the people you need to talk to. These people here are doing their job in coming here and explaining things to us so we know what the thinking is by the policymakers, and I would ask you that -- take your time and find out the information, but find out who makes the final decision, that's what's really important. Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. ROB FREI: We've got a couple more that I see.

MR. BRIAN BURNEY: Hi, my name is Brian
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Burney, I -- I live on the corner -- sort of on the corner of Highway 50 and 71, it's on the west side of Rocky Ford, so I'm familiar with that interchange improvement, and familiar with a lot of those -- those crashes that have happened over my lifetime.

But I want to thank you guys for all your hard work, this is a tremendous amount of work that you've put into this since, $I$ don't know, 2004, 2005, 2006, something like that. So hats off, really a good job.

We have a little bit of fear going on here. We feel like we are Radiator Springs in the movies Car -- Cars, right, and that we're going to get bypassed and that our town's going to die -- or our communities are going to die. That may be true, but what I guess I would challenge us to say -- just like what George just said -- was -- you know, this is a decision that relies upon the governor's office and our legislators, so -we're very passionate here tonight, let's also be passionate in reaching out and writing letters to those folks, but let's be passionate about doing some work here in our own communities throughout the Valley.

There's a sign outside of Rocky Ford that now says, "Growing Together," right, and I would challenge each of you that we need to do more growing together as
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communities, and collaborate together as communities in the Arkansas Valley along the Highway 50 corridor.

And I think our county commissioners could tell us that in Otero County we have some divide amongst towns, right, amongst municipalities and how they work together, and, so, I would say that perhaps us working together would help us to solve some of our own problems regardless of what happens with the Highway 50 that goes through, and that -- there was an organization a few years ago I would again -- again encourage all of you to take a look at, I know La Junta has done some good things with a -- an organization called "strongtowns.org," right? They look at problems of small-town America, rural areas, related to civil engineering problems.

And, so, I went to a meeting here in Rocky Ford in that government building right over here, and -it was set up over there in that big, large space -- 12 people showed up (indicating). Do you know how sad that made me that only 12 people showed up? And none of them had the color hair that $I$ have right here right now. And I don't mean that to be offensive, I mean that to suggest that perhaps we need to take the bull by the horns in our communities, some good things that are said -- said -- being said here, and deal with some of
the issues that we're faced with.
Main street, right, what do we do about main street rural America. Not just Rocky Ford, or La Junta, or Manzanola, but main street in general. Let's not tackle it as a stand-alone problem, let's tackle it as a -- as a problem that we all endure and -- and figure out how to work together to do community development and things like that (indicating). So strongtowns.org, let's work at growing together.

And regardless of what happens here with this let's look at what reality does invite us.

I'm going to go back to the Santa Fe Trail as being the thing that guided the railroad through Southeastern Colorado to deliver -- to deliver goods and services, to develop our towns, and it is the thing that divides our towns.

Think about when your children are young and you tell them not to cross the railroad tracks, what is the impression that is burned into their brain when they're told not to go over there because they might get injured, because they might die if they cross to that side of town? Ladies and gentlemen, we cannot do anything about the railroad running through each of our communities, right? And Highway 50 was put next to the railroad for convenience sake, who knows why, right?
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Those -- those are civil engineering things that we cannot fix.

And, so -- really if we wanted to fix some of the problems we'd leave Highway 50 where it was and move the railroad, but that would cost billions more I'm sure than building a highway -- a highway from, you know, Pueblo to the Kansas state line.

But I just want to point out that that -that really is some of -- a bigger, broader social issue that maybe we need to look at how -- how do we tackle it as community members.

Thank you, sir.
Some of that -- some of that social issue of divide, 'cause we -- that -- we're responsible for that divide, right, that we have to live with, with things like the railroad, don't cross to the other side.

Sorry I went over, thanks.
(Applause.)
MR. ROB FREI: Thank you.
I think I saw one more hand go up, come on.
MR. RAY WATTS: My name is Ray Watts, I live in La Junta, and I'm a candidate for County Commissioner.

But I want you to take into consideration this phrase, "Get your kicks on Route 66." Not anymore,
'cause Route 66 -- partial of it dissolved towns, the towns do not exist, it's Interstate 40 now. I can remember driving when $I$ was a kid, with my parents -- I wasn't driving, they wouldn't let me -- but back in the day Route 66 went from California all the way across to the East Coast, it bypassed a lot of towns when Interstate 40 was built and it drew up all those towns to nothing, there's nothing there, people moved away. So take that in consideration when you look at what they're trying to do here, we could end up being a nothing. A nothing. We don't want that. Thank you. (Applause.) MR. ROB FREI: Is there anyone else that would like to provide a public comment? Yes, please come up.

MR. DEVIN CAMACHO: I just want to emphasize again to make sure you speak to your elected officials, especially representatives. Kimmi is right there, she is running for House District 64; you also have -- I am here for Representative Navarro, she'll be more than happy to take any questions you have (indicating). Just make sure you talk to your representatives because, again, they are the ones that appropriate -- appropriate the budget for these things to happen. So thank you. (Applause.)

MR. ROB FREI: Is there any -- anyone else? Yes, Elaine.

MS. ELAINE STEPHENS: I'm Elaine Stephens, and I live west of Fowler. It's a bad highway there. Where they extended the passing lanes out of Pueblo was wonderful, wonderful, but they did not extend it on down because it's not in the program yet.

But I'm right near the High Line Canal bridge, and when I make a left-hand turn coming out of Pueblo I start signaling clear back about a mile before, tapping to let them know that $I$ 'm going to make a left-hand turn, then $I$ hit the bridge and guess what, there's traffic coming from the east, so then I have to switch over to the right side. So it's a bad turn for my property, and the ones who live near me.

I have seen tractors try to go by there -semis -- and they all have to go to the center of that little bridge.

How many of you drive to Pueblo? A lot. Sure. It's really dangerous there.

68th Lane has a bad curve, too, that you can't(sic) hardly see when you're looking for traffic.

So I'd like you to consider that area from Pueblo to -- to Fowler. A lot of people live in the Valley and drive to Pueblo to work, I have a lot of
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```
friends who do, and I am concerned for the safety of people on that lane -- or on that part of the highway. I appreciate all the work you do 'cause you've got your job cut out, it's a bad one. Thank you. (Applause.)
MR. ROB FREI: Is there anyone else?
(No response.)
MR. ROB FREI: Okay. Thank you.
For those that did not sign up I'll ask that you go in the back and please sign your name here just so we can keep a registry of it as well. Thank you, and -- and we'll be available till 8:00 tonight. Thank you. (Presentation was concluded.)
```

```
PRIVATE COMMENTS WERE TAKEN BY COURT REPORTER AS FOLLOWS:
```

MS. DOROTHY MUTH: Okay, I got in it for the very last of this, but $I$ been to the other one and $I$ been talking to someone, what you were saying here is exactly what you were saying at the other one. How do you --

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry?
MS. DOROTHY MUTH: I got to figure out how to put this without sounding . . .

I think bypassing the towns is going to kill the towns.

And 50 years ago, when $I$ was a kid, I remember you guys taking the land from the ranchers down -- all the way down Highway 50 and promising them a four-lane highway at that time, 50 years ago I remember that, and I think that's what you ought to stick with instead of taking land -- more land from the ranchers and doing them all in. That's my -- my spiel on it.

This going around, you're going to kill the towns, and -- and all we need is a four-lane highway, and I don't think you -- we're giving it all to Colorado Springs and Denver.

And Pueblo, that one interchange that you
guys keep changing every five years, and -- anyway -sorry. That's good.

MS. SHIRLEY HERMAN: I just wanted to make sure that when aligning this if they've already deleted a certain area that it doesn't come back without our noticing and causing problems with our water companies.

We have a domestic rural water company that is along the -- okay, it's along an eliminated roadway. As a small, domestic, rural water company, our water plant and all the wells are alongside of the roadway, it would be devastating to all of our customers to the south of Rocky Ford if something were to happen to our water company.

MR. GALE BUTLER: Anyhow, we got a dummy named Ken that's a architect, and he's up there on the project on the river -- Arkansas River and screwing everything up.

You notice when you come through Fowler, Colorado, that big, wide spot in the highway where you can't get a truck -- a semi around the corner to go across the river or go somewhere else, he designed the common curb out in the middle of the highway.

And then you got a project here in Manzano --
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nola, a parking lot he designed, you can't get a full-size pickup in it because he figured, well, we don't have big pickups anymore.

And then you come down here to the Armory in Rocky Ford, Colorado, he designed that, and the water's supposed to drain to the south, and what does it do, it drains into the building.

And then the WW Feeds in La Junta, he come in there and he cost the company 1500 -- 15 yards of concrete because he overkilled the foundation for a floor, a 40-by-60 building that they just going to store feed in. He thought they were going to park railroad trucks -- or trains in there.

And then -- and then on the -- on the highways, when they make the transitions from the bridges to the asphalt they can seem to never jive, they always three or four inches off, 'cause you go across the road whap, whap, whap.

And then when it comes to patching and repairing they don't do a good job. This outfit out of Can -- Canon City, it installed a -- they did a job on 266, the State finally had to come out and redo it for them.

Oh, and another deal a kid -- a kid did, he designed a deal out here at Highway 50 and 71 where that

1 barrier was, when you leaving to go back to Pueblo or
2 you going tonight you'll see they had to saw it because
3 the traffic couldn't see over that, then these small
4 cars -- they had several wrecks on account of that
5 because, duh, we didn't savvy what was going on.

7 down to the job site to see what's happening, so that's 8 the main problem.
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|  | ${ }^{64}[2]-40: 10,46$ | 8:3, | Bent's | Centennial | 8:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 66[3]-45: 25,46: 1, \\ 46: 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 9: 19, & 9: 20, & 9: 23, \\ 9: 24, & 10: 2, & 10: 7, \end{array}$ | better [6] - $4: 8,6: 17$, <br> $7: 24,11: 8,12: 3,41: 5$ | $\begin{array}{lr} \text { center } & 47: 17 \\ \text { certain } & 50: 6 \end{array}$ | conflicting 5:22 <br> conjunction $30: 1$ |
|  | 68 t | 10:11, 10:21, 11 | beyond | y | nnect 12:2 |
|  | 6:30 | 11:15, 11:15 | 33.10 | 32:1 | nn |
| 1 |  | 11:21, 23:23 | bigger 45:9 | rtify 53:5 | connects 12:2 |
| 3:11, 3:17, 3:22, |  | alternatives [14] | billions 45 | chair 21:10 | conservation |
| $3: 24,4: 25,5: 1,6: 12$, |  | 3:16, 8:2, 8:5, 8:22, | birding 16:20 | challenge [2] - 42:16, | consider [2] - 31:11, |
| 6:15, 9:23, 10:7, |  | 9:2, $9: 5,10: 6,10: 17$ | bit [7] - 2:14, 3:4 | 42:24 | 47:23 |
| 11:15, 12:14, 12:22, |  | 10:22, 10:25, | $4: 16,12: 21,23: 3 \text {, }$ |  | onsideration [7] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 17: 24, \quad 18: 6, \quad 21: 22, \\ & 30: 9, \quad 30: 15,30: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \mathrm{~s}[40: 21 \\ & 71[3]-36: 3,42: 2, \end{aligned}$ | Amarillo [2] - 29:18, | $38: 21,42: 1$ BNSF b | changes [2] - 5:15, | 7:21, 8:16, 11:5, |
| 1,000-foot [4] - 12: | $\begin{gathered} 71[3] \\ 51: 25 \end{gathered}$ | Amarillo [2] - 29:1 39:24 | BNSF 15:18 | 16:13 | 24:10, 32:20, 45:24, |
| 13:1, 13:13, 14:16 | 713 14:9 | America [3] | Boggsville 16:11 | characteristics | considered [3] - 18:6, |
| 10 [8] - 6:12, 6:15, | $75 \quad 39: 2$ | 43:14, 44:3 | Boise 39:23 | chosen 12:23 | :3, |
| $\begin{array}{ll}16: 5, & 20: 12, \\ 22: 8, & 21: 1 \\ \text { 2 } & 31: 20\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79 \quad 15: 6 \\ & 7: 20 \quad 52: \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{43: 5}{\text { amongst }}$ [2] - 43:4, | Boone 9:12 box 19:11 | Chris [5] - 21:1 | considering [2] |
| 10-min |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { box 19:11 } \\ & \text { brain } 44: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $32: 11,32: 12,32: 1$ | consist |
|  |  | 13:7, 34:15, 36: | br |  | 1 |
| 1051 | 8 | 38:24, $42: 7$ | 19:1, 21 | 24:18, 24:18, 31: | construction |
| $109$ |  | analysis [6] - 4:7 | Brian [2] | 硅 | 11:4, |
| 43:2 | 80 | 13, |  | cited 5:20 | 38 |
| 131 | 80s 40:21 | Animas [5] - 11:10 | 47:12, 47:18 |  | continually $35: 6$ |
| 14 15:14 | 81067 1:7 | Animas 11.11 -11, 16: | bridges [3]-8:6, | civil [2] - 43:14, 45:1 | contribute 5:14 |
| 15 [3] - 16:16, 24:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 89 \quad 12: 2 \\ & 8: 00 \quad 48: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 13 | 15:14, 51:16 | clear [2] - 5:16, 47:10 | control [2] - 33:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 51: 9 \\ & 150[3]-4: 3,4: 19, \end{aligned}$ |  | annually 5:1 | brief [3] - 2: | clearly 19:23 | 39:1 ${ }^{\text {3 }}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 150[3]-4: 3,4: 19, \\ 34: 16 \end{gathered}$ |  | ans 28:21 | ings [3] - 23:14, |  | ntroll |
| 150-mile |  | answers [4] - 28: 37:4, 37:6, 37:7 | brings [3] - 23:14, <br> 23:14, 23:14 | $\begin{array}{lr} \text { closer } & \text { 10:16 } \\ \text { closest } & 11: 8 \end{array}$ | convenience 44:25 conversations 21: |
| 13:21, |  | Anyhow 50 | broad 30 | co-ops 17:8 | cor 8:14 |
|  | abilit | anymore [2] - $45: 25$ | broader 45:9 | Coast 46:6 | corner [3] - 42 : |
| 17 [2] - 15:14, 15:15 | 7:12, 10:18 |  | budget 46:2 <br> build [4] - | collaborate color 43:21 | r [45] - 3 |
| 1790 14:7 | able $28: 21$ - | anyway 50:1 apologize 29:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { build }[4]- \\ & 11: 19,38: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { color 4o } \\ & \text { Colorado }[14]-1: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { corridor }[45] \\ & 3: 10, ~ \\ & 4: 1, ~ \\ & 4: 3: 4 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 18th 53:11 | $\begin{gathered} \text { access } \\ 7: 14, ~ \\ \hline 11: 11 \end{gathered}$ | Applause [20] - 22:18 | build-out 12:2 | 2:2, 2:9, 4:21, 16:21 | 4:8, $4: 16,4: 17,4: 20$, |
|  | ac | 23:17, 24:16 | bui |  | 4:22, 5:8, 5:18, |
|  | 35:23, 36:14, 37:2 | 19 |  | 44:14, $49: 23,50: 21$ | 6: |
|  |  | 33:7, 33:20 |  | 51:5, 53:2, 53:5 | 7 |
|  | accommodates 8:10 |  | bui | e |  |
| [18] | accomplish [2] - 34:10, | $\begin{array}{lll} 39: 12, & 40: 14, & 41: 22 \\ 45: 18, & 46: 12, & 46: 25 \end{array}$ | built [9] - 8:15, 9:19, $10: 1,10: 10,11: 22,$ | combined [2] - 3:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 13,13: 22,13: 24 \\ & 14: 2,14: 8,14: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| $9: 17$, $10: 22: 24$, $11: 7$ | ```36:5``` | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 18,46: 12,46: 25 \\ & 48: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $12: 1,12: 16,24: 4,$ | combined [2] - 3:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 8,14: \\ & 14: 23,1 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 10: 22, & 11: \\ 12: 25, & 13: 1 \end{array}$ | accomplished [2] - $34: 7,36: 15$ | appreciate |  | come(sic 28:4 | 15:12, 15:14, 15:2 |
| 17:22, | accordance | Approach 31 | bull | comes 51:19 | 16:4, 16:7, 16:17, |
| 18:13, | account 52 | approaches $31: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { burned } 44: 19 \\ & \text { Burney [2] - } 41: 25 \end{aligned}$ | coming [7] - 2:6, $22: 17,23: 6,36: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 23, \quad 17: 3,1 \\ & 17: 17, \quad 27: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| 30:23 | acquired | $\begin{gathered} \text { appropriate }{ }^{46: 23,46: 23} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Burney } \\ 42: 1 \end{gathered}$ | $41: 16, \quad 47: 9, \quad 47: 1$ | corridor-w |
| $\begin{array}{ll}2,866 & 14: \\ 2004 & 42: 8\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { acres [3] } \\ 14: 9 \end{array}$ | $\text { approved } 3: 23$ | bus [2] - 6:22, 6:2 | comment [27] - 2:1 |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll}2004 & 42: 8 \\ 2005 & 42: 8\end{array}$ |  | approximately [4] | businesses [2] - 15:21 | 2:18, 2:19, 2:21, | corridors |
| $\begin{array}{cc} 2005 \\ 2006 & 42: 8 \\ \hline 5] \end{array}$ | across $26: 10,27.16{ }^{\text {2 }}$, $46: 19,5$, | 4:3, 4:18, 5:1, 5: | 27 | 2:22, $2: 24,2: 25$ | 7:2 |
| 3:16, 2 | 50:23, 51:17 | Aragon [2] - 22:20, | Bu | 3:19, 18:25, 19: | cost [3] - |
| 2008 5:10 | Act 31:8 |  | buying $26: 10$ | 19:15, 19:2 |  |
| 2012 5:10 | activity | 16:1, 17:1 | buzz 39 : | $21: 9,21: 15,21: 18$ | $21$ |
| 2016 [3] - | ctual | architect 50:17 | bypas | 21:21, 21:2 |  |
| 23 [2] | adding 35: | ar | by | 30:4, 36:12 | county [11] |
| 2380 | additional | 14 |  | : 1 |  |
| 24 [2] | 19:12, 19:12, |  |  |  |  |
| $25[2]-13: 8,40: 22$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 38: 7, \quad 43: 14 \\ \text { Arizona } 41: 3 \end{gathered}$ | bypassing [5] - 23:24, | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 6, \\ & 19: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 53: |
| $25012: 25$ | address [5] - $6: 2$ | Arkansas [5] - 3:7, | $\begin{gathered} \text { bypassing }[5] \text { - } 23: 24 \\ 33: 15,34: 6,39: 6, \end{gathered}$ | $20: 1,20: 3,$ |  |
| $250 \text {-foot }$ | 7:23, 20:8, 20:8 <br> addressed [4] - 7: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rkansas } \\ & 4: 21, ~ \text { [5] } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $49: 12$ | $20: 9,22:$ | $16: 8, \quad 36: 2,41: 2$ |
| 266 <br> 27 <br> 15 | 20:23, 21:22, 22:11 | 50:18 |  | 40:6, 49:1, 52:9 | course [3] - 16:8 |
| 287 [3] - | addressing $22: 10$ | Armory 51: |  | mmercial 33:23 | 16:20, $20: 2$ |
| 29:17 | adequate 37 |  |  | mmissioner [2] - |  |
| 287/US [2] | adjacent 13:13 Administration a | aspects |  |  | 53:4, 53:13 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 29 & 19: 15 \\ 29 \text { th } & 3: 21 \end{array}$ | Administration 3:24 advantage 39:3 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { aspects } & 30: 17 \\ \text { asphalt } & 51: 16 \end{array}$ | California [2] - 40:18, |  | over 34:1 |
|  | advantage ${ }^{\text {advantages }}$ [2] - | assess 12:21 | 46:5 | common [3] - $39: 16$ | ows 23:4 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 12 \\ & \text { adverse } \quad 11: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Assessment [3] } \\ & 3: 12: 5: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAMACHO } 46: 16 \\ & \text { can't }[9]-9: 9,13: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 4, \quad 50: 24 \\ & \text { communities [8] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ramming } 33 \\ & \text { rash 5:11 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | adverse 11: <br> adversely |  | 25:20, 29:9, $33: 12$ | 7:19, 42:14, $42: 22$ | cash-related 8:10 |
|  | ics | atkinsglobal.com 20: | :17, 39:10, 50:2 | 43:1, 43:1, 43:24, | crashes [5] - 5:10 |
| 3,047 14:1 | affect 38:3 | attacks | 51:1. ${ }_{\text {can }}$ (sic | 44:24 | 22:15, 34:2, 34: |
| 30-day 3:20 | affects 25:25 | audit ${ }^{4}$ | can't(sic <br> Canal 47:8 | community [17] - $7: 25$ | $\begin{array}{ll}42: 5 \\ & \\ \text { create }\end{array}$ |
| 10 | ards 3:2 | auto avail | canals [2]-13:2 | $8: 15,8: 20,9: 18,$ $10: 1, \quad 10: 9,10: 14,$ | 37: |
|  | $\text { against }[4]-24: 2$ | available [6] | 15:11 | $11: 22,12: 1$ | criteria [2] |
| 4 | agencies $4: 15$ | 3:25, 4:4, 4:7, 18:11, | candidate 45:22 | 26:17, 27:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { criterla } \\ & \text { crops } 26: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 4 |  |  | Cannon [8]-23:19, $23: 19,23: 20,23: 2$ | 36:19, 44:7, | cross [4]-7:12, |
|  |  | avoid [2] - 14:3, 14:15 avoiding 13:16 | $\begin{array}{ll} 23: 19, & 23: 20, \\ 23: 22, & 28: 4, \\ 29: 16 \end{array}$ | 45:11 companies 50:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 18,44: 21,45: 16 \\ & \text { ossings } 7: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 4 (f [2] - 17:11, 31:18 | Ag |  |  | company [5] - 41:11, | cruise 3 |
| 4 | A |  | cannot [3]-30:20 | :10, 50:1 | 3] |
| 46:2, 46:7 | agricultura | B | Canon 51.21 |  |  |
| $40-\mathrm{by}-60$ 51:11 | 8:15, 9:2, 9:16, 9:23, |  | Canon 51:21 | comparable [3] | curb |
| 47 8:24 | 10.15, 9.2, $9.16, ~ 9.23$, |  | nyon [2]-30:2, $31: 1$ | 10:7, 10:18 | current [2]-4:7, 12:7 |
|  |  | background [2] - 9:8 $12: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capital } 40: 12 \\ & \text { capitalize } \quad 37 \end{aligned}$ | compared [2] - 5:12, | urrently [2] - 4:24, |
|  | 12:15, 13:10, $24: 20$ |  | Carne(sic 23:18 | comparison | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 3 \\ & \text { 1rve } 47: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 25:5, 25 : | bad [4] - 47:4, 47:14, <br> 47:21, 48:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Carne (sic } \begin{array}{l} \text { 23:18 } \\ \text { Carol } \end{array} \text { [3] } 29: 9, \end{aligned}$ | comparison 8 compiled $5: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 47: } 21 \\ & \text { =omers } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Airport | baggage 33:3 | 29:11, 29:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { compiled } 5 \\ & \text { complete } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { customers } \\ & \text { cut }[2] \text { - } 32: 21,48 \end{aligned}$ |
| $5[4]-18: 23,19: 1$, | alfalfa | bait [2] - 23:7, 23:7 | Carolyn [5] - 29:12 | 40:22 [2] 3.24, |  |
| 20:12, $20: 25$ |  | balance 7:22 | $29: 12,29: 13,29: 1$ |  |  |
| 50 [24] - $3: 9,5$ | alignment [11] - 6:13, | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { balancing } \\ \text { banker } & \text { 5:25 } \\ \text { - }\end{array}$ | $29: 14$ | $18: 18,18: 20$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5: 8,5: 18, \\ & 8: 25, \quad 9: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $6: 13,6: 16,8: 7,8: 24$ | banker [2] - 27:13 | carpooling 6:24 carpooling/trans | $\text { con }[2]-13: 1,18:$ |  |
| 5, 9:6, | 9:4, 9:5, 9:10, 9:13, | rrier 52:1 | carried [4] - 7:2, | concentrated 34:4 concentration [2] | Dahlke [3] - 2:1, 2:1, |
| 24, 26:21, 35:25 | 9:14, $12: 23$ - ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (ignments 312 | base [2] - 35:12, | $7: 16,10: 3,10: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { concentration } \\ & 16: 1,35: 22 \end{aligned}$ | :10 |
| 2, 43:2, 43:8, | alignments [3] - 9:12 9:15, 14:5 | beautiful 27:19 | tegorical 18:14 | [4] | daily 25:7 |
|  | alleviate | come 18:10 3.25 | categories [3] - 8:14 | 25:5, 34:19, 36:25 | damages $8: 1$ |
| 16, 49:17, 51:25 | alleviate <br> allowed [2] | becomes [3] - 3:25, | 12:13, $12: 18$ | $\text { concerned } 48: 1$ | damn 26:21 |
| 587 14:9 | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{a} 110 \\ 20 \end{array}$ | 4:7, 18:11 | cause [6]-30:4, 32 : | concerns 33:25 | Dan [7] - 2:1, 2:1, |
|  | al | beginning [2] - 3:5, | 45:14, 46:1, 48: | ncluded [3] - $3: 8$, | $\begin{array}{ll} 2: 10, & 12: 11, \\ 18: 8, & 18: 21 \end{array}$ |
|  | alongside | ievi |  | 14, 52:10 | angerous |
|  | already [7] | $\text { belongs } 41: 1$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { caused } & 5: 22 \\ \text { causing } & 50: 7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { udes } \quad 20: 1 \\ & \text { ete } \\ & 51: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $[2]-5: 9,5: 11$ |
|  | :17, 14:18, | benefits |  |  |  |
| 60 15:6 | 38:16, 39:8, $50: 5$ alternative [19] - 6:3, | len | $32: 4, \quad 35: 15$ | conditions [2] - 17:21, | $22: 3$ |
| 60s 40:2 | alternative [19] - | :10 | ceased 36:14 | conducted [3] - $3: 16$, | de 18:12 |
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| dead 38:4 | 25:18, 26:3, 26:6, | family [3] - 31:15, | 29:6, 29:9, 29:1 | haven't [2] - 36:14, | inches 51:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| deal [7] - 23:2, 23:12, | 26:17, 39:5, 39:21, | 31:15, 32:16 | 29:20, 32:11, 33:21, | 37:12 | include 16:6 |
| 25:25, 27:14, 43:25, | 41:8 | family's 24:20 | 36:22, 37:10, 39:13, | having [6] - 22 | included [3] - 8:3, |
| 51:24, 51:25 | economy 26:12 | farm [5] - 25:9, 25:18, | $40: 15,41: 23,45: 19$, | $28: 25,30: 2,30: 2$ | 13:14, 37: |
| decide 41:14 | Effect 8:13 | 25:19, 25:20, 27:12 | $46: 13,47: 1,48: 6$, | 31:3, 35:3 | includes [6] - 8:6, |
| decision [5] - 3:22, | effects [5] - 9:25, | farmer [5] - 17:8, | 48:8 | hazardous [3] | 8:7, 14:19, 14:19, |
| 3:23, 18:7, 41:20, | 10:8, 10:13, 11:13 | 27:13, 27:23, 27: | frequent [2] - 5:15, | 17:4, 17: | 14:20, 16:9 |
| 42:1 |  | 32:13 [2] | 27:15 | he's 50:17 | including [3] - |
| decisions $4: 14$ | efforts 4:11 | farmers [2] - 26:8, | Friday 19:17 | hear 28:21 | 16:10, $24: 8$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { decrease } \\ 38: 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ehrlich [3]- 29:12, } \\ & \text { 29:14, 29:14 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 25 \\ & \text { farmland [2] - 13:4 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { front }[4]-3: 1,12: 12 \text {, } \\ & 20: 25,25: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hearing [7] - 1:2, } \\ & 18: 25,19: 20,20: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { increase [3] - 17:1, } \\ 38: 10,38: 17 \end{gathered}$ |
| deferring | EIS [11] - 3:17 | 35:13 | fuel [2] - 33:12, | 21:7, 21:8, 21:8 | increased [3] |
| define 35:2 | 3:25, 4:2, 18:1 | farmlands | fueling 17:7 | held 40:25 | 12:5, |
| definitely 30:23 | 20:20, 20:23, 21:22 | farms [4] - 31 | full [4] - 12 | hell [2] - 26:7, 26 | increasing 37:23 |
| DEIS 29:24 | 30:14, 30:20, 31:1 | 31:13, 32:17, 33: | 14:12, 18:19, 19:23 | Hello [2] - 2:6, 39: | indicating [26] - |
| deleted 50:5 | EIS/Record 18:7 | faster 12:9 | full-size 51:2 | Here's 20:4 | 2:17, 2:21, 9:10, |
| delineation 14:12 | EISes 30:2 | fatalities [2] - 38: | fully 7:3 | hereby 53:5 | 13:9, 19:8, 20:6, |
| deliver [2] - 44:14, | either [3] - 21:13, | 38:24 | funded 28:16 | heretofore 53:6 | 20:10, 21:3, 21:19, |
| 44:14 | 21:23, 41:13 | Fe [4] - 15:18, 31:2 | funding [4] - $3: 25$, | hereunto 53:10 | 23:4, 25:10, 25:20, |
| demands 6:2 | Elaine [3] - 47:2, | 31:23, 44:12 | 4:4, 4:7, 18:11 | HERMAN 50:4 | 27:13, 27:18, 28:2, |
| Denver 49:24 | 47:3, 47:3 | fear [2] - 27:3, 42:11 | future [5] - 3:6, 6:2, | Hey 21:6 | 28:7, 28:15, 28:20, |
| Department $2: 2$ | elected 46:17 | February 3:15 | $7: 2,7: 23,28: 1$ | Hi [4] - 22:3, 32:12, | 30:20, 32:14, 33:1, |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { depend } & 23: 5 \\ \text { depot } & \\ \text { 33:4 }\end{array}$ | eligible [4] - 15:13, | federal [3] - 3:24, |  | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 37:16, } & 41: 25 \\ \text { Higbee } & 24: 6\end{array}$ | 33:5, 43:19, 44:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { depot } 33: 4 \\ & \text { design }[7]-5: 15, \end{aligned}$ | 15:16, 15:19, 15:22 <br> eliminated [4] - 7:20 | $\begin{gathered} 31: 1, ~ 31: 24 \\ \text { feed } \\ 51: 12 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Higbee } 24: 6 \\ & \text { higher }[2]-5: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:21 } \\ & \text { indirect [2] - 16:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 13:1, 13:1, 17:24, | 9:7, 11:5, 50:9 | feedlots 13:2 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \text { gner } \\ 12: 19 \end{array}$ | $16: 12$ |
| 18:12, 18:16, 18:19 | else's 33:25 | Feeds 51:8 |  | highway [36]-3:6, | individual 37: |
| designed [4] - 50:23, | emphasize 46:16 | feel 42:12 | G-e-r-i-n-g-e-r 29:7 | 3:24, 6:23, 7:2, 7:6, | individually 19:21 |
| 51:1, 51:5, 51:25 | encourage 43:10 | FEIS/ROD 18:9 |  | 7:7, 7:11, 7:13, 8:24, | information [5] - |
| detailed 14:13 | ends [3] - 3:21, 19:15, | FEMALE [6] - $33: 6$ | gas [2] - 33:10, 38:12 gave 34:1 | 12:2, $23: 1,23: 2$, | 19:14, 20:4, 20:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { determine }[3]-8: 17, \\ & 13: 4,14: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 12 \\ & \text { endure } 44: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 34: 8, & 34: 11, \\ 36: 7, & 36: 8 \end{array}$ | gave 34:1 <br> general [4] - 26:19 | $\begin{array}{ll} 24: 1, & 24: 11, \\ 25: 23: 20, & 28: 6, \\ 32: 18, \end{array}$ | $37: 8,41: 19$ <br> infrastructure 32: |
| devastating 50:12 | energy 17:20 | fewer [6] - 9:23, 9:24, | 26:20, 38:22, 44:4 | 33:9, 33:15, 37:24, | initial 30:9 |
| develop [2] - 6:5, | Engineer $2: 2$ | 10:8, 11:22, 11:25, | generally 11:6 | 42:2, 43:2, 43:8, | injured 44:21 |
| 44:15 | engineering [3] | 12.8 | generation [4] - 27:22 | 44:24, 45:4, 45:6, | ink 25:13 |
| developed [3] - 8:25, | 43:15, 45:1 ${ }^{\text {entire [4]- } 4: 8,5: 1,}$ | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { FHWA } & 12: 8 \\ \text { fifth } & 32: 13\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:24, } 32: 13, \quad 32: 14 \\ & \text { generous } 32: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $45: 6,47: 4,48: 2$, $49: 16,49: 17,49: 22$, | input 4:14 |
| $30: 8, \quad 30: 11$ developing | entire $33: 10, ~ 33: 18-4: 8, ~ 5: 1, ~$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { fifth } & 32: 13 \\ \text { fight } & 25: 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { generous } & 32: 23 \\ \text { gentlemen } & 44: 22 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 49: 16, & 49: 17, & 49: 22, \\ 50: 21, & 50: 24, & 51: 25 \end{array}$ | input(sic 26:4 inputs 32:24 |
| development [7] - 5: | environment [9] - 4:12, | figure [2] - 44:6, | geological [2] - 14:22, | highways [4] - 27:16, | installed 51:21 |
| 6:3, 24:9, 25:4, 25:4, | 9:16, 9:16, 9:19, | 49:10 | 14:25 | 35:4, 41:6, 51:15 | instead [4] - 33:4, |
| 39:21, 44:7 | 9:25, 10:10, 12 | figured 51:2 | George [6] - 37:1 | himself $2: 5$ | 34:18, 38:5, 49:19 |
| DEVIN 46:16 | 12:17, 14:9 | figures 26:5 | $37: 16,37: 16$ $40: 17$ | historic [8] - 10:14 | insult 35:16 |
| die [4] - $28: 1,42: 14$, | environmental ${ }_{1: 1}{ }^{\text {[16] }}$ ] $\overline{\text { a }}$ | final ${ }^{[8]}-3: 22,18: 7$, $18: 15,16,20: 23$, | 40:17, $42: 16$ | $15: 6,15: 7,16: 11$, $17: 14, ~ 30: 8, ~$ | Intent 3:13 <br> interchange [2] |
| 42:15, 44:21 ${ }_{\text {difference }} 9: 17$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 1: 1, & 2: 7, \\ 4: 11, & 4: 6, \\ 4: 13, & 5: 4, \\ 6: 4, & 8: 14, \end{array}$ | $18: 15,18: 16,20: 23$, $41: 10,41: 12,41: 20$ | Geringer (sic 29:4 | $17: 14,30: 8,30: 10$ <br> 31:7 | interchange [2] 49:25 |
| difficult 17:23 | 11:14, 11:25, 12:13, | finally 51:22 | gives 4:8 | historical 13:12 | interested 53:9 |
| difficulty [2] - 35:3, | 12:22, 17:18, 18:3, | financial $4: 10$ | giving [3] - 33 | history 3:4 | intermingling $30: 21$ |
| 36:1 | 22:7, 30:17 | fine [2] - 32:20, 38:18 | 39:19, 49:23 | hit 47:12 | interstate [7] - 27:16, |
| digging 15:3 | environmentally $3: 10$ | fit [2] - 12:18, $24: 11$ | Gobin 1:6 | hold 15:9 | 29:16, 38:7, 40:21, |
| dignity 33:4 | environmentally- 11:3 | five [3]-24:22, | goes [4] - 25:23, <br> $26: 18,29: 17,43: 8$ | hole 32:25 | 41:3, 46:2, 46:7 |
| direction 12:7 | environments [2] | 26:13, 50:1 | $\text { golf [2] - } 16: 8,16: 19$ | Holly [3] - 11:23, | introduce 2:5 |
| directly disagree 6:6 25.2 | 10:1, $12: 1$ especially [ | fix [2] - 45:2, $45: 3$ flexibility | golf [2] - 16:8, goods $44: 14$ | $16: 9,16: 19$ | investment $4: 10$ |
| disagree 25:2 $\text { dissolved } 46: 1$ | especially [3] - 31:3, $39: 5,46: 18$ | flexibility [3] - 6:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { goods 44:14 } \\ & \text { Goodwin }[5]-29: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { homes } 23: 1 \\ & \text { Hook } 23: 7 \end{aligned}$ | ```invite 44:11 involved [3] - 6:3,``` |
| District [2] - 40:10, | estimate [2] - 13:25, | floodplain 11 | 29:21, 36:23, 36:24, | hope [2] - 27:23, 27: | $24: 20,24: 21$ |
| 46:19 | 34:16 | floor 51:11 | 36:24 | horns 43:24 | irrigation [2] - 13:23, |
| ditches 13:23 | eval 8 | folks [6] - 18 | government 43:17 | hour 52:10 | 15:11 |
| $\text { divide }[3]-43: 4,$ | evaluated 8:2 <br> evaluation [2] - 3:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 2,21: 6,21: 7, \\ & 21: 14,42: 21 \end{aligned}$ | governor's [2] - 41:1 <br> 42:18 | houses 24:5 <br> however [3] - 10:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { issue }[4]-35: 8, \\ & 35: 10,45: 9,45: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| divided 32:22 | 31:19 | followed 6:8 | Granada [4] - 11:19, | 11:18, 15:2 | issues [3] - 6:25, |
| divides 44:16 | everybody [5] - 23:5, | FOLLOWS 49:2 | 11:19, 16:9, 16:19 | huge 26:16 | 30:24, 44:1 |
| Division 16:22 | 33:19, 33:25, 34:21, | footprints 25:15 | grandkids 27: | hundred [2] - 24:21, |  |
| document 120$]-3: 20$, $12: 14,15: 10, ~ 21: 22, ~$ | $35: 5$ everyone [4] - $3: 1$, | Ford [19] - 1:7, $10: 11$, $10: 12,10: 12,10: 13$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { graphic 13:3 } \\ & \text { Grasslands [2] - 16:1 } \end{aligned}$ | 31:15 |  |
| $12: 14$, $25: 12, ~$ 26:10, | everyone [4] - $3: 1$, 19:1, $21: 13,41: 1$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 10: 12, & 10: 12, \\ 10: 16, & 27: 12, \\ 10: 13, \end{array}$ | 23:10 |  |  |
| 31:22, 35:1, 35:18 | everything [3] - 32:21, | 29:6, $32: 15,37: 17$, | gravel $14: 24$ greater [3]-10:13, | 1 |  |
| documented 3:17 documents [2] - 4:1, | 33:15, 50:19 everywhere $40: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 15,40: 17,42: 3, \\ & 42: 23,43: 17,44: 3, \end{aligned}$ | greater [3] - 10:13, $10: 14,30: 21$ |  | January |
| 18:13 | evidence 31:21 | 50:13, $51: 5$ | green [2] - 9:8, 25:2 | I-25 4:23 | jive |
| dollars [2] - 26:6, | exactly 49:7 | foregoing 53:7 | grew $40: 17$ ground gre 25:24 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { idea } & 38: 11 \\ \text { ideas } & 36: 4\end{array}$ | job [6] - 41:16, 42.10, |
| 36:3 | example 13:6 | formal 19:20 | ground $25: 24$ growing [3]- | ideas 36:4 ${ }^{\text {identified [10] - 7:1 }}$ | 48:4, 51:20, 51:21, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { domestic [2] - 50:8, } \\ 50: 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{lr} \text { except } & 40: 23 \\ \text { excluded } & 5: 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { format }[4]-19: 8, \\ & 20: 22,28: 19,37: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \text { growing } & {[3]} \\ 42: 25, & 44: 9 \end{array}$ | $10: 2,11: 21,11: 25 \text {, }$ | jobs [2] - 23:14, 27:6 |
| DOROTHY [2] - 49:4, | exclusions 18:14 | formations 14:25 | guarantee [2] - 39:22, | 13:7, 15:3, 15:12, | John [3] - 16:7, 16:17, |
| 49:10 | exist 46:2 | forms [2] - 19:11, |  | 16:21, 17:4, $32: 3$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { DOT [3] - } 40: 8,40: 12, \\ & 41: 11 \end{aligned}$ | existed 31:21 <br> existing [13] - 6:13, | $21: 24$ <br> Fort [3] - 9:11, 9:13 | guess [8] - 24:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { identify } \quad 13 \\ & \text { idiot } 26: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jug } 33: 11 \\ & \text { July }[4]-1: 4,3: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| double [2] - 14:17, | $6: 13,6: 15,6: 16,8: 7$, | 16:12 | 35:2, 36:16, 42:15, | imagine 34:17 | 19:15, 53:11 |
| 32:23 | $8: 23,8: 25,9: 4,9: 5$, | forth 53:6 | 47:12 | impact [11] - 1:1, | $\underset{36: 13}{\text { jumped }[2] ~-~ 34: 21, ~}$ |
| downtown $39: 25$ draft [5] - $1: 1,3: 17$, | $9: 10, ~ 9: 13, ~ 38: 16, ~$ | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { forthcoming } & 34: 24 \\ \text { fortunately } & 25: 14\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { guided } 44: 13 \\ & \text { guys [10] }-21: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 11,7: 21,8{ }^{8: 18,} \\ & 12: 21, \quad 13: 21, \quad 14: 21, \end{aligned}$ | June [2] - 3:18, 3:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { draft }[5]-1: 1,3: 17, \\ & 30: 12,30: 14,30: 14 \end{aligned}$ | exit [2] - $32: 22,33: 17$ | fortunately forward [7] 2 | $24: 23,27: 6,34: 1,$ | $16: 25, \quad 25: 16, \quad 25: 18$ | Junta [23]-10:24, |
| drain 51:6 | exits 23:3 | 7:16, 10:3, 10:22, | 35:20, 36:2, 36:4, | 39:5 | 10:25, 11:2, 16:2, |
| drains 51:7 | expect 18:7 | 13:19, 17:9, 37:13 | 42:6, 49:15, $50: 1$ | impacted [6] - 8:16, | 22:4, 22:24, 23:8, |
| drawn 31:1 | expense 35:16 | foundation 51:10 |  | 14:8, 14:11, 15:1, | 23:11, 23:23, 23:24, |
| drew 46:7 | experience [2] - $30: 25$, | four-lane [13] - 7:8, |  | 16:6, 31:13 impacts [22] - 8:1, |  |
| ```dried 41:4``` | 41:7 | 7:8, $7: 10,77: 13,7: 15$, |  | impacts [22] - 8:1, <br> $9: 3,9: 15,9: 18,9: 23$, | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 10, ~ 29: 11, ~ 29: 15, \\ & 33: 23,39: 9,39: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| 47:25 | expressway [4] - 7:8, | 35:9, 37:24, 41:6, |  | 9:24, 11:7, 11:14, | 43:11, 44:3, 45:22, |
| driving [2] - 46:3, | $7: 15,26: 24,39: 20$ | 49:17, 49:22 | habitat [5] - 9:3, <br> 14:10, 14:11, 14: | 11:22, 11:25, 13:5, | 51:8 |
| 46:4 | extend [2]-32:8, 47:6 | four-lanes 40:3 | 14:17, ${ }^{\text {14, }}$ | $13: 16,14: 18,16: 10,$ | justice 17:18 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Due } & 9: 3 \\ \text { duh } & 52: 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { extended [2] - 29:24, } \\ & 47: 5 \end{aligned}$ | four-laning 7:7 $\text { Fourteen } 15: 15$ | hair 43:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 13, \\ & 25: 19,23, \\ & 26: 4, \\ & 26: 17,18, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| dummy 50:16 | extension [2] - 40:5, | fourth [3]-7:17 | half 32:21 | 30:21, 31 |  |
| dying 27:17 | 40:8 | 27:24, 32:13 | Hanagan [3] | mplement |  |
|  |  | Fowler [12] - 9:2 | Hanzaz [2] - 40:16, | improve [6] - 3:7, 5:8, |  |
| E | F | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 22, \quad 10: 3, \quad 14: 5, \\ & 15: 25, \quad 16: 8, \quad 16: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 40:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { improve }[6]-3: 7,5: 8, \\ & 5: 19,5: 25,7: 11, ~ 9: 17 \end{aligned}$ | Kansas [5] - 4:18, 5:2, |
|  |  | 22:12, 38:18, 47:4, | happen [6] - 27:18, | improved [2] - 12:7, |  |
|  |  | 47:24, 50:20 | 28:18, $37: 22,40: 1$ | 36:4 4 | Kathy [3] - 22:2, 22:3, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { e-mail [2] - } 20: 7,20: 8 \\ & \text { e-mailed 19:13 } \end{aligned}$ | faced 44:1 <br> facility [5] - 7:4, | Fowler's fragment 280 | happened 42:5 | improvement [2] - 6:20, 42:4 | Keith [3] - 36:22, |
| EA 18:16 | 7:5, 7:9, 7:16, 17:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fragment } 9: 2 \\ & \text { Franklin }[4]-22: 22, \end{aligned}$ | happening [2] - 22:13, | improvements [13] - | 36:24, 36:24 |
| earlier 21:25 | factor 5:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Franklin }[4]-22: 22 \text {, } \\ & \text { 22:23, } 22: 24,23: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 52:7 | 3:9, $4: 5,5: 8,5: 18$, | Ken 50:17 |
| easements 16:4 | factors $5: 13$ | freeway [3] - 7:8, | happens [3] - $31: 15$, | 6:11, $6: 22,6: 22,12.4$ | kicks 45:25 <br> kid [4] - 46:3, 49:14, |
| east [3] - 4:17, 46:6, | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { failed } & 6: 25 \\ \text { fairly } & 10: 6\end{array}$ | 7:13, $26: 24$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 43: 8, & 44: 10 \\ \text { happy } & 46: 21 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 18,8: 8,8: 11, \quad 12: 4, \\ & 24: 25, \quad 26: 25 \end{aligned}$ | kid [4] - 46:3, 49:14, 51:24, 51:24 |
| east/west 4:20 | Fails 29:18 | Frei [30] - 2:6, $2: 7$ | harbors 17:6 |  | kids 27:24 |
| economic [14] - 5:21, | familiar [3] - 32:5, | 12:11, $219: 5$, | hardly 47:22 |  | kill [3] - 33:18 |
| $11: 13$, $25: 3, ~ 17: 21, ~$ 2 |  | 22:22, $23: 18,23: 20$, | Hasty ${ }_{\text {hats }} \mathrm{e} 28: 13$ | inadequate [3] - 5:16, | 49:12, 49:21 |
| 25:3, 25:4, 25:16, | families 31 | 24:17, 27:10, 29:3, | hats 42:9 | 5:19, 5:21 | Kimmi [4] - 39:13, |
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|  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{pr}$ | rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39:14, 46:18 |  |  |  | :10, 53:8 | rather |
| kitchen 2:20 | I | $\mathbf{N}$ | P | process [9]-4:2, 4 : | Ray [2] - 45:21, 45:21 |
| knock 26:23 |  |  |  | 4:12, 6:3, 6:8, 10:1 | reaching |
| knowledge 34:23 |  |  |  | $18: 12,21: 19,31:$ | real [2] - 20:21, 37:21 |
| known [3] - 14:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mail } 20: 9 \\ & \text { mailed } \quad 19: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Naff [2] - 53:4, 53:13 } \\ & \text { name's [3] - 2:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { p.m }[2]-1: 5,52: 11 \\ & \text { paid } 32: 19 \end{aligned}$ | produce 13:22 | $\text { reality } 44: 11$ |
| knows 44:25 | main [9] - 1:6, | :11, 32 | paleontological [4] | product 18:1 | really [8] - 12:24, |
|  | 22:10, 22:16, | named | :22, 15:1, 15:2, | production | 15:2, 39:4, 41:20, |
|  | 4:2, $44: 2,44: 4$, | names 37:10 | 15:4 46:3 | productivity | 42:9, 45:3, 45:9, |
| I | maintain $35: 14$ maintains din | national [5] | parents 46:3 | Pro.9 26.5 | 47:20 |
|  | $\begin{array}{lc} \text { maintains } & 17: 6 \\ \text { maintenance } \quad 8: 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 11 \\ & 32: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { park }[2]-16: ~ \\ & \text { parking } 51: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Professional [2] } \\ & 53: 4,53: 13 \end{aligned}$ | reason 14:3 <br> reasonable [2] - |
| La [23] - 10:24, 10:25, | major [7] - 4:19, 4:22, | natural [7] - 8:15, | [2] - 16: | 47:7 | 30:4 |
| 11:2, 16:2, $22:$ | 11:4, 11:6, | 9:16, 9:25, 11:22, | 17: | Programmatic [2] | reasons |
| 22:24, 23:8, 23:11, | 25:1, 37:22 | 12:1, 12:16, 14:9 | partial [2] - 7:7, 46:1 | 30:7, $30: 13$ | Rebecca [2] - |
| 23:23, 23:24, 24:7, | makes [2] - 35:5, 4 | Navarro 46 | party 53:9 | project [22] - 3:14, | 29:21 |
| 28:11, 28:12, 29:10, | making [2] - 21:20, | naysayers 37:18 | passing [8] - 5:14, | 5:7, 5:17, 5:24, 6: | rebuild |
| 29:11, 29:14, 33:23, | 35:23 | nearly [2] - 31:20 | 7:6, $8: 8,12: 6,18: 15$, | 7:24, 8:5, 10:1 | received [2] - 10:14, |
| 39:9, $39: 15,43: 11$, | MALE [2] - $20: 16,20: 18$ | 31:22 | 22:15, 33:14, 47:5 | 11:9, 18:19, 20:5 | 18:5 |
| 44:3, 45:22, 51:8 | management 6:25 | needed [3] - 3:9, 4:5, | passionate [3] - 42:19, | 24:22 | recogniz |
| labor 32:2 | Manager 2:8 | 25:3 | 42:20, 42:21 | :2, 27:2, 27:5, | recognized 19:22 |
| lack 11:6 | Manzano 50:25 | needs [11] - 5:22, 6:1, | past | 7:21, 28:16, 31: | recommend 3:9 |
| Ladies 44:22 | Manzanola [7] - | 6:20, 6:21, 7:2, 7:3, | pastureland | 50:18, 50:25 | recommendations [2] |
| $\underset{\text { Lamar }}{\text { 28:15 }}$ [3] - 5:3, 5:5, | 10:5, 10:6, 28 | $7: 5,7: 23,7: 25$ $22: 11,31: 17$ | patching 51: | projects [3] - $3: 2$ | 8:19, 24:14 |
| lands [5] | Manzanola's | negative | 17. | $8: 15$ | Record |
| 31:4, |  | neighbors |  |  |  |
| 31:25 |  | NEPA | cent | ope | 15, 16:16, 17: |
| Landscape | markets | 4:12 | perhaps [2] - 43:6, | 16:5 | red |
| lane [3] - 22 | Martin | :16 | $43: 23$ | property [9] - 23:2 | redo 51 |
| 47:21, 48:2 | 16:18, $32: 1$ | neutral 53:9 | period [8] - 2:13, | 23:12, 23:24, $23: 2$ | uced 53: |
| lanes [16] - | massive 29:25 | Nevada [3] - 40 | 2:23, 3:20, 18:5, | 1, 39:17, | reduction |
| 12:6, 18:15, | material 17:4 | 40:2 | :1 | 39:19, 47:15 | undant |
| 28:9, 28:10, | materials [2] - | newest 23:23 |  | [2] | refuge 7:10 |
| $28: 13$, $38: 15, ~$ $38: 14$, | 17:6 | next-door | Pfaff [2] - 37:16, |  | refuges 7:10 |
| 40:2, 47:5 | $\max _{\text {maximize }}$ 4:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { nice } \begin{array}{l} \text { ni:19 } \\ \text { nine [2] } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | phrase 45:25 | otection | regardless [2] |
| Las [8] - 11 | maybe [4] - 18: | no-build [2] | physical 31:2 | otection |  |
| 11:11, | 24:6, 35 | noise 17:20 | picks [2] |  | regional [4] - 4:20, |
| 40:22, 40:23, | med 7:9 | nola 51:1 |  | provides | $5: 23,6: 10,6: 17$ |
| law 17:12 | median | Nominations 31:2 | pickup [3] - 26:1 | providing 6:1 | Register 31:23 |
| leading 9:1 | Medina [2] | none 43:20 | 33:11, 51:2 | provision 8:8 | Registered 32:2 |
| learn 28:24 | 53:13 | Norma [5] - 23:18, | pickups 51:3 | Prowers 11:16 | registry 48:11 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { least } & 12: 21 \\ \text { leave } & 45: 4\end{array}$ | meet [6] | 23:19, 23:22, 23:2 | $\text { Pinon [2]-30:2, } 30: 25$ | public [24] - 1:2, | related [2] - 6:6, |
| leave $45: 4$ leaving 52:1 | 7:5, 7:24, 10:19, 12:7 | 28:4 ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ [17] - $1: 6$ | places [2] - 17:8, | 2:13, 2:22, 2:23 | 43:14 |
| ${ }_{\text {led }}^{\text {leaving }} 8: 1952$ | meeting [2] - 34:23, | north [17] - 1:6, 6:12, | 23:13 | 2:25, 3:15, 3:19 | Relative 30:12 |
| led 8:19 [2] - 47:9, | 43:16 | 6:12, $8: 23,8: 23$, | planning [3] | $4: 15,16: 5,17: 13$ | relatively 5:12 |
|  | meets | 9:21, 10:5, 10:8, | 4:14, 8:7 | 19:15 | released 3:17 |
| 47:12 ${ }_{\text {legis }}$ 41:13 | meets 11:8 | 10:12, 10:13, 10:25 | plant 50:11 | 19:20, 20:13, $20: 22$ | rel |
| legis 41:13 legislators l | mega [2] - 28:16 | 11:2, 11:10, 11:11, | please [9] - 13:19, | 21:7, 21:8, $21: 9$, | reli |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { legislators } 42: 18 \\ & \text { legislature [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | members 45:11 <br> mentioned [3] | 11:20, $11: 23,14: 4$ north/south $4: 22$ | $19: 16, ~ 19: 22, ~$ $20: 24$, $32: 9$, | $34: 23, ~ 36: 12, ~ 46: 14, ~$ $53: 4,53: 14$ | 5:4, 11:17 ${ }_{\text {remaining }}$ |
| 40:24, 41:14 | $16: 19,31: 12$ | Notary [2] - 53:4 | 46:14, 48:10 | publ | ining 15 |
| less [2] - 9:3, 35:6 | microphone 20: | 53:14 | point [3] - 26:23 | Pueblo [20]-2:3 | repairing 51:20 |
| lesser 11:14 | mid-2017 18:8 | nothing [5] - 36:15, | 32:8, 45:8 | $4: 17,5: 2,5: 11,8: 21$ | replacement 15:15 |
| let's [10]-27:6, | middle [3] - 32 | 46:8, 46:8, 46:11, | pointed 18:8 | 8:22, 15:25, 22:12, | report [2] - 30:12, |
| $\begin{array}{ll}27: 6, & 40: 3,40: 3, \\ 42: 19, & 42: 21,44: 4\end{array}$ | $34: 5,50: 24$ Mike [3] - 22 | 46:11 ${ }^{\text {notice }}$ [3]-3:13 | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { points } & 5: 24 \\ \text { policymakers }\end{array} 41.18$ | 28:8, $33: 17,38: 18$, | 37:6 [2] ${ }^{\text {] }}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 42: 19,42: 21,44: 4, \\ & 44: 5,44: 9,44: 11 \end{aligned}$ | Mike [3] - 2 22:23, 22:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { notice } \begin{array}{c} \text { not }-3: 13, \\ 9: 22, \\ 90: 20 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | policymakers 41:18 portion [2] - 21:7, | $7: 10 \text {, }$ | reporter [6] - 2:24, <br> 19:7, 49:1, 49:9, |
| letters 42:20 | mile [2] - $32: 23,47: 10$ | noticing 50:7 | $21: 8$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 19: \\ & 53: \end{aligned}$ |
| level [14] - 3:11, | mileage 38:9 | nowhere [5] - 33:18 | positive 16:25 |  | Representative 46:20 |
| 6:10, 12:14, 12:19 | miles [7] - 4 | 22, | possible [2] - 14 | pulling 35:2 | representatives [2] |
| $\begin{array}{lll} 12: 22, & 12: 25, & 13: 15 \\ 14: 12, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 1,6: 12,6 \\ & 34: 16,35: 25 \end{aligned}$ |  | :1 | pulls 31:9 | 46:18, 46:22 |
| 17:24, 18:1, 18:2, | milling 21:2 | $24: 8$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { possibly } & 37: 2 \\ \text { potential } \\ {[13]} \end{array}$ | 5:17 | request [3] - 29:23, |
| 18: | million |  | , |  | $30:$ |
| Le | millions |  |  | 11:9, 16:24 | requir |
| 39:14, 39:15 | :15 |  | 15:70, 15:20, 26.4 |  | Reservo |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { lifetime }[2]-32: 16, \\ & 42: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\operatorname{mind}_{38: 19}^{\min }[3]-13: 19,17: 5 \text {, }$ |  | 15:7, 26:20, 26:21 potentially [7] - 14: | putting 25:21 | 6: |
| likely [2] - 5:13, 5:22 | mine 34:19 | observed |  |  |  |
| limit [4]-7:13, | minimal 17:18 | obviously | 15:22, 16:6, 18:17 |  |  |
| 19:25, 25:3, $25: 3$ | minimize [4] - 7:25 | occur 37:21 | pow 40:24 |  |  |
| limited 5:14 | 9:18, 10:13, | occurring [2] 35:23 | power 40:24 |  | resource [3] - 8:16, |
| limits [2]-5:21, 25:2 | mining 14:23 minor 8:8 | offensive 43:22 | practical 27:7 | quality [3] - 8:17 | 17:14, 17:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { linear } 15: 17 \\ & \text { lines [2] - 25:21, } \end{aligned}$ | minor minute 8: |  | practicality ${ }^{\text {prairie }} 902$ |  | resources [18] - 10:1 |
| 25:22 |  | 41:13, 42:18, 52 | preferred [10] - 7:16, | quarries 14 | $2: 17,13: 11 \text {, }$ |
| links 4:22 | minutes | officials 46:17 | 8:12, 9:6, 9:8, 9:20, | ques $20: 19$ | $15: 2,15: 5,15: 6$, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { listed }[2]-8: 14, \\ 15: 19 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:1 } \\ & \text { mishaps } \end{aligned} \text { 37:22 }$ | oil 38:12 <br> Oklahoma 39:23 | $10: 2,10: 20,11: 7$, $11: 15,11: 21$ | quick 20:21 | $15: 17,15: 20,16: 10,$ |
| lived [2] - 32:15, | Miss [4] - 22:2, 22:20, | one-on-one $3: 1$ | prepared 4:1 | 22:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 16, \quad 17: 1 \\ & 30: 8,31: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 40:17 |  | ones [2] - 46:23, 47:15 | presentation [6] - | quite [2] - 9:9, 23: | respectful 20:3 |
| lives 39:18 | mitigation [3] - 4:9, | ongoing 8:6 | :12, 2:12, 18:23, |  | responded 18:6 |
| Loaf 33:11 local [8] - 4:15, $4: 19$ | $4: 10,13: 18$ mix $15: 20$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \begin{array}{l} \text { onto } \begin{array}{l} 7: 12 \end{array} \\ \text { operations } \end{array} & 14: 23 \end{array}$ | $8: 14$ |  | response [4] - 22:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { local }[8]-4: 15,4: 19 \\ & 5: 22,6: 17,7: 12, \end{aligned}$ | mix 15:20 mobile $35:$ | opportunities [2] | on |  | 29:5, 29:8, 48:7 |
| 7:14, 7:22, 8:10, | mobility [15] | 5:15, 12:6 | primarily 21.22 |  | result [2] - 10:8, 11 |
| located 15:24 | 5:9, $5: 19,5: 20,5: 21$, | option [3] - 6:15, 7:2, <br> 7:11 | $\text { primary } 15: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Radiator } 42: 12 \\ & \text { rail [2] - } 6: 21, ~ 6: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { results } 8: 18$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { location }[4]-6: 17, \\ & 7: 14,10: 21,24: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 25,5: 25,7: 1,7: 22, \\ & 7: 22,12: 5,17: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 7: 11 \\ \text { options } & 7: 10 \end{array}$ | $\text { print }[2]-25: 13 \text {, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rail [2] - } 6: 21,6: 24 \\ & \text { railroad [8] }-15: 19, \end{aligned}$ | retired 29:15 <br> review [14] - 3:19, |
| locations [2] - 8:19 | 25:1, $35: 3,35: 4$ | organization [2] | Priscilla [3] | 44:13, 44:18, 44:23, | review [14] - $3: 19$, |
| 14:6 | modes 6:20 | 43:9, 43:12 | 53:4, 53:13 | 44:25, 45:5, 45:16, | $17: 16, \quad 17: 22, \quad 17: 23 \text {, }$ |
| long-distance $\begin{aligned} & 5: 23 \\ & \text { looking [2] - 18:10, }\end{aligned}$ | moment [3] - 19:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Otero [3] - } 9: 21, \\ & 36: 25,43: 4 \end{aligned}$ | private [3] - 39:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 12 \\ & \text { raise } 27: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $17: 25,18: 5,18: 18,$ |
| $\underset{47: 22}{\text { looking }[2]-18: 10, ~}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:14, } \\ & \text { money } \end{aligned}$ | 36:25, 43:4 others $35: 6$ | $49: 1,52: 9$ privately | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { raise } & 27: 3 \\ \text { raised } & 37: 13 \end{array}$ | $29: 23,30: 1, \quad 30: 4 \text {, }$ |
| lose 37:3 | 26:9 | otherwise [2] - 37:8, | privately-owned 31:2 | raising 26:8 |  |
| losing 37:8 | $41: 2$ | 53:9 | pro [2]-3:14, 10:9 | ranchers [2] - 49:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reviewed } 16] \text { - } 3: 10 \text {, } \\ & 15: 10,30: 1,30: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| loss [2] - 26:4, 26:6 | money's 41:14 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { ought } \\ \text { outcome } & \text { 99:18 } \\ \text { 53:9 }\end{array}$ | probability 25:24 | 9:19 | 35:1, $35: 18$ |
| lost 36:10 | move [3] - 13:19, 17:9, | outcome outfit 51: | probably [2] - 24:12, | ranches [6] - 15:22, | Reynolds 9:11 |
| lots [4] - 2:15, 23:13, $23: 15,23: 25$ | $45: 4$ moved | $\begin{aligned} & \text { outfit } 51: 20 \\ & \text { outlined } 6: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $38: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 8, \quad 31: 13, \quad 31: 14, \\ & 32: 17, \quad 33: 9 \end{aligned}$ | ridiculous 26:24 |
| low $21: 14$ | 40:18, $46: 8$ | 2] | :10 | ranchland 35:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { right-of-wa } \\ & \text { rip } 32: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| wer [2] - 3:7, 4:21 | movies 42:12 | 42:23 510 | 52:8, | Randall [6] - 33:21, |  |
| KAS 19:4 ${ }^{\text {K }}$ | moving [2] - 16:3, 28:7 | S 8.9 | roblems [8] - 22:16, | 33:22, 33:22, 34:9, | 14: |
| Lyons"(sic 9:14 | multi-decade $27: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { overlays } 8: 9 \\ & \text { overview [2] }-18: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $25: 11,37: 21,43: 7,$ | $\text { range }[4]-14: 4,14: 6 \text {, }$ |  |
|  | multiplied 13:8 <br> municipalities 4 | overview [2] - 18:2, |  | range [4] - 14:4, 14:6, $14: 7,25: 9$ | 50:18, $50: 23$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { municipalities } & 43: 5 \\ \text { MUTH [2] - 49:4, } & \text { 49:10 }\end{array}$ |  | eed 24:15 | rangelands [3] - 13:10, | roa 29:1 |
|  |  |  | proceeding 53:5 | $14: 7, \quad 14: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { road }[5]-5: 15,23: \\ & 25: 19,29: 17,51: 18 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
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MR. DAHLKE: All right. If you would like to take a seat we're going to get started with our presentation tonight.

My name's Dan Dahlke, I'm a resident Engineer with the Colorado Department of Transportation here out of Pueblo, I've been working on this project for about two years; and I'll let Rob introduce himself now (indicating).

MR. ROB FREI: So I'm Rob Frei, I'm the Region 2 Environmental and Planning Manager, and I've been working on this project for about two-and-a-half years.

MR. DAN DAHLKE: All right, a little bit about tonight's meeting. If you would like to look at the document, the document's out in the hallway, there's a hard copy of it, we do not have copies to hand out, it's a fairly large document (indicating).

If you would like to review it additionally there -- we have it in our office here in Pueblo, and it's also in libraries throughout the whole corridor, so if you would like a list of where it's located let us know and we can steer you toward that.

There's also comment forms out in the hallway, if you would like to provide a written comment go ahead, fill it out, and put it in the box. You also
can get online and fill out an electronic form, or also send an e-mail to an e-mail address that is down at the bottom (indicating). We will also have this posted at the end of the presentation.

After the presentation we'll also allow you to give a verbal comment, which Rob will go into more specifics at the end of that presentation of how to do that.

So now we'll jump into project history. The Corridor Selection Study was the beginning stages for developing a corridor-wide vision for the future highway to improve safety and mobility in local -- the local Arkansas Valley. The study concluded that the transportation improvements are needed along US 50, and recommend the corridor be environmentally reviewed under a Tier 1 level En -- Environmental Impact Assessment. The Tier 1 EIS began in 2006.

A little bit of the schedule. A Notice of Intent for the project was published in January of 2006, scoping and public meetings were conducted in February 2006, and an Alternatives Evaluation was conducted and documented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS which was released in June of 2016.

The public will review and comment on the document for a 30-day period beginning in June -- and
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actually that is -- we actually changed that to a 40-day period, and currently will end on Feb -- or July 29 th.

The decision in the combined Tier 1 Final EIS and Record of Decision, once approved by the Federal Highway Administration, will be complete -- will complete the Tier 1 EIS. As funding becomes available for projects within the corridor a Tier 2 NEPA document will be prepared.

Since the US 50 corridor is from Pueblo all the way to Kansas funding will not be available all at once to implement improvements for the entire corridor all at once.

The Tiered NEPA process allows CDOT to environmentally analyze current and future funding when it becomes available. Studying the entire corridor at once gives CDOT a better understanding of mitigation strategies, and the ability to maximize financial investments for mitigation efforts corridor-wide.

Using the Tiered NEPA process allows environmental analysis to shape the transportation planning decisions, along with input from agencies and you, the local public.

The corridor that this study looks at is from US 50 east from Pueblo to the vicinity of the Kansas state line, which is approximately 150 miles long. It's
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a major local, regional, and national corridor serving east/west travel throughout the local -- Lower Arkansas Valley, Southern Colorado, and beyond. The corridor links two major north/south transportation routes of I-25 and US 287. It also currently serves as the main street for nine local communities in Southeast Colorado. The Tier 1 NEPA study used a study area of approximately 1 to 4 miles wide for the entire 150-mile wide corridor from Pueblo all the way to Kansas. The US 287/US 50 reliever route was studied separately in the US 287 at Lamar Reliever Route EA. The reliever route study analyzed US 287 routes that go around the community, so we excluded that from this project. Purpose of the project. The purpose for the proposed improvements along US 50 corridor is to improve safety and mobility for all users. Safety data compiled from 2008 to 2012 showed approximately 330 crashes annually from Pueblo to the Kansas line. This crash data observed showed the corridor to be relatively higher compared to other state averages of similar corridors. Several factors are likely to contribute to this, including limited passing opportunities, frequent changes in road design characteristics, and in -inadequate clear zones.

For mobility, inadequate mobility along the
corridor has been cited as a factor that limits economic development. Inadequate mobility is likely caused by conflicting needs of the local, regional, and long-distance users, as -- as well as numerous uncontrolled access points along the corridor. This project seeks to improve mobility for all users by balancing mobility and access needs, while also providing flexibility for future travel needs. So -- next slide. Next. For alternative screening, the alternative developed process involved using transportation engineering and environmental criteria to evaluate potential transportation solutions. Each of the criteria was directly related to the purpose and need of the project. The screening process followed four steps which are outlined through the following questions.

For the first step we looked at a regional level where would the transportation improvements be made. We looked at a north corridor, which was 1 to 10 miles north of the existing alignment, we looked at the existing alignment, and, then, we also looked at south options, which ranged from 1 to 10 miles south of the existing alignment. The existing corridor was selected based on the location better serving local and regional users.
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The next step we took was what types or modes of transportation improvements would meet the needs of the corridor, so we looked at rail, bus, carpooling, which included transportation system management, and also just the highway. The rail, bus, carpooling and transportation safety management strategies failed to address safety issues, mobility for any user, and provided flexibility for fu -- and provide flexibility for future traffic needs. The highway option was carried forward because it fully addressed all the needs.

The third step we took, and the question that we asked was, what type of facility would meet -- meet the needs of the corridor. So we looked at a two-lane highway with passing lanes, we looked at a four-lane highway, we looked at a four-lane rural expressway, and, then, we also looked at a four-lane freeway.

The facility types without median refuge, which the two-lane options and the four-lane highway option didn't provide, would not improve the ability for local users to cross or turn left onto the highway, a four-lane freeway would severely limit the number of locations -- or crossings of the -- the locals could access, for these reasons the four-lane highway -- or the four-lane expressway -- pardon me -- was identified
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as the preferred facility to be carried forward.
The fourth step we took to -- took a look at was through town or around town, and the question we asked was would transportation improvements be made through the communities, or along the corridor, or around them.

So the through-town corridors were eliminated from consideration because of the impact it would have to local mobility, balance mobility for all users, and flexibility to meet future traffic needs; the around-town corridors would better meet the project purpose and need, and minimize community impacts.

For alternatives evalua -- evaluated, in accordance with NEPA a no-build alternative is included to provide a basis for comparison with the build alternatives. For this project the no-build alternative includes ongoing maintenance of pavement and bridges on the existing US 50 alignment; it also includes planning minor safety improvements, provisions of passing lanes, routine pavement overlays, repair of any weather- or crash-related damage, and also accommodates local agency improvements to the US 50 corridor.

Selection of the preferred alternative. The preferred around-town route was based on the Effects Analysis conducted for three environmental categories:

MEDINA COURT REPORTING
27761 County Farm Rd., Pueblo, CO 81006
(719) 948-4763
rural and agricultural, natural, and community and built. Consideration for the quantity of resources impacted, along with the quality, allowed the study to determine the significance of the impact. The results of the study led to recommendations on the corridor locations around each of the communities.

So we're going to look at Pueblo County. So in Pueblo County the first built alternative we had was in Pueblo, and we had three options, we had the Pueblo Airport north, the 47 connection, and the Pueblo existing alignment. The existing section of US 50 in Pueblo is already a developed transportation corridor, while the other alternatives would fragment agriculture and prairie habitat. Due to the significantly less impacts the existing alignment would have compared to the other built alternatives the existing alignment is preferred along the US 50 section.

The next section we have is Pueblo to Fowler. So we had the -- "Fort Reynolds" is what we're calling it. So we had the Fort Reynolds existing alignment or the Fort Reynolds realignment, which is also the Boone(sic) -- Boone turnoff. Both alignments have similar impacts to rural and agricultural environment, and the natural environment, the difference is Alternative 2, which is the Fort Reynolds realignment,
would improve safety and minimize potential impacts to the community and built environment, leading this alternative to be identified as the preferred alternative.

Next, in Otero County we had the Fowler north and the Fowler south, and you'll notice both lines are green. Alternative 1 would have fewer impacts on agriculture, while Alternative 2 would have fewer impacts to the natural environment, and each has comparable effects on the community and built environment. Since both have tradeoffs no alternative was identified in Fowler, and both will be carried forward to a Tier 2 analysis.

In Manzanola we had a north and a south alternative, both alternatives were fairly comparable, however, Alternative 1 would result in fewer potential effects to agricultural productivity, and in the community and built environment.

In Rocky Ford we also had a north and a south alignment, the north has a higher potential to -- or has a greater potential to minimize effects to historic resources, and received greater community support during the process, and because the route is closer to the town of Rocky Ford.

In Swink we had a north and a south alignment
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as well, both alternatives were comparable in their ability to meet the purpose and need of the project, and both had their advantages to the town of Swink. No preferred route was selected for this location, and just like in Fowler both of them move forward with the Tier 2 study.

In La Junta we had four options, we had La Junta north and, then, we had three options to the south, each one a little bit further away from town. La Junta north would result in the most environmentally-damaging route because it would require construction through a major floodplain, it was also eliminated from consideration because the three oth -other south alternatives would generate a lack of major adverse impacts. Alternative 2 is the preferred because it's the shortest, closest to town, and better meets the purpose and need of the project.

In Bent County we had Las Animas north and Las Animas south. Las Animas north has major access advantages that could alleviate potential socioeconomic effects of a bypass, combined with the lesser environmental impacts of the two alternatives. Alternative 1 was identified as the preferred alternative.

And in Lamar, as mentioned before the 287/US

50 reliever route was already studied and, so -- that goes around the community, so that was excluded.

In Granada we had a north and a south option, the south option was identified as the preferred alternative because it has slightly fewer natural and community and built impacts.

In Holly also had a north and a south route. The south route was identified as a preferred alternative because it has fewer environmental impacts to the natural, and community and built environments; also it improves access from State Highway 89 to US 50, and vice-versa.

So benefits of the project. The project improvements will address the existing concerns throughout the corridor as previously mentioned, and offers the following benefits: increased safety, increased mobility for all users, increased passing opportunities with -- in -- two lanes in each direction, and improve shoulders that will meet current FHWA standards, and fewer speed reductions, and faster travel times throughout the corridor.

Rob's going to take over.
MR. ROB FREI: Thanks, Dan.
So up here on the slide you can see that we looked at kind of four different categories of -- of
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resources and we separated them into agricultural, built -- community and built environment, natural environment, and, then, other resources that didn't fit into those categories real well, so I'll be going over those with you in just a moment.

On this next slide to help you understand how we came up with a -- the amount of potential impacts along the corridor we put a graphic up here. So for resources like wetlands, farm -- farmlands, agricultural lands, the -- the project corridor alignment is about 1,000 feet along the 150 -mile long section of US 50 , but when we actually do the -- the build-out of -- of the project we're only going to need about 250 feet, so what we did was we just calculated the total acreage of that resource and then just multiplied by . 25 to come up with a number.

Please keep in mind that this is a worst-case scenario, that when we actually get into final design, you know -- for example, if this was a wetland there could be an alternative where we could avoid or minimize impacts to that resource, and that would be considered at the Tier 2 level.

So the first set of resources we'll talk about is -- is agricultural impacts. There are four feedlots, six produce markets, 24 irrigation ditches and
canals along the corridor; there are also -- for farmlands there's a -- a range from 2,866 acres to 3,047 acres; and the same thing with ranchlands, it's 1,790 to 2,380 acres. And the reason there's a range there is simply because -- as Dan discussed -- we still haven't determined whether or not -- we haven't identified -identified a preferred alternative at Fowler and Swink, so that's why there's a range there.

And, again, please keep in mind that this is over the 150-mile long corridor.

Natural environment impacts. We have wetland and riparian, 587 acres to 713 acres. Most of that is -- is riparian habitat. We did not do a full wetland delineation at the Tier 1 level, so those numbers could be refined further, and, again, we would take opportunities to -- to reduce our impacts where -wherever we could.

Wildife habitat, 4,287 acres to 4,564 acres. What that includes is -- is really a combination of -of the rangelands that provide wildlife habitat, it's the wetland riparian areas we've identified, and, then, there's a -- a few state wildlife areas along the corridor that we will be impacting along the way, so that acreage is included there as well.

For the geological and paleontological
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resources there are four mining operations, they consist of sand and gravel quarries along the corridor, and, then, we also have identified six geological formations along the corridor. At this moment we don't know of any known paleontological resources along the corridor, but as is often the case you don't discover them until you start digging or start construction, so -- but we've identified what those high-risk areas are.

Community and built environment. There are 60 to 79 historic resources along the corridor. So for these type of resources you can't really impact just a quarter -- 25 percent of -- of the given resource, so if that resource was within that 1,000 -foot corridor it was included as -- as potentially being impacted.

So of those 60 to 79 historic resources, 24 of those are irrigation canals that we've determined to be potentially eligible along the corridor, and we also have 14 to 17 bridges that are on US 50 that are also identified as being potentially eligible as well.

We also have two long linear resources, we have the Santa Fe Trail that parallels much of US 50, and, then, also the BNSF Railroad.

And then the remainder of resources include businesses, primary residences, and outbuildings associated with potentially eligible historic ranches.
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The archaeological resources. We've identified nine known archaeological sites along the corridor, they are located through two corridor segments, one's between Pueblo and Fowler, and the other one's between La Junta and Las Animas; and, again, we'll make efforts to avoid impacts to those wherever available.

Land use, there are 13 conservation easements along the corridor and 10 public properties. The public properties consist of a few state wildlife areas, the John Martin Reservoir, the golf course in Fowler, two pedes -- two pedestrian trails that are proposed in Granada and Holly; and, then, also includes potential impact -- indirect impacts to the Comanche National Grasslands, to Boggsville National Historic Site, and, then, Old Bent's Fort. Indirect impacts to those would be potential changes in access getting to those areas.

And then park lands and recreational, again it's -- it's the Fowler golf course, John Martin Reservoir, the state wildlife areas, the trails that we discussed; it also includes four birding trails that use US 50 that the Colorado Division of Wildlife has identified.

So transportation or other resources, the first one there is transportation. Dan went over the
purpose and need for this project, and that's wha -obviously if -- if we were to implement this project we'd increase the mobility and safety along that corridor, so it would be a pos -- a positive benefit.

The hazardous materials. There's 162 hazardous material sites known along the corridor, that will change as we move forward. Hazardous material sites can range from, you know, a -- a Wal-Mart that carries household products to a fueling station to a farmer co-op along the corridor, so that -- that kind of gives you a sense of -- of what sort of sites we're looking at.

And then Section $4(f)$ is a
transportation-specific law regulation that we -- that provides additional protection to public parks and rec -- public park and recreation resources, and then provides additional protection to historic and archaeological resources as well.

So minimally impacted resources, we have environmental justice, water quality, global climate change, aesthetic and visual, air quality, traffic noise, and energy.

Social and economic conditions. At this level -- at the Tier 1 document level, without further design we don't fully know what those impacts will be,
they'll be reviewed in -- in much further detail at the Tier 2 level process, so maybe not the best to put it on that slide as minimally impacted, but that's something we'll need to take a bigger look at as we move forward.

So next steps, I'm going to kind of reiterate what -- what Dan went over at the beginning of the presentation.

So comments received tonight throughout the review period will be considered and responded to in the Tier 1 FEIS and Record of Decision, once we complete that we can move into the Tier 2 NEPA documents for each individual project, these could range from categorical exclusions for improvements between towns potentially to larger documents like EAs or potential EISes for around-town routes; and, then, once those are complete we'll move forward into project final design and construction.

So if you have comments tonight there's various ways again to provide those to us. One way is after this presentation you can have an opportunity to come up here and give a public comment formally. If you choose to do that we'll ask that you go over to the table over where you signed in and actually sign up, so we'll do that in about five minutes after this presentation is completed (indicating).
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You can also speak your comments privately to the transcriber, or court reporter, over here as well (indicating).

You can also provide written comments tonight. There's a comment box when you came into the -- to the hearing, there's comment forms and pens, you can provide a comment tonight, or you can take one of those comment forms and mail or e-mail those to us, and we have the information on the next slide on -- on that one (indicating). Two slides from now.

If you want to provide a verbal comment tonight, again, please add your name to the speaker list.

Please wait for me to -- to recognize you and, then, we'll -- I'll call you up, I'll ask you to clearly state your full name and -- and where you're from.

We have a three-minute limit for -- for verbal comments, deferring verbal comments -- time is -is not allowed; and, of course, please be respectful with your comments.

And this final slide here has a project website that you can go to if you want to review the document online or have additional -- see additional information detail, and you can e-mail your -- your
comments to the e-mail address there at atkinsglobal.com, and, then, there's also a mailing address as well.

So that concludes this portion of it, we'll do the public hearing portion here in just a few minutes. Thank you.
(A break was taken.)
MR. ROB FREI: So if I can have your
attention real quick. Excuse me, real quick.
So I just want to make sure -- nobody has signed up for a formal public comment statement, I just want to make sure that's the case. So I'm not seeing anybody that wants to get up here, so we'll go ahead and close this portion of it. Thank you.

We'll be available here if anybody has questions. Thank you.
(A break was taken.)
MR. ROB FREI: So we do have one individual that wants to come up and provide comments, and we'll let him do that here real quick. So just ask you to come on the other side of the mike --

MR. JASON MUNOZ: Sure.
MR. ROB FREI: -- and we'll give you three minutes, we'll have a timer set up here to kind of help you gauge your -- your time, so thank you.

MR. JASON MUNOZ: Thank you.
MR. LUKAS SCHROEDER: State your full name and where you're from.

MR. JASON MUNOZ: My name is Jason Munoz, Pueblo, Colorado. I don't expect to take all three minutes, but $I$ just want to say as a citizen $I$ think that this project is crucially important to the -Southern Colorado and -- corridor going from Pueblo to Kansas, and I -- I support it.

I would like to go on record saying that I would like to see, particularly in Otero County, the corridor that goes through the communities to stay as they are, there's just so much social and economic impacts that would be affected if the Highway 50 were to go south or north of those communities.

That's pretty much it, thank you.
MR. ROB FREI: Thank you.
Is anyone else interested in providing a public comment?
(No response.)
MR. ROB FREI: Okay, thank you.
(The proceedings were concluded at the hour of 6:10 p.m.)

*     *         *             *                 * 
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| involved 6:11 | mike 20:21 | :9 | realignment [2] | ed | 9:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| irrigation [2] - 13:25, | $\text { miles }[4]-4: 25,5: 8 \text {, }$ | planning [3] - 2:10, | 9:25 | separately 5:10 | tonight's $2: 14$ |
| issues 7:7 | mind [2] - 13: | please [5] | - | serving [2] - 5:1, 6:2 | toward 2:22 |
|  | minimally [2] - 17:19, | 14:9, 19:12, 19:1 | aso | Several 5:21 | town [6]-8:3, 8:3, |
| J | 18:3 | $\begin{aligned} \text { 19:20 } & \\ \text { points } & 6: 5 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 23,11: 3,11: 9, \\ & 11: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| J | $\begin{array}{r} \text { minimize }[4]-8: 12 \\ 10: 1,10: 21, ~ 13: 20 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { points } \\ & \text { portion }[3]-20: 4, \end{aligned}$ | received [2] - 10:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shape } 4: 20 \\ & \text { shortest } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | mining | P20:5, [3] | 8.8 | shorthand | adeoffs |
| Janua | minor | pos 17:4 | gniz | houlders 12:1 | raffic [3] - 7: |
| Jason | minutes [4] - 18:24, | positive 1 | recommend | showed [2] - $5: 17$, 5:1 | 8:10, 17:21 |
| 21:1, 21:4, 21:4 | 20:6, 20:24, 21:6 | posted 3:3 | recommendations | sign 18:23 | Trail 15:21 |
| John [2] - 16:11, $16: 19$ July [3] - 1:4, $4: 2$, | mitigation [2] - 4:16, | potential [10] - 6:13, | record [3]-4:4, | signed [2] - 18:23 | trails [3] - 16:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { July } \\ & \text { 22:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4: 18 \\ \text { mohil } \end{array}$ | $10: 1,10: 16,10:$ $10: 21,11: 20,13$ | 18:10, $21: 10$ | $20: 11$ | $16: 20,16: 21$ |
| jump 3:9 | 6 | 16:13, 16:17, 18: | recreational 16 | significantly 9:14 | transcript 22:7 |
| June [2] - 3:23, 3:25 | 6:6, 6:7, 7:7, 8:9, | potentially [5] - | reduce 14:16 | similar [2] - 5:20, | transportation [14] |
| Junta [4] - 11:7, 11:8, | 8:9, 12:17, 17:3 | 15:14, 15:17, 15:19 | reduced 22:6 | 9:23 | $2: 5,3: 14,4: 20,5: 4$, |
| 11:10, 16:5 | modes $7: 1$ | 5:25, 18:13 | reductions 12: | simply | 6:11, 6:13, 6:18, 7: |
| justice 17:20 | moment [2] - 13:5, | prairie 9:14 | refined 14:1 | Site 16:15 | 7:4, 7:6, 8:4, 9:12, |
|  | move [5] - 11:5, 17:7, | preferred [11] - | refuge | sites [4] - 16:2, 17:6 | 16:24, 16:25 |
| K | 18:4, 18:11, 18:16 multiplied 13:15 | $\begin{array}{lll} 8: 23, & 8: 24, & 9: 17, \\ 10: 3, & 11: 4, & 11: 15 \end{array}$ | Region 2:10 regional [4] | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 8,17: 11 \\ & \text { six }[2]-13: 25,15: 3 \end{aligned}$ | transportation-s travel [3]-5:2, |
|  | Munoz [4] - 20:22, | 11:23, 12:4, 12:8, | 6:3, 6:17, 6:24 | slide [6] - 6:9, 12:24, | 12 |
| nsas [5] - 4:10, | 21:1, 21:4, 21:4 | :7 | regulation 17: | 13:6, 18:3, 19:9, | true 22 |
| $4: 24,5: 9,5: 18,21: 9$ |  | prepared 4:8 | reiterate 18:5 | 19:22 19:10 | tur |
| known [3] - 15:5, 16:2, |  | presentation [7] - | related 6:14 | slides 19:10 | turnoff 9:22 |
| 17:6 |  | $3: 4,3: 5,3: 7$ | relatively 5 : released 3:22 | slightly 12:5 social [2] - 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { two-and-a-half } 2: \\ & \text { two-lane [2] } 7: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | pr |  |  |  |
| T | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Naff [2] - 22:4, } 22: 1 \\ & \text { name's } 2: 4 \end{aligned}$ | pr | $5: 11,5: 11,12: 1$ remainder $15: 23$ | 11:20 | type [2] - 7:13, 15:11 |
|  |  | 22:13 | repair 8:20 | sort 17:11 | typewritten 22:6 |
| La |  | privately | reporter [3] - 19:2, | south [14] - |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 11:9, } & 16: 5 \\ \text { lack } & 11: 14\end{array}$ |  | proceedings [3] - $21: 22,22: 5,22: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 4, \quad 22: 13 \\ & \text { require } 11: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 22, \quad 10: 6, \quad 10: 1 \\ & 10: 19, \quad 10: 25, \quad 11 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| lack 11:14 Lamar [2]- | 13:2, 14:11 | process [6] - 4:13, | Reservoir [2] - 16:11, | 11:14, 11:19, 12:3, |  |
| lands | needed 3:14 | 4:19, 6:11, 6:15, | 16:20 | 12:7, 12:8, |  |
| 16:18 | needs [8] - $6: 3,6: 7$, | 10:23, 18:2 | residences 15:24 | 21:15 | uncontrolled 6:5 |
| lanes [3] - 7:15, 8:19, | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 6:8, } \\ 7: 14, & 8: 10\end{array}$ | produce 13:25 productivity | resident 2:4 <br> resource [4] - 13:1 | Southeast 5:6 <br> Southeastern | understanding 4: |
| 12:18 | NEPA [6]-4:7, | productivity 10:17 <br> products 17:9 | resource [4] - 13:15, | Southeastern 1:6 | user 7:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { larger 18:14 } \\ & \text { Las [4] - } 11: 18,11: 19, \end{aligned}$ | 4:19, 5:7, 8:14, 18:11 | Professional [2] | resources [18 | 21:8 | users [7] - |
| 11:19, 16:5 | neutral | 22:4, 22:13 | 10:22, 13:1, | speak 19:1 | 6:25, |
| law 17:14 | no-build | project [22] - 2:6, | 13:9, 13:23, 15:1, | speaker 19:12 |  |
| leading 10:2 | $\underbrace{8: 16}_{\text {no-build }}$ [2] - 8:14, | 2:11, $3: 9,3: 19,5: 13$, | 15:5, $15: 10,15,11$ | specifics 3:7 | using [2] - 4:19, 6: |
| led 9:5 | nobody | 5:14, 6:6, 6:15, 8:11, | 15:15, 15:20, 15:23, | speed 12:20 |  |
| less 9:14 | nobody noise 17:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 16, \quad 11: 2,11: 17, \\ & 12: 13, \quad 12: 13,13: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 1, \quad 16: 24, \quad 17: 16 \\ & 17: 18, \quad 17: 19 \end{aligned}$ | ss 22:2 <br> stages | V |
| lesser 11:21 level [7] - 3:16, 6:18, | north [15] - 6:19, | 13:13, 17:1, 17:2, | respectful | standards |  |
| 1evel $13: 22,14: 14,16,17: 24,18$, | 6:20, 9:10, 10:5, | 8:12, 18:16, 19:22 | responded 18:9 | start [2] - 15:7, 15: |  |
| 17:24, 18:2 | 10:14, $10: 19,10: 20$, | 21:7 | response 21:20 | started 2:2 | Valley [2] - $3: 1$ |
| libraries 2:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 25, ~ 11: 8,11: 10, \\ & 11: 18, \\ & 11: 19, \end{aligned}$ | projects 4:7 - ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | result [2] - 10:16 | state [10] | verbal [4]-3: |
| likely [2] - 5:21, 6:2 | $12: 7,21: 15$ | properties [2] - 16:9, <br> 16:10 | 11:10 results 9:4 | 5:20, 12:11, 14: $16: 10,16: 20,19:$ | 19:11, 19:19, 19:19 |
| limit [2] - 7:22, 19:18 limited 5:22 | north/south | proposed [2] | review [4] | $21: 2,22: 2,22:$ | vice-versa 12:12 |
| limits 6:1 | Notary [2] - | 16:12 | 3:24, 18:9, | statement [2] - 1:1 | vicinity 4:24 |
| linear 15: |  | protection [2] - 17:17 ${ }^{\text {pren }}$, | reviewed [2] | 20:11 | visual 17:21 |
| lines 10:6 | notice ${ }^{\text {numbers }} 14$ | pr | Re | station |  |
| litigation 22:9 | numerous | 7:8, 7:20, | 9:20, 9:21, 9:25 | steer 2:22 |  |
| local [11] - $3: 12$, |  | 14:20, 18:19, 19:4, | riparian [3] - 14:12, | step [4] - 6:17, 7:1, |  |
| $3: 12, ~ 4: 22, ~ 5: 1, ~ 5: 2, ~$ $5: 6,6: 3,6: 24,7: 21$, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:7, 19:11, } 20: 19 \\ & \text { provided } 7: 8 \end{aligned}$ | road 5:23 | $\text { steps [2] - } 6: 15,18: 5$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 5: 6, & 6: 3, \\ 8: 9: 24, & 8: 21, \end{array}$ |  | provides [2] - 17:15, | Rob [10]-2:7, 2:9, | strategies [2] - 4:17, | wait 19:14 <br> Wal-Mart 17:8 |
| locals 7:23 | observed 5: | 17:17 | 2:9, $3: 6,12: 23,20: 8$, | 7:6 | wants [2] - 20:13, |
| located [2] - 2:21, | Obviously 17 | providing [2] - 6:8, 21:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 18,20: 23,21: 17, \\ & 21: 21 \end{aligned}$ | street [2] - 1:6, studied | 20:19 |
| $16: 3$ | offers 12:16 | provisions 8:19 | Rob | studied [2] - 5:10 <br> 12:1 | ways |
| 11:4 |  | public [14] - 1:2, | Rocky [2] - 10:19 | Studying 4:15 | we'll [15] - 3:5, 3: |
| locations [2] - 7:23, | ongoing 8:17 | 3:20, $3: 24,4: 22$, | 10:24 | pervision 22 | 13:23, 16:5, 18:4, |
| 9:6 6 - 6 (4 | online [2] - 3:1, 19:24 | $\begin{array}{ll}16: 9,16: 9,17: 15 \\ 17: 16,18: 21, ~ & 20\end{array}$ | route [10] - $5: 10$ $5: 11$, $5: 11$, $8: 24$ | support [2] - 10:2 | 18:16, 18:22, 18:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { long-distance } 6: 4 \\ & \text { looking 17:12 } \end{aligned}$ | onto 7:21 | :16, 18:21, 21:19, 22:4, | 0:23, 11:4, 11:11 | Swink [3] - 10:25, | 19:15, 20:4, 20:13, |
| looks 4:23 | opportunities | 22:14 | 12:1, 12: | 11:3, 14:7 | 0: |
| Lower 5:2 | - $5: 22,12: 18,14: 16$ | published | routes [3] - 5:4, 5:12, | system 7: | we |
| LUKAS 21 | opportunity 18:20 | Pue |  |  | -19, [4] 13 , 17.11 |
|  | option [4] - 7:9, 7:20, | 8, 9:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { routil } \\ & \text { rural } \end{aligned}$ | T | we've [4] - 14:21, |
| $\mathbf{M}$ | 12:3, 12: <br> options [5] | 12, 9:18 | 9:23 |  |  |
|  | :19, 9:9, 11:7, | purpose [7] - 5:14 |  | table 18:23 | website 19:23 |
| mail 19:8 | Otero [2] - 10:5, 21:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { purpose }[7]-5: 14, \\ & 5: 14,6: 14,8: 12, \end{aligned}$ |  | taken [3]-20: | West 1:6 wetland |
| mailing $20: 2$ | outbuildings 15:24 | 11:2, 11:1 |  | : | 14:11, 14:13, 14:21 |
|  | outcome 22:9 |  |  | 0:1 | wetlands 13:9 |
| major [5] - 5:1, 5:4, | outlined 6:16 |  | 5:16, 5:16, $: 6,7$ | 21:1, 21:16, 21:17 | wha 17:1 ${ }^{\text {WHEREO }}$ 2 10 |
| 11:12, 11:14, 11:19 | overlays |  | $8: 19,10: 1,12: 16$ $17: 3$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 21:21 } \\ \text { Thanks } \end{gathered}$ | wherever [2] - 14:17, |
|  |  | quality [3] - | sand 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Thanks } 12: 23 \\ & \text { there's }[12]-2: 15, \end{aligned}$ | 16:6 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 7:6 } \\ \text { Manager } & \text { 2:10 }\end{array}$ | P | 17:20, 17:21 | Santa 15:21 | 2:23, 14:2, 14:4, | whether 14:6 whole 2:20 |
| Manzanola 10:14 |  | quantity $9: 2$ | saying 21:10 | 14:8, 14:22, 17:5, | wide [2] - 5:8, 5:9 |
| markets 13:25 | p.m [2] - 1:5, 21:23 | quarries 15:2 | scenario 13:18 | 18:18, 19:5, 19:6, | wildlife [6] - 14:18, |
| $\underset{16: 19}{\operatorname{Martin}}[2]-16: 11$ | paleontological [2] 14:25, 15:5 | quarter ${ }^{\text {quick }} 3$ ] $-20: 9,20: 9$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { schedule } \\ & \text { SCHROEDER } \\ & \end{aligned}$ | they'll 18: | $14: 20,14: 22,16: 10 \text {, }$ |
| material [2] | parallels 15:21 | 20:20 | scoping 3:20 | thing 14:3 |  |
| 17:7 | pardon 7:25 |  | $\underset{\text { screening }}{6: 15}$ [2] - 6:10 | third 7:12 | 15:13, 22:4 |
| materials ${ }_{\text {maximize }} \quad 17: 17$ | park [2] - 16:18, 17:16 | $\mathbf{R}$ | seat $2: 2$ | through-town 8:7 | WITNESS 22:10 |
| median 7:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { particularly } \\ & \text { party } 22: 9 \end{aligned}$ |  | 9:17, 9:18, 13:11 | 5:2, 12:15, 12:21, | $19: 4$ |
| Medina [2] - 22:4, | passing [4] - 5:22 | rail [2] - 7:3, Railroad 15:22 | 17:13 | 18:8 |  |
|  | 7:15, 8:19, 12:17 | ranches 15:25 | $\begin{array}{lr} \text { seeing } & 20 \\ \text { seeks } & 6: 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tier [16] - } 1: 1, \\ & 3: 17,3: 22,4: 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 7:13, $8: 10,8: 11$, | pavement [2] | chlands 14:3 | segments 16:4 | 4:7, $5: 7,10: 13,11$ | $\underline{1}$ |
| $11: 2,12: 19$ eeting $2: 1$ | pedes 16:12 | 14:8, 17:8, | selected [2] - 6:23, | 13:22, 14:14, 17:24, <br> $18: 2,18: 10,18: 11$ |  |
| meeting ${ }^{\text {meetings }} 3$ : | pedestrian pens 19:6 | ranged 6:22 | tion [2] - 3:10, | red [2]-4:13, 4:19 | you'11 10 |
| meets 11:16 | percent 15:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rangelands } 14: 20 \\ & \text { real [4] }-13: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $8: 23$ | 20:24 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { mentioned [2] - 11:25, } \\ & 12: 15 \end{aligned}$ | period [3] - 3:25, 4:2, | real $20.9,20: 20$, | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { send } & 3: 2 \\ \text { sense } & 17: 11 \end{array}$ | tonight [6] - 2:3, $18: 8,18: 18,19: 5$, |  |
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| $\overline{z z}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| zas |  |  |  |  |  |
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