

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
COMMENTS SUBMITTED AT IN-PERSON MEETING					
1.	N/A	4/21/2025	Sign-in Sheet	Necesitamos un semaforo en Bahoma y North Loop. Me too MR Translation: We need a traffic light at Bauman and North Loop. Me too MR	Comments noted. This comment has been provided to the appropriate TxDOT contact for consideration as this area is outside of the currently proposed project area. Translation: Su comentario ha sido anotado. Este comentario se ha remitido al contacto correspondiente de TxDOT para su consideración, ya que esta zona se encuentra fuera del área del proyecto propuesto actualmente.
2.	Delfina Lechuga	4/21/2025 and 5/7/2025	Written Comment and Email	See attached email and based on current map the retention pond on Bauman is still not acceptable. Request removal of retention pond from my property as explained on attached email. Change the pond from middle of property to right/left corner is that acceptable? Please attached email for more information on pond on any part of my property is not acceptable? [Printed and emailed comment below:] Apologies - resent, below was sent to wrong Arterial1 address. ~ I received subject letter and have reviewed same with concern(s) on the map attached with the letter. The map places a retention pond previously placed on the Beltran/DelaRiva property and is now in my property. This is totally unacceptable. I have plans to build and farm on my property and your revised plan/s have now made that impossible. There is no longer access to the road/street cited to my property. Surly, the pond can be relocated, or better yet deleted, as there are already two canals whereby water can be diverted. The pond now sits squarely on my property depriving me of any development now or in the future. Any plans I have are now dependent on the adjacent properties for road access and hinders my ability to develop or procure any investment. Your new plans directly impact any future investment I have that will come with a major new access road that traverses several major roadways and has direct access to I-10.	Comments noted. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made. Please note that the current location of the retention basin is split between the De La Riva property and your property. The currently proposed retention pond locations are in preliminary design and will be further evaluated during the detailed design phase of the project (also known as the PS&E phase). Note that, per El Paso County Water District #1, structures that fall under their jurisdiction may not be used for stormwater retention. In addition, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SW3P) will be developed and implemented as part of the project. The SW3P, which is administered by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), is designed to control erosion in the project vicinity resulting from soil disturbance during construction, including permanent controls if needed.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Your need for retention pond needs to be reevaluated as there appears to be other viable locations and the ability to repurpose the adjacentj canals need to be considered. Based on the above request revision of the plan/s and removal of the requirement for a retention pond on my property. Delfina C. Lechuga [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	
3.	Ann Marie Hemme	4/21/2025	Written Comment	I'm pleased w/ Arterial 1, Alternative 3a Revised plan. Appropriate traffic lights, speed limit, turn lanes, pedestrian routes, stop signs, and being well lit for safety is important. I believe this is the best route to procede with, that will impact fewer people and homes than previous alternatives that have been proposed. This route will also help curtail a vast majority of traffic heading through Socorro from the Clint area and new development. Thank you.	Comments noted. Please note that traffic signals, the speed limit, turn lanes, sidewalks/shared use paths, signage, and lighting will be evaluated in more detail as the project design progresses.
4.	Rafael Nevarez	4/21/2025	Written Comment	Fue la mejor opcion pienzo que afecta menos personas Translation: It was the best option, I think it affects fewer people.	Comment noted. Translation: Su comentario ha sido anotado.
5.	Linda Hemme	4/21/2025	Written Comment	I agree with Arterial 1 Alternative 3A Revised We have been fighting for several years for our property and the properties of my neighbors. Alternative 3A Revised impacts the least amount of properties. I believe I counted only 12 properties and 1 commercial property. Also most of the traffic is coming from the Clint area. I see the cars/traffic. Coming from Clint every morning on my way to work. I truely believe that Alternative 3A Revised will help clear traffic and help it alivate the traffic.	Comments noted.
6.	Ruth Dimas	4/21/2025	Written Comment	No estamos de acurdo en que se constulla una carretera de cuatro carriles al frente de nuestra propiedad, el area es muy tranquila y al tener una calle así de grande solo aumentara el trafico y pondra en riesgo la seguridad de mi familia, mi hijo el mayor es autista y elegimos contrustuir nuestra casa en esa area para evitar el ruido y trafico que a el con su autismo severo le afecta mucho. No estamos de acuerdo en contruyan “Retention Basin 9” ya que esta dentro de nuestra propiedad y afectara que nuestra agua de reigo se valla al pond. Oh se valla a regar hacia la calle. No estamos de acuerdo de no a ver sido informados apropiadamente de este proyecto y que muchos de nuestros vecinos aun no están enteradas. [REDACTED] Ruth Dimas Este aviso lo recibimos el día 05/16/25, cuando nos notificaron que este proyecto lleba desde 2021 y no fuimos notificados hasta ahora.	Comments noted. Regarding noise impacts associated with the project, a noise analysis will be conducted for the proposed project, and if mitigation is reasonable and feasible for impacted receivers, noise walls or other mitigation methods will be considered. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Translation: We do not agree with the construction of a four lane road in front of our property, the area is very quiet and having a road this big will only increase traffic and put my family's safety at risk, my oldest son is autistic and we chose to build our house in that area to avoid the noise and traffic that affects him with his severe autism. We do not agree to build “Retention Basin 9” as it is on our property and will affect our water from the pond. Oh it will be irrigated into the street. We do not agree that we have not been properly informed of this project and that many of our neighbors are still not aware of it. ██████████ Ruth Dimas We received this notice on 05/16/25, when we were notified that this project has been going on since 2021 and we were not notified until now.	meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. The currently proposed retention pond locations are in preliminary design and will be further evaluated during the detailed design phase of the project (also known as the PS&E phase). Note that, per El Paso County Water District #1, structures that fall under their jurisdiction may not be used for stormwater retention. In addition, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SW3P) will be developed and implemented as part of the project. The SW3P, which is administered by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), is designed to control erosion in the project vicinity resulting from soil disturbance during construction, including permanent controls if needed. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. En cuanto a los impactos de ruido asociados al proyecto, se llevará a cabo un análisis de ruido para el proyecto propuesto y si las medidas de mitigación resultan razonables y viables para los receptores afectados, se considerará la instalación de muros contra el ruido u otros métodos de mitigación. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento. Las consideraciones de seguridad relacionadas con el proyecto para los usuarios del transporte público seguirán evaluándose e incorporándose a medida que avance el diseño del proyecto. El proyecto debe cumplir con los requisitos de la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA) y con las normas de seguridad vial. El proyecto incluiría un camino de uso compartido independiente para peatones y ciclistas. Además, el proyecto está diseñado para mejorar el tiempo de llegada de los servicios de emergencias debido a la construcción de un puente sobre la vía del tren. No solo reducirá los retrasos causados por el paso de los trenes, sino que eliminará la posibilidad de colisiones entre trenes y automóviles en ese lugar. En cuanto a un posible aumento de la delincuencia, este tema es responsabilidad del Departamento de Policía de la ciudad de Socorro. Las ubicaciones de los estanques de retención propuestas actualmente se encuentran en la etapa de diseño preliminar y se evaluarán más a fondo durante la fase de diseño detallado del proyecto (también conocida como la fase PS&E). Tenga en cuenta que, según el Distrito de Agua #1 del Condado de El Paso, las estructuras que se encuentran bajo su jurisdicción no pueden utilizarse para la retención de aguas pluviales.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Además, se elaborará y pondrá en práctica un Plan de Prevención de la Contaminación de las Aguas Pluviales (SW3P) como parte del proyecto. El SW3P, que es administrado por la Comisión de Calidad Ambiental de Texas (TCEQ), está diseñado para controlar la erosión en las áreas cercanas al proyecto que resulte de la alteración del suelo durante la construcción, incluyendo medidas de control permanentes si es necesario. Se han ofrecido varias oportunidades de participar al público a lo largo de la fase de análisis de alternativas del proyecto, incluyendo una reunión pública virtual llevada a cabo en septiembre de 2021 y una reunión pública con personas interesadas llevada a cabo en enero de 2022. También se anunciaron y llevaron a cabo reuniones con los propietarios/ inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes en julio de 2024[GG1.1][EL1.2] y marzo de 2025, y cuando se solicitaron a lo largo del proceso del proyecto. Se llevo a cabo una segunda reunión pública en mayo de 2025. Los métodos de comunicación se adaptaron para cada evento según el propósito de la reunión y las lecciones aprendidas de eventos anteriores. Se utilizaron varios tipos de notificaciones para cada reunión. A todos los propietarios y inquilinos adyacentes a la Alternativa Preferida (incluso si no se verían directamente afectados) se les envió por correo una notificación y un boletín informativo del proyecto con la fecha, la hora y el lugar de la reunión, tanto en inglés como en español. El boletín también se colocó (a mano) en las puertas de entrada o portones accesibles de todas las propiedades ubicadas junto a las alternativas discutidas en las diversas reuniones. Además, se publicó un aviso público en dos periódicos locales (uno en inglés y otro en español) y tanto el aviso como el boletín se enviaron por correo electrónico a todas las direcciones de correo electrónico disponibles. También se aceptarán y revisarán comentarios del público en cualquier momento a lo largo de la vida del proyecto; sin embargo, solo se documentarán formalmente aquellos relacionados con las reuniones o audiencias públicas. El equipo del proyecto ha hecho todo lo posible para garantizar la transparencia del proyecto y la concientización pública, lo que incluye tanto una amplia difusión de los avisos de reuniones públicas (a través de notificaciones en periódicos y redes sociales) como una distribución específica de avisos e información a los propietarios directamente afectados por el proyecto (mediante el envío directo de avisos por correo y boletines informativos de invitación entregados en mano). La información presentada en cada reunión se desarrolló utilizando los mejores datos disponibles al momento de la reunión. Las alternativas propuestas y la información general se fueron actualizando entre reuniones a raíz de los cambios en las condiciones existentes (debido al desarrollo) y como resultado de los comentarios del público.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Tenga en cuenta que se llevará a cabo una audiencia pública después de que se apruebe el documento ambiental. Esta audiencia se anunciará de la misma manera que las reuniones públicas previas.
7.	Rosa Ortega	4/21/2025	Written Comment	Need lights ASAP on North Loop and Bauman, can't get out trying to get into North Loop	Comment noted. This comment has been provided to the appropriate TxDOT contact for consideration as this area is outside of the currently proposed project area.
8.	Bertha Madrid	4/21/2025	Written Comment	3A is the better option	Comment noted.
9.	Saul Gallegos	4/21/2025	Written Comment	Estoy de acuerdo con la 3A Translation: I agree with 3A.	Comment noted. Translation: Su comentario ha sido anotado.
10.	Gabby Contreras	4/21/2025	Written Comment	Thank you for the clean multivisual displays. It really helps envision the project. Additionally, thank you for looking at Alternate routes & taking new development into account. Can't wait to see the project completed.	Comments noted.
11.	Bertha Madrid	4/21/2025	Written Comment	Victor and Alejandra from the City of Socorro were very helpful in answering my concern. My question was, are we going to have traffic lights on Bauman and North Loop intersection. Alejandra confirmed that it is going to take affect this year.	Comments noted. This comment has been provided to the appropriate TxDOT contact for consideration as this area is outside of the currently proposed project area.
12.	Rosa Ortega	4/21/2025	Written Comment	3A is better option for all. Less house affected	Comment noted.
13.	Dalila Hermosillo	4/21/2025	Written Comment	I agree with the preliminary roll plots of the route that was shown at the public meeting on May 21, 2025. It is a good choice because people's houses & homes will not be town down. There is alot of open land as was demonstrated in the pictures & videos. Dalila Hermosillo & Noemi Hermosillo	Comment noted.
14.	Carlos M Garay	4/21/2025	Written Comment	I believe that 3A is the best option of all Routed suggested!	Comment noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
15.	Alma Hemme	4/21/2025	Written Comment	We are very happy at Arterial 3A alt. was chosen This is the Best option I strongly Agree Arterial 3 is the Best. This is going to help a lot of people with a Big Relief to practice a Better life. Thank you for your understanding. We strongly agree with their opinion.	Comments noted.
16.	Noemi Hermosillo	4/21/2025	Written Comment	estoy de acuerdo con los planes preliminares que mostraron en esta reunión el miércoles 21 de mayo, porque allí hay muy pocas viviendas y se ve muy bien el proyecto. Noemi Hermosillo Translation: I agree with the preliminary plans that were shown at this meeting on Wednesday, May 21, because there is very little housing there and the project looks very good. Noemi Hermosillo	Comment noted. Translation: Su comentario ha sido anotado.
17.	Irma Cordova	4/21/2025	Written Comment	Although these changes in the road construction do not directly impact me. It will impact me & my family indirectly or should I say directly. I am very satisfied that 3A was priced because it will impact fewer people. I'm not happy that this project will bring alot of traffic to my area not to mention noise pollution. I pray that the project is finished in a timely manner. While I have this opportunity I'll say that those huge grey buildings popping up all over socorro are ugly and will only bring more head aches to our city way of life.	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.
18.	Efrain Caballero	4/21/2025	Written Comment	I am the current owner of [REDACTED]. I bought my property in September 2024. I am so upset about this new project proposal. It will affect my neighbors and I with traffic, heavy traffic, high noise, pollution and smog. These are farmers and ranchers you will be affecting. This community owns livestock and farms. You are affecting livelihoods of families that have had this way of living for decades and decades. This area is not suitable for heavy traffic. Farmers and ranchers will be affected as well as all the kids that love to play in the streets. Heavy traffic will bring car accidents and high volume of noise. North Loop is not even capable of handling high volumes of traffic. I bought this land because I wanted to come back to my roots and raise horses and big green pastures. You will be destroying what keeps socorro beautiful. Ripping away through ranches and farmland and replacing it with concrete. I oppose this project heavily and do no want it to go further. Please do not disturb our peace. Efrain Caballero [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis - community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
19.	Irma Magallones/Edgar Carrasco	4/21/2025	Written Comment	I am owner of [REDACTED] road the street proposed will do the follow affections the way of living with the following: - Noise pollution - Traffic pollution - Road has left my front yard extremely close to my front door - We bought this property due to health reasons as smog in city affects chi - Retention Basin #9 will conflict with my crop field as I irrigate with the cannal will run into Retention Basin #9 and I will loose water to it. - I also see street run off to go into pond with run off water and go into the mesa drain that is right next to it. Don't contaminate. - Why not use the new connection being built on North loop and Clint cut off? - We run farm equipment of this road we will impede traffic constantly also with live stock. - This is a farm community the last farming community this will affect the property for generations. Please help. This will also increase property taxes. - Street is to close to my front door and Basin pond.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis - community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. The currently proposed retention pond locations are in preliminary design and will be further evaluated during the detailed design phase of the project (also known as the PS&E phase). Note that, per El Paso County Water District #1, structures that fall under their jurisdiction may not be used for stormwater retention. In addition, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SW3P) will be developed and implemented as part of the project. The SW3P, which is administered by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), is designed to control erosion in the project vicinity resulting from soil disturbance during construction, including permanent controls if needed. Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation's (TxDOT's) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					(PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. In addition, the City of Socorro is currently conducting detailed design for phase 1 and alternative analysis for phase 2 of the extension of Nuevo Hueco Tanks. However, this alignment is also on the north side of Socorro, between Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard. To the south of Socorro, the following roads currently provide access to the city; however, the routes are not direct or they are too far south to meet the objectives of the proposed project: FM 1110, Clint-San Elizario Road, and Clint Cut-off Road. The proposed Preferred Alternative would connect to I-10 approximately 2.58 miles south (eastbound along I-10) of Horizon Boulevard. This is about halfway between the existing Horizon Boulevard and Clint-San Elizario Road intersections, which meets the objectives of the project. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping.
20.	Alonzo Velasquez	4/21/2025	Written Comment	With all do knowledge of excuses. I represent socorro and my concerns are all the families, farmers, and endangered people if this road were to be build. Me and my sister were to have a calm childhood till these excuses to build more, most people don't even want this road meaning more accidents, burglaries, unsafe situations such as kidnapps, abduction, most importantly gangs. And to include most people known IN THIS Area are not comfortable with "basic barriers." We are known as one of the safest parts of the city, and most people's privacy are IGNORED IN SOCORRO. We know what will happen and this OUT OF OUT Pocket puts me, adults, especially kids and elders IN DANGER.	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
21.	Alonzo Velasquez	4/21/2025	Written Comment	My concerns about the building of this road will be the crime and uncertainty this road will bring to our town. Socorro an already unsafe city building another main “artery” would bring unwatned crime being so close to the city. Not to metion destroying the way of life of being away from the city. We live out here to be away FROM the NOISE. BUILDING THIS Road my kids wont be able to ride a bike down the road with this street been right next to our property. The noise it will bring with all the commercial traffic that will be going through. Not to mention the property value drop that something like this will bring. STOP giving PERMITS to developers WHEN THIS city was not built to handle the traffic its seeing now. In your design there are no noise barrier no protect to protect home that will run around this proposed rout. Please don’t destroy our way of life NO BUILT	Comments noted. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
22.	Lorena Silvestre-Tobias	4/21/2025	Written Comment	I support and agree with the results of the new, clear study that demonstrated what we had been fighting for which is Bauman Rd was NOT the MOST VIABLE Alternative for this project. Fully support decision to build on Alternative 3A revised	Comments noted.
23.	James Lowenberg	4/21/2025	Written Comment	1.st why were nobody affected notified 2. Clint cut off is getting sent to I-10 Which is ½ mile down the road so why build another artery so close to the other? 3. If this is part of the larger plan to push for a international bride I think you should just be open about it. 4.The The mayor doesn't need a man bun!	Comments noted. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation's (TxDOT's) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					(PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. In addition, the City of Socorro is currently conducting detailed design for phase 1 and alternative analysis for phase 2 of the extension of Nuevo Hueco Tanks. However, this alignment is also on the north side of Socorro, between Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard. To the south of Socorro, the following roads currently provide access to the city; however, the routes are not direct or they are too far south to meet the objectives of the proposed project: FM 1110, Clint-San Elizario Road, and Clint Cut-off Road. The proposed Preferred Alternative would connect to I-10 approximately 2.58 miles south (eastbound along I-10) of Horizon Boulevard. This is about halfway between the existing Horizon Boulevard and Clint-San Elizario Road intersections, which meets the objectives of the project. Regarding comment #3: This project is unrelated to and has independent utility from any proposed international bridges in the area.
24.	Rolisa Marasigon	4/21/2025	Written Comment	This has been an actual project that supposedly most of the residents are trying to withhold because of environmental constraints and private property issues. As a resident, I hope that we can think of alternate route and consideration of the entire plan. Furthermore, most of the affected areas are the long hand-me-down houses which are having sentimental value for the elders. I hope that you reconsider the plan (I know that this is for the community, more so, think of the affected families as well) thank you.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made.
25.	Heriberto Castaneda	4/21/2025	Written Comment	I prefer Anderson Road used for Arterial 1. It affects the least amount of homes. I think it would be the least amount of money needed to build Arterial 1.	Comments noted.
26.	Allison Garcia	4/21/2025	Written Comment	I don't like this plan, it will cut into our property. I moved out here to have privacy and now you are going to put a high traffic area where my kids play and ride horses. The point to move to socorro was to raise my kids in a quiet neighborhood away from crime & teach them how to farm, build their confidence with handling animals (livestock) growing their own food & enjoying all the stars at night. This is very heart breaking that because of all the new houses we will now hace to suffer with added pollution and noise that will ruin what we have created.	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 230 feet from your home and 82 feet from your property fence. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Please also see responses to Comment #s 251, 252, and 258, which also pertain to this property.
27.	Waynell Strachaan	4/21/2025	Written Comment	Orchard on Anderson Rd & North Loop	Comment noted.
28.	Lorenzo Ramirez	4/21/2025	Written Comment	Estamos de acuerdo en el proyecto ALTERNATIVA 3ª por que afeta a menos personas y alluda para el futuro en vialidad. Gracias. Translation: We agree with the ALTERNATIVE 3 project because it affects less people and helps for the future in road maintenance. Thank you.	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
29.	San Antonio Castaneda	4/21/2025	Written Comment	I am against building this access or proposed Arterial 1 No one wants to have their home destroyed or get kicked out or bought out of their home. First of all Because people have lived in their homes for years. Second Because if their homes are knocked out where will they live especially the elderly or disabled its not like they can pick up start again or start working to pay for a brand new house. Third of all the city will not pay the value of peoples homes or compensate them properly for their home or home value and appraisal. Which is sad Because whatever people receive wont be enough and or worth it. If the city is expanding then the city of Socorro should have thought about it or have seen this coming ahead of time or planned. This not a way to progress by knocking peoples homes or livelihood. Reconsider and think better and leave people's homes alone.	Comments noted. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
30.	Antonio Silvestre	4/21/2025	Written Comment	Yo estoy de acuerdo que la ciudad socorro tenga desarrollo en los caminos para el trafico espero que este proyecto se haga pero no perjudicar lo menos posible a la gente espero que se haga un buen plan gracias por todo Si estoy de acuerdo Alternativa 3=A parece que no afecta mucha gente Gracias Translation: I agree that the city of Socorro should have development on the roads for traffic. I hope that this project is done but not to harm the people as little as possible. Yes I agree Alternative 3=A seems not to affect many people. Thank you	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida.
31.	Raymundo Silvestre	4/21/2025	Written Comment	Alternative 1682 estoy de acuerdo R. Silvestre 5/21/25 Translation: Alternative 1682 I agree R. Silvestre 5/21/25	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
32.	Leticia Silvestre	4/21/2025	Written Comment	Estoy de acuerdo con la construcción el Alternativa 3ª revisada Translation: I agree with the construction of the revised Alternative 3A.	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
33.	Mauricia R. Gonzalez	4/21/2025	Written Comment	I am in favor of the new proposed Arterial (Alternative 3) 1682 Blvd. I hope no new homes are built before the construction of this highway, that could possibly be affected in a negative way. Displacement should never be the price for progress. Less impact is a step forward, so I approve.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.
34.	Veronica Carbajal	4/21/2025	Written Comment	I support Revised Alternative 3a.	Comment noted.
35.	Mary Ann Dominguez	4/21/2025	Written Comment	Is there going to be sound barrier road on Skov Road. Very concerning for all traffic noise in the area. Sound barrier wall would help. Is there going to be a rock wall at least to separate neighbor from 4 lane highway Also what help is it to have this highway to just go to the gate way & not the freeway. If I want to go west – I will have to go 7 miles to clint to make a U Turn to get on the freeway. How does this help? Also if I’m coming home from El Paso I need to exit on Horizon exit to get the gateway and the exit is crazy and it will take about 30 minutes just to get to the intersection of this new highway and the gateway. Please text me with new information [REDACTED]	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Regarding noise impacts associated with the project, if mitigation is reasonable and feasible for impacted receivers, noise walls or other mitigation methods will be considered. TxDOT’s Corridor Master Plan, Reimagine I-10, provided a high-level analysis regarding the need for additional interchanges in this area. If warranted in the future, a new interchange would be constructed under a separate TxDOT project and is not within the current project scope. To travel westbound on I-10 from the I-10/Arterial 1 intersection you would take Gateway Boulevard East for approximately 2.35 miles and make a U-turn at Clint-San Elizario Rd.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					To reach the intersection of I-10/Arterial 1 from Downtown you would take the Horizon Boulevard exit and travel approximately 2.28 miles along Gateway Boulevard East to the I-10/Arterial 1 intersection.
36.	Elizabeth Bustamante	4/21/2025	Written Comment	I agree with the results of the study and the re-route & revision of Alternative 3A (1682 Boulevard) as a more viable option. It is a route that impacts less homes	Comment noted.
37.	Berta Alicia Sierra	4/21/2025	Written Comment	Yo prefiero que por donde van an por la calle Anderson la mejor opsjon. Translation: I prefer Anderson Street as the best option.	Comment noted. Translation: Su comentario ha sido anotado.
38.	Pablo Solis II	4/21/2025	Written Comment	People who moved this area moved away from city life to enjoy peace and quiet. The installation of a major roadway takes this away. You will increase noise pollution, increase geographical vibrations, increase the risk of a hazardous materials accident with the increase of commercial vehicles. I understand growth of a community, why not widen North Loop and Horizon Boulevard with a Double Deck Road, like what Austin has. Please consider NO BUILD at this site.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Improvements to North Loop and Horizon Boulevard would not meet the purpose and need of this project. In addition, a “Double Deck Road” at this location would potentially increase project costs and ROW requirements. The No Build alternative will be carried forward throughout the environmental process as a baseline for comparison with the build alternative(s).

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
39.	Manuel Ornelas	4/21/2025	Written Comment	I am in favor of the Arterial 1. However I would like for where it intercepts with North loop, the right of way on North loop to be made also into a 4 lane. Leaving North loop a 2 lane street will create traffic congestion for drivers turning left. We need 4 lane streets at the intersection for both streets. Also, need to connect Antigua St to the Arterial. There is a Neighborhood Association at Rancho Viejo. They and a city oficial that lives there pushed to not have street connection to new neighborhood. Leaving Rancho Viejo as the only street into the neighborhood. This is very dangerous. If an accident was to happen on Rancho Viejo and North loop, access would be blocked. If a house is on fire or a person has a medical emergency, lifes could be lost. Antigua Dr. needs to connect to Arterial. Politicians that live in the neighborhood should upstain from advising neighbors otherwise.	Comments noted. Intersection turning movements for the proposed project, including the number of turn lanes at each intersection, are currently under review and will meet required engineering standards based on estimated traffic projections. Connectivity from/to adjacent neighborhoods will be analyzed as the project design progresses.
COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY MAIL					
40.	Nancy V. Castorena	6/6/2025	Mail	Yo estoy encontra ya que tengo 2 meses que compre mi casa y el resto de la calle son casas nuevas me parece injusto ya que nunca avisaron deestos planes antes dela compra y que vayan a construir una carretera tan grande e inesesaria que va a traernos mas contaminación e accidents. Translation: I am against it because I bought my house two months ago and the rest of the street is made up of new houses. I think it's unfair because they never warned us about these plans before we bought the houses and now they are going to build such a big and unnecessary road that will bring us more pollution and accidents.	Comments noted. Your home at [REDACTED] was previously impacted based on the design presented at Public Meeting #2. However, since that time, the project team revised the alignment at this location to minimize impacts to residences, including your home. We sent a newsletter in April of 2026 to let all previously affected property owners know that the current alignment no longer directly impacts their homes. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Su vivienda, ubicada en el [REDACTED], se vio afectada anteriormente según el diseño presentado en la Reunión Pública #2. Sin embargo, desde entonces, el equipo del proyecto revisó el diseño para minimizar los impactos a viviendas, incluyendo a la suya. En abril de 2026 enviamos un boletín informativo a los propietarios/inquilinos adyacentes que anteriormente se habían visto afectados para informarles que el diseño actual ya no afecta directamente a sus viviendas. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Las consideraciones de seguridad relacionadas con el proyecto para los usuarios del transporte público seguirán evaluándose e incorporándose a medida que avance el diseño del proyecto. El proyecto debe cumplir con los requisitos de la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA) y con las normas de seguridad vial. El proyecto incluiría un camino de uso compartido independiente para peatones y ciclistas. Además, el proyecto está diseñado para mejorar el tiempo de llegada de los servicios de emergencias debido a la construcción de un puente sobre la vía del tren. No solo reducirá los retrasos causados por el paso de los trenes, sino que eliminará la posibilidad de colisiones entre trenes y automóviles en ese lugar. En cuanto a un posible aumento de la delincuencia, este tema es responsabilidad del Departamento de Policía de la ciudad de Socorro.
41.	Lucia Estrada	6/6/2025	Mail	No estoy de acuerdo con la idea de sacarnos de nuestros propiedades – En esta calle vivimos pura jente de la tercera edad y no ya no podemos comenzar de nuevo. Translation: I disagree with the idea of removing us from our properties—only senior citizens live on this street, and we can't start over again.	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 160 feet from your home and 105 feet from your property fence. Please note that after the public meeting, the project team revised the alignment at this location to minimize impacts to residences. We sent a newsletter in April of 2026 to let all previously affected or adjacent property owners know that the alignment was moved to the north. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Please see responses to Comment #s 180 and 292, which also pertain to this property. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Según su dirección en [REDACTED], no se propone la adquisición de ningún derecho de paso dentro de su propiedad. El borde del pavimento de la vía quedaría aproximadamente 160 pies de su casa y a 105 pies de la cerca de su propiedad. Tenga en cuenta que, después de la reunión pública, el equipo del proyecto revisó el diseño en esta ubicación para minimizar el impacto a las viviendas. En abril de 2026 enviamos un boletín informativo para informar a todos los propietarios/ inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes que el diseño se había desplazado hacia el norte. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida. Consulte las respuestas a los comentarios #180 y #292, que también se refieren a esta propiedad.
42.	Mauro Guerrero	6/6/2025	Mail	I disagree with this proposal. Reason I live in Socorro is because I wanted to avoid the traffic. This construction which is approximately 400 yds from my home will take that tranquilify away there are other areas further out in the country that should be considered.	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
43.	Joanna Hernandez	6/6/2025	Mail	No estamos deacuerdo con el nuevo camino, pasa cerca de mi casa, y será inseguro, ruidoso. Translation: We disagree with the new road. It passes close to my house and will be unsafe and noisy.	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department.
44.	Kim Lowenberg	6/6/2025	Mail	Stop!! We live in the Country for a reason! I'm a pecan farmer in Clint! No busy road wanted!! Protect the farms!!	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the NEPA process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable, including avoidance and minimization of farms in the area.
45.	Maria Ocampo-Rodriguez	6/6/2025	Mail	Bengo para enterarme de k se trate la junta Translation: I'm here to find out what the meeting is about	Comment noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
46.	Rudy & Micayla Rodriguez	6/6/2025	Mail	If this passes the new coming rd. will destroy and put our farms/community @ risk. Our peaceful neighborhood is overwhelmed as is w traffic trying to navigate North Loop. Instead of adding more vehicles to a already busy rd why not widen it? We want to stop the Anderson project. Save our farms & family homes.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made.
47.	Francisco Sierra	6/6/2025	Mail	New roads and building can change and hurt animals. When big roads are built, it can break up where animals live, making it hard for them to find food. This can make fewer animals around. Also, loud cars and trucks can scare cows and sheep, making them feel sick. When construction happens, it can wash away the dirt that helps plants grow. So, while new buildings help people, we must think about how they can hurt farm and animals too. Because of this it greatly affects my way of life for me and my family.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project.
48.	Patrick Hammer	5/30/2025	Mail	This project will create a miserable environment for everyone who lives anywhere near it. The implacations of this will be devastating to all of my neighbors, their children, the future of these children, the impact of this in far extending, Affecting Hundreds of people and Dozens of communities! The Infrastructure is not capable of handling such a load. This will be a Burden on every taxpayer! Address: [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED] Representing: Athena West Colonia	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
49.	Max and Susan Winter	6/6/2025	Mail	We are protesting Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) for the following reasons: 1) Lack of adequate time to voice concerns 2) Loss of valuable productive farmland 3) Environmental impact of construction and then of light and noise pollution 4) Safety of previously peaceful, safe communities 5) Massive increase of traffic. We feel that these industrial complexes should be built close to I-10 (in the desert area) rather than in our rapidly diminishing productive and beloved farm land of the Rio Grande Valley. Residents' signatures [apparent]: Max Winter 6/5/25 Susan Winter 6/5/25 Address: [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED] Representing: The above	Comments noted. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. As part of the NEPA process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The City of Socorro follows Chapter 211 of the Texas Local Government Code (https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/GetStatute.aspx?Code=LG&Value=211), which grants municipalities the authority to regulate land use, building heights, and lot sizes to protect public health and safety. The City implements these state statutes locally through its Unified Development Code (UDC) and Chapter 46 of the Local Ordinances (https://costx.us/local-ordinances/). In compliance with state law, the city's Planning & Zoning Commission (https://costx.us/planning-zoning/) and City Council hold public hearings and issue notifications to property owners before any zoning changes or variances are approved. The City conducted a zoning assessment as part of the Socorro 2040 Comprehensive Master Plan, which included extensive public outreach. There is currently no planned City of Socorro M2 Heavy Industrial Zoning in the area as a result of the project.
50.	Chrisopher Eugene Trujillo	6/10/2025	Mail	The reason that we don't want this Arterial 1 project here in Socorro Tx is because their was never a long term or short term plan of what was coming in. There will be a technicality thus lawsuits filed against Socorro and TxDOT. Especially since nobody was notified property regarding this project. We believe that this project should be pushed out of Socorro. Furthermore there will be a lot of conflict with the Mission Trail. This project will destroy the oldest "Camino" in the entire country. I find this statement to be true and correct to the best of my knowledge. Residents' signature [apparent] Christopher Trujillo Address: [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation's (TxDOT's) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. Three Public Meetings were held in 2014 for the PEL study. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					- community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.
COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY EMAIL					
51.	Jesus Garcia	5/21/2025	Email	I am happy with the new proposed plan for the construction of the new road. I have been waiting for a better plan and this looks a lot more promising and realistic. Bauman rd not being affected is very important since the school is there. Sent from my iPhone	Comments noted.
52.	Joeseeph Nava	5/22/2025	Email	Hello, Do you have the knowledge to update these maps? They are very misleading and confusing because there are entire neighborhoods and many streets that are not even on your map. How can the community input anything with maps that don't have our neighborhoods on them to orientate ourselves. Please overlay your proposal on a current map. Thank you Joseph 6	Kim Johnson (ICF) sent the following email to Mr. Nava on 5/25/2025: Mr. Nava, thank you for your interest in the Arterial 1 Project. Because you sent your email via to one of our older email address, I'm wondering if you are looking at older maps. As noted in the attached Notice and Newsletter, to review the on-line information please go to www.txdot.gov and type in "Arterial 1" - then go to the 2nd item on the list (link provided below): https://www.txdot.gov/projects/hearings-meetings/el-paso/2025/arterial-1-1682-boulevard-052125.html Note that the schematic design roll plot should be uploaded to this site by next Tuesday or Wednesday. Once you have a chance to look at the site, please email and let me know if you have any additional questions. If you still can't find your property based on the latest maps, I can schedule a call with you and share my screen to help. Thanks! Kim Johnson Note – no response from Mr. Nava was received.
53.	Jackson Hurst	5/22/2025	Email	Name - Jackson Hurst Address - [REDACTED] Comment - I approve and support TxDOT's Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) from I-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Project. The aspect that I love about TxDOT's Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) from I-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Project is that Arterial 1/1682 Boulevard will provide new connectivity. sent from [REDACTED]	Comments noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
54.	Manuel Ornelas	5/26/2025	Email	I live right next to the proposed intersection of North Loop and Arterial 1. I greatly support Arterial 1 revised alternative. It will reduce congestion on Horizon Blv. Make sure the lower valley keeps its green fertile landscape. Arterial 1 should have lots of trees. Save as many pecan trees as possible. I want to make suggestions that can improve traffic flow. My concern is at its intersection with North Loop. No improvements on North Loop are shown. North Loop is a two-lane street with no middle lane and shoulder. We need for it to also be turned into a four lane so that traffic can easily turn left or right when merging into or off Arterial 1. Otherwise, traffic will pile up as the Artiral 1 alternate will attract drivers now using Horizon and the Clint 1110. As an example, the intersection of North Loop and Horizon where the same Horizon lane layout is kept on North Loop for about 1000 ft before merging into one lane. We can update 1000 ft of street both east and west of the intersection on North Loop. Also, my concern that Antigua Dr as it is not shown as connecting to Arterial 1. This subdivision only has 1 entrance. In case of an accident on North Loop and Rancho Viejo, EMS, Police and Fire Department will not be able to assist an emergency in the subdivision. Potentially causing the life of someone. It can also be used to divert traffic if an accident happens at Arterial 1 and North Loop. About 2 years ago the adjacent subdivision was proposed. New homes are now being built. Residents of Rancho Viejo Subdivision voted to not connect the new subdivision thru Los Robles Dr. A City of Socorro official lives there. Advising residents and the resident association. Basically tipping the scale on what she wanted for the Subdivision. Not taking importance on what was best for the community as a whole. Do not let one individual put her preference on top of that of others. Let safety be priority and make sure connection with Antigua Dr is built. There will not be additional cost to the project as Antigua Dr is already built up to the Proposed Arterial 1. Thanks for allowing us to make inputs on this long-awaited project. While there might be some who may oppose , 100% of all neighborhood and Socorro residents are excited and want this project to start right away. Get Outlook for iOS	Comments noted. Project landscaping will be decided during the detailed design phase of the project (also called PS&E phase). As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Intersection turning movements, including the number of turn lanes at each intersection, are currently under review and will meet required engineering standards based on estimated traffic projections. Connectivity to adjacent neighborhoods, such as Antigua Drive, will be analyzed as the project design progresses. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department.
55.	Desiray Garcia	5/27/2025	Email	Sent from my iPhone [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Desiray Garcia [REDACTED] [REDACTED] My household I don't want them to build the road because I like how peaceful it is. If you build the road there will be higher pollution in the air and they can run over dogs when they get out of the fence. I would be very sad if my dogs died. I think it would increase my anxiety because it would make a lot of noise & I would be terrified when cars crash. I plead that you will construct this road somewhere else. Even though it might help Socorro get better I think it is not worth taking away the peace from so many families. All my neighbors say they got their property because of the peacefulness & quietness they have here. Please do not build the road & since my house will be directly impacted consider me & my household very important opinion. I thank my mom for building this house & it would mean a lot if you didn't build this road.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made. Your property at [REDACTED] is approximately 150 feet from the proposed Arterial 1 right-of-way and would not be affected by the proposed project.
56.	Maria Garcia	5/27/2025	Email	Sent from my iPhone [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Maria Garcia [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I'm against the project 100% I want the NO BUILD!!! When I moved to this area it was because it's a quiet area. I suffer from anxiety this road impacts me and my family in many ways health wise its creating and will create impacts to my health. It impacts my property because it will next to my home with traffic, noise, pollution, accidents and many more,	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department.
57.	Yvonne Martinez	5/28/2025	Email	Thank you, Yvonne Martinez [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Yvonne Martinez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] The proposal to construct this road so close to my property fills me with deep concern and I want to express my profound concerns. Beyond the immediate inconvenience, I am deeply worried about the long-term consequences for my family and community. The scale of this project threatens to permanently alter the character of our neighborhood. The constant noise and disruption from construction and increased traffic will undoubtedly impact on our daily lives. Making it difficult to work, sleep, relax, brings risk to our children who play outside and those wide horses in the area. Moreover, the potential decrease in air quality is a serious health concern. I am deeply worried about the long-term effects on my family’s quality of life and consequences for my family and community. Our community values its peace and quiet, and this road threatens to destroy that, I urge you to consider the emotional and environmental toll this read will take, but also the irreplaceable loss it will inflict on our homes and lives. We need to explore alternative solutions that prioritize the well-being of our community and preserve the quality of life we cherish. Let’s work together to find a solution that benefits everyone, not just a few.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Regarding alternative solutions, the purpose of the proposed project is to address the increase in traffic in Socorro, as mentioned above, and to improve connectivity across Socorro for the benefit of anyone using the roadways, including residents. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made.
58.	Paula Garcia	5/28/2025	Email	To Whom It May Concern, Attached you will find my Comment Form. Thank you. Paula Garcia [REDACTED] [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Paula Garcia [REDACTED]	Comments noted. Currently, the schematic includes proposed ROW on both sides of Anderson Road at this location, and the proposed alignment would impact your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 64 feet from your home. There are several residential structures along this existing curve, which makes it difficult to avoid impacts. However, during detailed design (also known as PS&E), the engineering team will analyze if it is viable to reduce the footprint at this location in order to reduce impacts to parcels on both sides of the road.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				██████████ ████████████████████ I have asthma and heart issues. I live in a rural area because of this. A highway a few feet from my house will not only be incredibly dangerous for my family and livestock (horses, sheep, chicken, dogs) but also detrimental to my health and wellbeing. I have lived here for over 30 years in peace and quiet. I live here for the peace and quiet. I do not believe it is absolutely necessary for my health to be compromised and my neighbors. Land and houses to be taken away for a major highway that could be built on farm road I10 which already connects to the overpass and would not destroy anyone's house and peace. I am a retired teacher living on a disability income. I cannot afford to move away.	Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Although the proposed Arterial 1 roadway is a four-lane road, it would not be or function as a freeway. The proposed design, including speed limits and similar aspects, would be more similar to Horizon Boulevard.
59.	Telesforo Garcia	5/28/2025	Email	To Whom It May Concern, Attached you will find my Comment Form. Telesforo Garcia [REDACTED] [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Telesforo Garcia [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I have lived here for over 35 years. I have built up my land with trees and bushes and grass and fences. I have put blood, sweat and tears into this land. I do not want all my hard work for the last 3 decades to be gone into a major highway that would destroy my peace and safety. I raised my children here. My grand-children are growing up here. A highway would make my house and land unsafe for my grandchildren and horses, sheep, chicken and dogs. I moved to a rural area on purpose. If I wanted to live in a city I would have stayed in El Paso. My wife has breathing and heart problems. This would put an end to a good quality of life for her. I don't see why this highway cant be built off on Farm Rd I10 where we would not be adversely affected.	Comments noted. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation’s (TxDOT’s) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. In addition, the City of Socorro is currently conducting detailed design for phase 1 and alternative analysis for phase 2 of the extension of Nuevo Hueco Tanks. However, this alignment is also on the north side of Socorro, between Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard. To the south of Socorro, the following roads currently provide access to the city; however, the routes are not direct or they are too far south to meet the objectives of the proposed project: FM 1110, Clint-San Elizario Road, and Clint Cut-off Road. The proposed Preferred Alternative would connect to I-10 approximately 2.58 miles south (eastbound along I-10) of Horizon Boulevard. This is about halfway between the existing Horizon Boulevard and Clint-San Elizario Road intersections, which meets the objectives of the project.
60.	Jesus Jose Reyna	5/28/2025 and 6/3/2025	Email	[The attached comment card reads as follows:] Jesus Jose Reyna [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Anderson Community/Rancho Viejo This project is changing my whole life around. Loosing part of my property is one thing but I just finish building a home that I will have to demolish. I am a father of 3 children which two of them attend middle school and I have a one year old. We are devastated with this news. My familys we have horses and live stock my children wont be able to Ride Horseback like they are acoustum to. Pollution and noise and giving up on this farmland neighborhood seems just unreal. From my deeps familys heart please reconsider on this project.	Comments noted. Your property at [REDACTED] would be directly impacted by the proposed project. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. The proposed alignment will continue to be refined during the detailed design phase, and the engineering design team will attempt to avoid relocations where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Please see responses to Comment #'s 206, 248, and 280 which also relate to this property.
61.	Michael J. Garcia	5/29/2025	Email	Sent from my iPhone [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Michael J. Garcia [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I grew up here enjoying the country side with animals and the beautiful peace and quiet. My children enjoy coming to visit and we do not have to carry about there safety, they are free to roam around and be with the animals without us worrying about them getting into trouble and/or being harmed. I would like to continue that legacy without a four lane highway being put into my parents front yard. If a highway is built there it would be to dangerous for my parents, their livestock, and for my kids safety. We will be	Comments noted. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				unable to visit. My mom has bad asthma and heart issues and the pollution from this highway would adversely affect her health. My dad also suffers from diabetes and the stress would also compromise his health.	The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis - community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.
62.	Daniel Tepezano	5/29/2025	Email	To Whom It May Concern Please view my feedback attached regarding Project Arterial 1. Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Daniel Tepezano [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Tepezano Resodence Dear City of Socorro Officials,	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				I am writing as a concerned resident regarding the proposed street development project that would run alongside my property and reportedly require the demolition of existing homes in our community. While I understand the importance of infrastructure growth, I strongly oppose this particular plan due to the negative impact it would have on our neighborhood. Our area is currently a peaceful and tight-knit community. Introducing a new street would bring increased traffic, noise, and safety concerns, disrupting the tranquility that we and our families deeply value. Even more troubling is the fact that this project would displace families who are currently living in their homes. Uprooting residents in this manner is not only heartbreaking but undermines the sense of stability and community that makes Socorro special. I urge the City to reconsider or explore alternative routes or options that do not require displacing residents or damaging the character of our neighborhood. We respectfully ask that the voices of those who live here and will be directly affected be taken into serious consideration during the planning process. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I hope to see a solution that supports both progress and the well-being of our community.	- community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment).

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made.
63.	Jesus Rodriguez	5/29/2025	Email	https://acrobat.adobe.com/id/urn:aaid:sc:VA6C2:145b3d64-56ed-495e-993b-26bd4fb238f8 Created and shared using Adobe Scan. Get the app. Sent from my iPhone [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Jesus Rodriguez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Disruption of family life and legacy. I for one am against Arterial 1!	Comment noted.
64.	Jessica Garcia	5/29/2025	Email	https://acrobat.adobe.com/id/urn:aaid:sc:VA6C2:f33d635f-dbe4-4f62-a96b-3e4d31f0f92c Created and shared using Adobe Scan. Get the app. Sent from my iPhone [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Jessica Garcia [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I was born and raised in Socorro. I currently still live and am now raising my kids in Socorro. My family and I chose to reside here because of the fond	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				memories we had growing up. Living in the outskirts away from the city is what we imagined it to be like for my family. Building a highway in an area where we have so much farmland and families who had not only built homes, but memories and lifelong legacies is down right degrading. You are not only taking away from our homes but from our families as well. We choose to live in Socorro to have some peace from the city. I am strongly against Arterial 1!	- community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
65.	Sonya Solano	6/1/2025	Email	https://acrobat.adobe.com/id/urn:aaid:sc:VA6C2:dd21fbcf-e7a7-4fa5-95cf-9af63a26c6f3 Created and shared using Adobe Scan. Get the app. Sent from my iPhone [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Sonya Solano [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Building a Highway there is not the best place to build too many of our houses are around by elderly people who do not have the funds to move and start over at another house.	Comments noted. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: air quality impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					• traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.
66.	Araceli Arias	6/2/2025	Email	Obtener Outlook para iOS [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Araceli Arias [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Estoy escribiendo este comentario para expresar mi fuerte oposición al proyecto de Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) como residente y propietario nos viene como sorpresa a mi y a mi familia que se va construir el ARTERIAL 1 ya que apenas en diciembre 2024 pudimos comprar casa con muchos sacrificios y no se me hace justo que me quiten mi sueño hecho realidad (tener una casa. Araceli Arias [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Translation: I am writing this comment to express my strong opposition to the project of Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) as a resident and homeowner it comes as a surprise to me and my family that ARTERIAL 1 will be built since only in December 2024 we were able to buy a house with many sacrifices and it is not fair to take away my dream come true (to have a house).	Comments noted. Your property at [REDACTED] would be directly impacted by the proposed project. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. The proposed alignment will continue to be refined during the detailed design phase, and the engineering design team will attempt to avoid relocations where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ Please see responses to Comment #s 181 and 263, which also pertain to this property. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Su propiedad, ubicada en [REDACTED], se vería directamente afectada por el proyecto propuesto. La Alternativa Preferida se desarrolló para minimizar y evitar los desalojos donde fuera posible. El diseño propuesto seguirá perfeccionándose durante la fase de diseño detallado, y el equipo de diseño de ingeniería intentará evitar los desalojos donde sea posible. Durante la adquisición de los derechos de paso, la ciudad de Socorro seguirá el proceso de adquisición de derechos de paso de la Administración Federal de Carreteras, el cual incluye una evaluación de terceras partes, una compensación basada en el valor justo de mercado y asistencia para la reubicación, cuando corresponda. Este proceso incluirá una coordinación individual con cada propietario afectado una vez que comience el proceso de adquisición de los derechos de paso. No se anticipa que este proceso

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					comience hasta que se apruebe el esquema y se finalice el proceso ambiental. La expropiación es la opción menos deseable para la ciudad, y se explorarán todas las posibilidades antes de que se implemente este proceso. Incluso en el caso de expropiación, se ofrecerá asistencia para la reubicación, cuando corresponda. Puede encontrar más información sobre este proceso aquí: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ Consulte las respuestas a los comentarios #181 y #263, que también se refieren a esta propiedad.
67.	Kathy Mijares	6/2/2025	Email	[The attached comment card reads as follows:] Kathy Mijares [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Athena West Colonia I am writing to express my strong opposition to the road proposal to be built on Anderson Street (Surrat Pecan Farm) connecting I-10 to Socorro. The new road poses a potential hazard to the local communities way of life in this area. This close knit community has lived in this agricultural area for many generations. Residents here have enjoyed the peace and quite and the residents privacy. This project until affect our way of life, breeding live stock for, food, income and growing crops to feed our families. Most importantly passing on this way of life to our children and grand children, this area is not just a piece of land we purchased or inherited, it is our investment.	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
68.	Jose R. Contreras	6/2/2025	Email	[The attached comment card reads as follows:] Jose R. Contreras [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Athena West I oppose to the proposed build of road connecting I-10 to Socorro. I have invested income, time managing my property to enjoy the peacefulness I have living in Athena West Colonia. Adding in a major road with leave families displaced, not to mention, more damage to North loop and this is our primary road for farmers to travel with tractors and/or heavy equipment. Possible theft from new developing area bringing in outside people trying to steal what we work so hard for. Say no this build and help the local farming community stay as it is for generations to come.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping.
69.	Dianna Mijares	6/2/2025	Email	[The attached comment card reads as follows:] Dianna Mijares [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Athena West Colonia	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				My mom lives in Athena West Colonia. She is new to the area but it is something she always dreamt of having. Farmland to grow crops and have farm animals. This is her happy place and she puts her heart into working her home with her husband. This area is very peaceful and adding a new road will bring, noise, more traffic, potential risk of theft of farming tools, equipment, and possibly homes.	was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping.
70.	Rocio Martinez	6/2/2025	Email	To Whom It May Concern: It appears there may be some bias now as to which alternative to choose. First your paperwork appeared to have identified 3 Alternatives. The first Alternative was supposedly identified as the preferred one. Now you jumped from the first alternative to the third Alternative. I don't want to see anyone	Comments noted. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment).

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				lose their home, but according to the city Alternative 3 is apparently the preferred option now. Not happy with scaring the first community of Alternative 1 and putting them on the edge. You are now wanting to do the same thing with the community affected by your Alternative 3. You argue this is needed to alleviate traffic. The truth is you are making it worse. I do not accept the argument that this is the best route to alleviate traffic, it's just a route. Most people that live in the Alternative 3 area have lived there for 40 some years and most only live on SS. If you want to build your road find an alternative that doesn't affect these communities. Instead of spending so much funds on a project like this; use the funds to fix the issues the socorro city oversees in many or our communities. Another thing, you can start being transparent with the communities being affected. You provided maps that don't identify the affected streets and do not do enough to make the community aware of what is going on. I assure you not everyone knows of your plans. Stop hiding information and be transparent with the community. Sincerely, Affected Community Member	At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings.
71.	Leslie Rios	6/3/2025	Email	Leslie Rios Rio Grand Classic Livestock Auction [REDACTED] [REDACTED] office [REDACTED] [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Leslie K. Rios [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 155 feet from your home and 18 feet from your property fence. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				My home is located at [REDACTED]. My drive way is on the corner of Anderson and Quail Mesa. I have six acres and a water well for irrigation purposes. My son and grandchildren live with me, my grandchildren attend Clint Elementary (Surratt). Both my adult children graduated from Clint High School. My business is Rio Grande Classic we have horse auctions. My property is needed to board horses. I need this property for my business. I would not be able to replace six acres in the Clint school district. The property value would drop drastically with a busy highway out the back door. I sincerely hope another route would be located. Thank you! Leslie Rios	was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The El Paso Central Appraisal District is responsible for appraising all real and business personal property within El Paso County. It is not within the City of Socorro's jurisdiction to assess if the project would affect property values in a negative or positive way.
72.	Rosa A. Ramirez de Pedrueza & Arturo Pedrueza	6/3/2025	Email	Adjunto Hoja de comentarios. Sent from my iPhone [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Rosa Alma Ramirez de Pedrueza y Arturo Pedrueza [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Yo no estoy de acuerdo en la construcción carretera Arterial 1 por lo siguiente: 1) CONTAMINACION AMBIENTAL 2) Daño Ecológico 3) Ruido Constante 4) Forma de vida 5) Carretera que pondrá en peligro nuestra vida y tranquilidad 6) Nuestra comunidad es rural 7) Destruirá tierras de cultivo Nosotros no sabíamos porque no nos enviaron ningún aviso nunca, nos dimos cuenta por una vecina el jueves 29 de mayo del presente año. 6/3/25	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Translation: I do not agree with the construction of Arterial Highway 1 because of the following: 1) ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION 2) Ecological Damage 3) Constant Noise 4) Way of life 5) Road that will endanger our life and tranquility. 6) Our community is rural 7) It will destroy farmland We did not know because no notice was ever sent, we found out from a neighbor on Thursday, May 29th of this year.	The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. See responses to comment #s 128, 259, 265, and 277, which also pertain to this property. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento. Las consideraciones de seguridad relacionadas con el proyecto para los usuarios del transporte público seguirán evaluándose e incorporándose a medida que avance el diseño del proyecto. El proyecto debe cumplir con los requisitos de la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA) y con las normas de seguridad vial. El proyecto incluiría un camino de uso compartido independiente para peatones y ciclistas. Además, el proyecto está diseñado para mejorar el tiempo de llegada de los servicios de emergencias debido a la construcción de un puente sobre la vía del tren. No solo reducirá los retrasos causados por el paso de los trenes, sino que eliminará la posibilidad de colisiones entre trenes y automóviles en ese lugar. En cuanto a un posible aumento de la delincuencia, este tema es responsabilidad del Departamento de Policía de la ciudad de Socorro. Las consideraciones de diseño relacionadas con las operaciones agrícolas y ganaderas se incorporarán durante la fase de diseño detallado (también conocida como fase PS&E). Esto puede incluir la incorporación de aberturas en la mediana en ubicaciones estratégicas, así como la optimización de señales de seguridad y marcas viales. Se han ofrecido varias oportunidades de participar al público a lo largo de la fase de análisis de alternativas del proyecto, incluyendo una reunión pública virtual llevada a cabo en septiembre de 2021 y una reunión pública con personas interesadas llevada a cabo en enero de 2022. También se anunciaron y llevaron a cabo reuniones con los propietarios/ inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes en julio de 2024 y marzo de 2025, y cuando se solicitaron a lo largo del proceso del proyecto. Se llevo a cabo una segunda reunión pública en mayo de 2025. Los métodos de comunicación se adaptaron para cada evento según el propósito de la reunión y las lecciones aprendidas de eventos anteriores. Se utilizaron varios tipos de notificaciones para cada reunión. A todos los propietarios y inquilinos adyacentes a la Alternativa Preferida (incluso si no se verían directamente afectados) se les envió por correo una notificación y un boletín informativo del proyecto con la fecha, la hora y el lugar de la reunión, tanto en inglés como en español. El boletín también se colocó (a mano) en las puertas de entrada o portones accesibles de todas las propiedades ubicadas junto a las alternativas discutidas en las diversas reuniones. Además, se publicó un aviso público en dos periódicos locales (uno en inglés y otro en español) y tanto el aviso como el boletín se enviaron por correo electrónico a todas las direcciones de correo electrónico disponibles.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					También se aceptarán y revisarán comentarios del público en cualquier momento a lo largo de la vida del proyecto; sin embargo, solo se documentarán formalmente aquellos relacionados con las reuniones o audiencias públicas. El equipo del proyecto ha hecho todo lo posible para garantizar la transparencia del proyecto y la concientización pública, lo que incluye tanto una amplia difusión de los avisos de reuniones públicas (a través de notificaciones en periódicos y redes sociales) como una distribución específica de avisos e información a los propietarios directamente afectados por el proyecto (mediante el envío directo de avisos por correo y boletines informativos de invitación entregados en mano). La información presentada en cada reunión se desarrolló utilizando los mejores datos disponibles al momento de la reunión. Las alternativas propuestas y la información general se fueron actualizando entre reuniones a raíz de los cambios en las condiciones existentes (debido al desarrollo) y como resultado de los comentarios del público. Tenga en cuenta que se llevará a cabo una audiencia pública después de que se apruebe el documento ambiental. Esta audiencia se anunciará de la misma manera que las reuniones públicas previas. Consulte las respuestas a los comentarios números 128, 259, 265 y 277, que también se refieren a esta propiedad.
73.	Daniel Lorey	6/3/2025	Email	Good evening, I am the home owner for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Please see my attached word document with my comments about this project. Very Respectfully, Daniel J. Lorey [REDACTED] [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Daniel J. Lorey [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 1. This proposed road cuts more than just a path through land — it cuts through homes, histories, and the heart of a community. It is not just a "development project" on paper. It's generations of families who have built lives here, worked this land, and created a home rooted in hard work and tradition. 2. You are not accounting for the people — those who've built dreams here, who've raised families here, and who've come to call this place home. You're not considering the wildlife that coexists with us — the	1. Comments noted. 2. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. 3. Comments noted. 4. The project team conducted early coordination with El Paso County representatives and have invited them to all public outreach activities. In addition, the team will continue to coordinate with the County and other local officials throughout the life of the project.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				owls, bats, dogs, cats, and even the occasional loose horse. This plan doesn't just ignore these realities — it threatens to erase them. 3. I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the proposed road project that would run through farmland and residential areas near North Loop and Anderson Road. This project presents several critical legal, procedural, and environmental issues that cannot be ignored. 4. First and foremost, this project lies along the county line. As publicly acknowledged by the mayor, there has been no collaboration or coordination with the county government—an oversight that not only undermines intergovernmental transparency but may also violate procedural planning requirements for projects crossing jurisdictional boundaries. 5. Additionally, the mayor has stated that the city has not secured the required 20% financial contribution for the project. This raises serious concerns regarding why TXDOT would accept or advance a project proposal lacking both funding and regional coordination. The use of state or federal funds without confirmed local financial support contradicts the spirit of fiscally responsible infrastructure planning. 6. There are also serious environmental concerns. The affected area, particularly the pecan farm near the proposed route, is known to be a habitat for protected species, including bats and owls. In Texas, all native bat species are protected under the Texas Parks and Wildlife Code, which prohibits the killing, harassment, or disturbance of bat colonies without appropriate permits. Furthermore, if any endangered bat species are present, this project would fall under the jurisdiction of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and would require consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for a habitat assessment and potential permitting. 7. Disturbing these habitats without compliance with state and federal law is not only unethical, but it may also be unlawful. No project should proceed without a comprehensive environmental impact study and full legal review under applicable wildlife protection statutes. 8. Considering these legal, environmental, and procedural failures, I urge that this project be halted immediately. The community deserves transparency, environmental stewardship, and respect for	5. Although construction funding for the project has not been secured, funding for the planning and detailed design phases has been approved. The City of Socorro, the El Paso MPO, and TxDOT have conducted frequent coordination regarding this City-sponsored project, and the project has received local support. Although no formal conclusion has or can be made at this time regarding the potential building or maintenance of Arterial 1 outside of the Socorro City limits, the project team has coordinated with El Paso County, as noted above. Prior to the public meeting, El Paso County agreed that an alternative with proposed ROW within the County jurisdiction is viable; however, they noted that coordination should continue as the project moves forward through the NEPA process. 6. See the response to Comment #2, above. 7. An Environmental Assessment will be prepared for the proposed project in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). If it is determined that the proposed action would have a "significant environmental impact" then either the No Build Alternative would be chosen, the project would be revised, or an Environmental Impact Statement would be prepared. 8. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				the rule of law, not a rushed and disorganized plan that threatens homes, wildlife, and public trust. 9. When I came here in 2022 as an active-duty service member, this was the first place I could truly call home. While my wife was hospitalized for three weeks, I closed on our first house. Through hardship, this community embraced us. This isn't just the place where I live, it's where I belong. 10. raise serious concerns regarding the proposed construction of an industrial facility, reportedly intended for emergency response services, within a residential area near North Loop in Socorro, Texas. This proposal presents significant legal, environmental, and public safety challenges that demand immediate attention and review. First, the placement of an industrial-use facility in a residential zone district raises questions about compliance with local zoning ordinances. According to Chapter 211 of the Texas Local Government Code, municipalities must ensure zoning regulations promote the health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community. Placing an industrial building, particularly one potentially storing chemicals or hazardous materials—within a residential setting, may violate the intended purpose of residential zoning and expose residents to environmental and health risks. If the proposed facility is to house chemicals or hazardous substances, this also invokes federal and state environmental regulations, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA). These laws require proper hazard communication, emergency response planning, and disclosure of chemical storage to local emergency planning committees. There is a legitimate concern that chemical storage could lead to air, soil, or groundwater contamination, particularly in a densely populated residential area. 11. In addition to environmental hazards, North Loop Road is already insufficiently equipped to handle high volumes of traffic. The road is narrow, poorly designed for industrial use, and frequently congested. This poses a direct public safety risk, especially if emergency response services need quick, unobstructed access. According to Texas Transportation Code § 545.401, roadways must allow for safe and efficient passage of emergency vehicles. The existing infrastructure in this area fails to meet that standard.	of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. 9. Comments noted. Thank you for your service. 10. The purpose of the proposed project is not to construct an industrial facility. In addition, there is currently no planned City of Socorro M2 Heavy Industrial Zoning in the area as a result of the project. However, your home is near non-zoned areas under the jurisdiction of El Paso County. The City of Socorro is not able to establish zoning within areas outside of their jurisdiction.. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				12. Moreover, local law enforcement and traffic management resources are already stretched thin. Increasing industrial traffic in an inadequately designed area could further burden police response times and create a heightened risk for vehicle collisions, pedestrian hazards, and delayed emergency interventions. 13. Given these concerns, I urge the city and relevant regulatory authorities to: · Conduct a full zoning and land use compliance review. · Require an environmental impact study in accordance with both state and federal law. · Assess the traffic impact and roadway suitability before approving any construction or permits. Ensure community involvement and public hearings are part of the decision-making process. 14. Failure to address these issues transparently and lawfully may expose the city to liability and undermine public trust. I respectfully request that this proposal be reconsidered considering the serious risks to health, safety, and environmental integrity. 15. If you as city representatives don't have a 5,10, 15 year plan for the city and representing its constituents appropriately then I am sorry but you're not what the community needs. All these homes built would've not received there permits had the office of the planning and zoning authority properly notified these people of a potential issue in the future because of the potential project. 16. I am not asking you, I am telling you: No build. No road. No destruction. This community will stand united to protect what is ours — with or without a voice at the table. You will not destroy our home.	railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. 11. Improvements to North Loop Drive are not within the scope of this project. TxDOT recently conducted a Feasibility Study for North Loop Road in the vicinity of the project. Please see the Study page on the TxDOT web site for more information (https://www.txdot.gov/projects/hearings-meetings/el-paso/fm76-north-loop-drive-feasibility-study.html). 12. Refer to Response #10, above, regarding safety. 13. A full zoning and land use compliance review is not required for transportation projects under the NEPA process. The City of Socorro follows Chapter 211 of the Texas Local Government Code (https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/GetStatute.aspx?Code=LG&Value=211), which grants municipalities the authority to regulate land use, building heights, and lot sizes to protect public health and safety. The City implements these state statutes locally through its Unified Development Code (UDC) and Chapter 46 of the Local Ordinances (https://costx.us/local-ordinances/). In compliance with state law, the city's Planning & Zoning Commission (https://costx.us/planning-zoning/) and City Council hold public hearings and issue notifications to property owners before any zoning changes or variances are approved. The City conducted a zoning assessment as part of the Socorro 2040 Comprehensive Master Plan, which included extensive public outreach. There is currently no planned City of Socorro M2 Heavy Industrial Zoning in the area as a result of the project. Regarding environmental studies, please see the response to Comment #6, above. Regarding traffic studies, the City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Regarding public and community involvement, multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. 14. Comments noted. 15. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation’s (TxDOT’s) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. In the early conceptual phases of the project, the El Paso MPO’s Travel Demand Model was used as a tool to forecast traffic and travel throughout the region to assist with planning purposes. In addition, more detailed traffic analyses are being conducted during the schematic phase of the project. 16. Comments noted.
74.	Dannie R. Bidwell	6/3/2025	Email	Created and shared using Adobe Scan. [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Dannie Ray Bidwell [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] My daughter that lives on Anderson Rd. has chronic breathing difficulties. She has live here almost 30 years mainly because this is a rural area. The excess noise and pollution will be extremely detrimental to her health. I am a disabled Vietnam veteran and I suffer from heart disease, COPD, and recovering from lung cancer. And my constant concern for my daughter’s health would only be multiplied by the noise, pollution, and traffic. Lack of foresight on the warehouse builders should not punish my daughter and her family because of their poor planning.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
75.	Judith A. Bidwell	6/3/2025	Email	Created and shared using Adobe Scan. [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Judith A. Bidwell [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Our daughter who lives on Anderson Rd. has asthma & allergies and her health is already compromised. I would always worry about her health deteriorating further. A 4 lane highway only a few feet from her residence will cause unnecessary stress on her and on me. She lives away from major roads because of the polluted air so she can breath healthier air. Building a 4 lane highway expressly for semi's is not fair to people who chose this area to live to get away from the noise and pollution. And just because companies have built warehouses in the area is no reason to make it easier for semi's to get there. The companies knew the road situation before choosing the area.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
76.	Raquel Martinez	6/4/2025	Email	Note: This comment was received twice. Once sent by App for Gmail and once sent by Samsung Galaxy S24 FE, an AT&T 5G smartphone [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Raquel Martinez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I'm AGAINST the project and as a low income homeowner I'm strongly against Arterial 1 tearing through my backyard. It'll bring dangerous	Comments noted. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				accidents, toxic pollution, and unbearable noise, wrecking my safety, privacy, and way of life. With housing costs sky-high, I can't afford to move or replace my home's value. This project threatens to force me out upending everything I've built I'm fighting for my house and community please consider alternatives that don't destroy lives.	As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Your property at [REDACTED] would be impacted based on the current design, but your home is not within the proposed ROW. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ Please see response to Comment #261, which also relates to this property.
77.	Rebeca Aguilar	6/4/2025	Email	[The attached comment card reads as follows:] Rebeca Aguilar [REDACTED] [REDACTED] My family and I have moved to our family’s ranch for a peaceful lifestyle. Since we moved I have enjoyed introducing my daughter into the ranch lifestyle away from the city. I am proud to say that because my daughter is so entertained with managing our farms animals and outdoor chores to keep our farm clean and taken care of has helped her develop social skills in a farm setting. Such as focus on activities that encourage communication, collaboration and emotional regulation. Now that a study has been introduced for Anderson Rd for a new road to be build right next to our home will affect our livestock and disturb our peace.	Comments noted. Please also see responses to Comment #s 78, 79, 80, and 185, which also pertain to this property.
78.	Norma Sierra	6/4/2025	Email	To whom it may concern, Please refer to the attached to access the Comment Form for the Arterial 1 Project. Respectfully, Norma L. Sierra :-) [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Norma L. Sierra [REDACTED] [REDACTED] The Arterial 1 project is a project that will impact our neighborhood in a negative way. Not only will it impact the life and habitat of the farm animals but also of the animals native to the Chihuahua desert! I will also impact the pollution levels in our area which is one of the reasons that we moved away from the city. We enjoy the life without noise pollution, air pollution and a healthy life style. This road will also impact the alfalfa farming and animal breeding at our ranch. I support a NO build in Socorro since there is already a road connecting Socorro Rd to I-10 @ the clint cut off being developed. The building of this road and construction of warehouses will also affect the arroyos & cause flooding in our area the way it happened in 2014.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation’s (TxDOT’s) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					(PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. In addition, the City of Socorro is currently conducting detailed design for phase 1 and alternative analysis for phase 2 of the extension of Nuevo Hueco Tanks. However, this alignment is also on the north side of Socorro, between Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard. To the south of Socorro, the following roads currently provide access to the city; however, the routes are not direct or they are too far south to meet the objectives of the proposed project: FM 1110, Clint-San Elizario Road, and Clint Cut-off Road. The proposed Preferred Alternative would connect to I-10 approximately 2.58 miles south (eastbound along I-10) of Horizon Boulevard. This is about halfway between the existing Horizon Boulevard and Clint-San Elizario Road intersections, which meets the objectives of the project. The currently proposed retention pond locations are in preliminary design and will be further evaluated during the detailed design phase of the project (also known as the PS&E phase). Note that, per El Paso County Water District #1, structures that fall under their jurisdiction may not be used for stormwater retention. In addition, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SW3P) will be developed and implemented as part of the project. The SW3P, which is administered by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), is designed to control erosion in the project vicinity resulting from soil disturbance during construction, including permanent controls if needed. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. Please also see responses to Comment #s 77, 79, 80, and 185, which also pertain to this property.
79.	Alondra Sierra	6/4/2025	Email	[The attached comment card reads as follows:] Alondra Sierra [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				As a fifth generation of the Sierras with are style of ranching passed down from generation to generation I would like to preserve and save this land to keep and pass down to the next generation and to keep and help others barrel race is my dream but sense the farm and ranch style is dying I cant do so and with the air pollution, noise pollution, traffic and car crashes this can heavily hurt or kill our livestock and the ranch I have been wanting to pass down to the future generations will be gone and with our animals, some like to rome around the streets and some horseback ride but with the road we are protesting to build we will not be able to because they will get hurt.	selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping.
80.	Alejo Sierra	6/4/2025	Email	Please find attached comment form opposing arterial 1 project. I SUPPORT A NO BUILT. Respectfully,	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Alejo Sierra Socorro resident. [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Alejo Sierra [REDACTED] [REDACTED] The construction of the Arterial 1 project will destruct our peace & livelihood. It will destroy our wildlife (protected quail, roadrunners, burrowing owls, migratory birds, rattle snakes & more) My family income also derives from farming & ranching, with hardwork & sweat we have purchased tractors & several farm equipment to cultivate the land we own & leased land around the area. If arterial 1 project is built transporting our tractors & farm equipment will be difficult we need to protect our FM roads. Also we horseback ride around the area & with roads of this magnitude it will destroy our riding trails. As my understanding a road is already in the works to connect I-10 to Clint cutoff. I SUPPORT A NO BUILT as it will destroy our peace, increase traffic, noise & Air pollution and our health. SAVE OUR FARMS	minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation’s (TxDOT’s) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. In addition, the City of Socorro is currently conducting detailed design for phase 1 and alternative analysis for phase 2 of the extension of Nuevo Hueco Tanks. However, this alignment is also on the north side of Socorro, between Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					To the south of Socorro, the following roads currently provide access to the city; however, the routes are not direct or they are too far south to meet the objectives of the proposed project: FM 1110, Clint-San Elizario Road, and Clint Cut-off Road. The proposed Preferred Alternative would connect to I-10 approximately 2.58 miles south (eastbound along I-10) of Horizon Boulevard. This is about halfway between the existing Horizon Boulevard and Clint-San Elizario Road intersections, which meets the objectives of the project. Please also see responses to Comment #s 77, 78, 79, and 185, which also pertain to this property.
81.	Raquel S. Dominguez	6/5/2025	Email	Please see attached document! [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Raquel S. Dominguez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Rancho Viejo Community (Anderson) Lack of safe roadways to accommodate traffic. North Loop is only 2 lanes. Deception and lack of proper/timely notice to those affected. People will be losing their homes – some of which are recent builds This is a farming community – hazards to land, wildlife, and air quality Farmlands and livestock will be affected/eliminated Please don't build!	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					(via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping.
82.	Lisa Aguilar	6/6/2025	Email	[The attached comment card reads as follows:] Lisa Aguilar [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Athena West I live in the surrounding area, where allowing this project would affect all those around. Not only will there be an overload of traffic in our quiet neighborhoods, it will destruct homes that have spent their live savings to build their forever homes. Families in this area have built and lived in this area for the peace and tranquility. We have built to be able to allow our children to enjoy riding their bikes, play in in front yards with the peace knowing they are safe. We ride our horses, ride our golf carts, ride our dirt bikes, ride our quads, knowing we are all safe. Why disrupt our lives by placing a four lane road for the convenience of those who do not even live in our area. This project needs to be place where families are not around, where kids are running around, where lives won't be changed!!!	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/
83.	Robert Dominguez	6/5/2025	Email	See attached [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Robert Dominguez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] SAF I am a farmer and live about a mile from the proposed Arterial. This arterial would open the doors to industrial plants that would negatively impact the area. You would also be destroying farmland.	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro follows Chapter 211 of the Texas Local Government Code (https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/GetStatute.aspx?Code=LG&Value=211), which grants municipalities the authority to regulate land use, building heights, and lot sizes to protect public health and safety. The City implements these state statutes locally through its Unified Development Code (UDC) and Chapter 46 of the Local Ordinances (https://costx.us/local-ordinances/). In compliance with state law, the city's Planning & Zoning Commission (https://costx.us/planning-zoning/) and City Council hold public hearings and issue notifications to property owners before any zoning changes or variances are approved. The City conducted a zoning assessment as part of the Socorro 2040 Comprehensive Master Plan, which included extensive public outreach. There is currently no planned City of Socorro M2 Heavy Industrial Zoning in the area as a result of the project.
84.	Marc A. Lazcano	6/5/2025	Email	Dear Project Team, I am writing as a concerned resident of Socorro, TX, living at [REDACTED], regarding the proposed Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) project currently under review. After reviewing the project materials, including the newsletter and map outlining the preferred route and retention pond locations, I am strongly opposed to this project for the following reasons: Proximity to My Home: The proposed route appears to run alarmingly close to my residence and neighborhood. I am deeply concerned about the potential impact on our safety, air quality, noise levels, and overall quality of life during and after construction. Property Value and Disruption: Large-scale infrastructure developments like this can significantly lower property values, increase traffic congestion, and	Comments noted. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				disrupt the peaceful nature of our community — a key reason many of us chose to live in this area. Lack of Transparency and Community Input: Many of my neighbors, including myself, were unaware of this project until very recently. For a development of this magnitude, I believe there has been insufficient direct outreach to those of us who will be most affected. Environmental and Health Concerns: The introduction of new roadways and retention ponds may alter natural drainage, pose flooding risks, and contribute to long-term environmental damage. As a community already impacted by extreme weather and development pressures, we cannot afford further degradation. I respectfully request that the project team reconsider this route, especially its proximity to residential neighborhoods like mine. I urge you to prioritize alternatives that avoid impacting established communities and instead focus on improving existing infrastructure more responsibly. Please confirm whether my property is within or near the proposed footprint and what, if any, protections or rights I have as a nearby homeowner. I also request to be kept informed of all public meetings, updates, and future opportunities for formal input. Sincerely, [Marc A Lazcano] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. The El Paso Central Appraisal District is responsible for appraising all real and business personal property within El Paso County. It is not within the City of Socorro’s jurisdiction to assess if the project would affect property values in a negative or positive way. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Your property at 11710 Flor Preciosa Lane would be directly impacted by the proposed project. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. The proposed alignment will continue to be refined during the detailed design phase, and the engineering design team will attempt to avoid relocations where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/
85.	Gerardo A. Sanchez	6/5/2025	Email	Good afternoon I am prostrating Arterial 1 project. Such project will cause an environmental impact to our framing lands and wildlife. Here’s a breakdown of the effects from each: 1. Industrial Waste Industrial activities generate a variety of wastes—solid, liquid, and gaseous—which can be highly polluting: Environmental Impacts: • Air Pollution: Emissions of greenhouse gases (CO₂, CH₄), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) contribute to climate change, acid rain, and respiratory problems. • Water Pollution: Untreated or poorly treated wastewater can contaminate rivers, lakes, and groundwater with heavy metals, toxins, and chemicals (e.g., from textile, pharmaceutical, and chemical industries). • Soil Contamination: Deposition of toxic waste and sludge leads to reduced soil fertility, acidification, and long-term damage to ecosystems. • Hazardous Waste: Includes radioactive waste, solvents, batteries, etc., which pose long-term risks to human health and biodiversity. • Thermal Pollution: Discharge of hot water from factories harms aquatic life by reducing oxygen levels in water bodies. 2. Wildland (Natural Areas)	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. The purpose of the proposed project is not to construct an industrial facility. In addition, there is currently no planned City of Socorro M2 Heavy Industrial Zoning in the area as a result of the project. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				While wildlands themselves are not waste-producing, human interaction with wildlands can degrade them: Environmental Impacts: • Deforestation (for development, mining, or logging): Leads to loss of biodiversity, carbon sink reduction, and increased erosion. • Habitat Fragmentation: Roads, fences, and other developments break up animal habitats, affecting migration and survival. • Invasive Species Introduction: Human activities can introduce non-native species, disrupting ecological balance. 3. Farmland (Agricultural Lands) Agriculture is essential but also one of the largest contributors to environmental degradation when poorly managed: Environmental Impacts: • Soil Degradation: Over-farming, monocropping, and improper irrigation lead to erosion, salinization, and nutrient depletion. • Water Pollution: Runoff of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers leads to eutrophication—excess nutrients in water causing algal blooms and dead zones. • Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Livestock emit methane (CH₄), and fertilizer use releases nitrous oxide (N₂O)—both potent greenhouse gases. • Loss of Biodiversity: Clearing natural habitats to expand farmland leads to a decline in native species. • Overuse of Water Resources: Intensive farming, especially in dry regions, depletes groundwater and surface water sources. I want you to reconsider relocating Arterial 1 project to the I-10 corridor. And avoid diminishing our peaceful way of living, don't diminish our beautiful farmlands, and wildlife. Gerardo A. Sanchez [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	• community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.
86.	Elena Mata	6/5/2025	Email	See attached [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Elena Mata [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Self	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				I oppose the Arterial because it will negatively affect our way of life. We moved out here for peace and quiet away from hustle and bustle that this arterial could bring,	
87.	Annai Delgado	6/5/2025	Email	City of Socorro and TXDOT: As a City of Socorro citizen, I oppose Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd.) Attached please find my Comment Form to be included in the official meeting summary. Thank you, Annai Delgado [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Annai Delgado [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Socorro citizen opposing Arterial 1 I oppose the development of Arterial 1 project. The reason for bringing this right of way (ROW) is to serve the expansion of industrial developments and this reason will negatively impact the livelihood of the common citizens of Socorro. Within 2 miles from the proposed ROW there is an expansion to a road creating a ROW for trailers and commercial vehicles from North Loop to Highway I-10. The referenced ROW that is already in in process and in the construction phase; is the extension of the Clint Cut-Off road. It makes no sense to displace and bring further traffic to a ROW less than 1 mile away from this development. Furthermore, there are 10 unused and vacant warehouses over 10,000 sq/ft that are being advertised for lease within a 7 mile radius of Arterial 1. To bring in a ROW and develop the adjacent land for industrial and commercial use while evidence shows that the demand is simply not there, demonstrates the City of Socorro and TXDOT are deliberately disregarding the needs of the common citizen and instead appeasing the interests of corporations and developers. While I understand that growth in the City is to be expected, the Arterial Project is not one that will address the needs of the City or its citizens. Instead, Arterial 1 is a ROW project that will serve the needs of commercial developers and cause harm to many concerned citizens. In addition to the expansion and ongoing construction of extending the Clint Cut-OFF Road, located 2 miles from Anderson Rd. This Horizon Blvd. route already extends from Socorro Rd to Highway I-10. If the City of Socorro and TXDOT are looking for routes to connect Socorro Rd. to Highway I-10, then the committee and those responsible for identifying a proposed ROW should identify a different route that better serves the community and industrial businesses, without harming	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. The City of Socorro follows Chapter 211 of the Texas Local Government Code (https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/GetStatute.aspx?Code=LG&Value=211), which grants municipalities the authority to regulate land use, building heights, and lot sizes to protect public health and safety. The City implements these state statutes locally through its Unified Development Code (UDC) and Chapter 46 of the Local Ordinances (https://costx.us/local-ordinances/). In compliance with state law, the city's Planning & Zoning Commission (https://costx.us/planning-zoning/) and City Council hold public hearings and issue notifications to property owners before any zoning changes or variances are approved. The City conducted a zoning assessment as part of the Socorro 2040 Comprehensive Master Plan, which included extensive public outreach. There is currently no planned City of Socorro M2 Heavy Industrial Zoning in the area as a result of the project. Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation's (TxDOT's) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. In addition, the City of Socorro is currently conducting detailed design for phase 1 and alternative analysis for phase 2 of the extension of Nuevo Hueco Tanks. However, this alignment is also on the north side of Socorro, between Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard. To the south of Socorro, the following roads currently provide access to the city; however, the routes are not direct or they are too far south to meet the objectives of the proposed project: FM 1110, Clint-San Elizario Road, and Clint Cut-off Road. The proposed Preferred Alternative would connect to I-10 approximately 2.58 miles south (eastbound along I-10) of Horizon Boulevard. This is about halfway between

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				already existing houses and properties in existence. Arterial 1 will force traffic to come through residential neighborhoods, while having the Horizon Blvd option, then 4 miles later the Anderson ROW (proposed Arterial 1), then further down the road—1 mile later—the Clint Cu Off, this seems redundant and poorly planned. I oppose the relocation of the citizens for the development of the Arterial 1 and seek that a reconsideration and that an alternative route be considered.	the existing Horizon Boulevard and Clint-San Elizario Road intersections, which meets the objectives of the project. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department.
88.	Mario Delgado	6/5/2025	Email	Subject : Comment Form Opposing Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd.) City of Socorro and TXDOT: As a City of Socorro citizen, I oppose Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd.) Attached please find my Comment Form to be included in the official meeting summary. Regards, Mario Delgado [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [The attached comment card reads as follows:] Mario A Delgado [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. The City of Socorro follows Chapter 211 of the Texas Local Government Code (https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/GetStatute.aspx?Code=LG&Value=211), which grants municipalities the authority to regulate land use, building heights, and lot sizes to protect public health and safety. The City implements these state statutes locally through its Unified Development Code (UDC) and Chapter 46 of the Local

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Socorro citizen opposing Arterial 1 I oppose the development of Arterial 1 project. The reason for bringing this right of way (ROW) is to serve the expansion of industrialdevelopments and this reason will negatively impact the livelihood of the common citizens of Socorro. Within 2 miles from the proposed ROW there is a an expansion to a road creating a ROW for trailers and commercial vehicles from North Loop to Highway I-10. The referenced ROW that is already in in process and in the construction phase; is the extension of the Clint Cut-Off Road. It makes no sense to displace and bring further traffic to a ROW less than 1 mile away from this development. Furthermore, there are 10 unused and vacant warehouses over 10,000 sq/ft that are being advertised for lease within a 7 mile radius of Arterial 1. To bring in a ROW and develop the adjacent land for industrial and commercial use while evidence shows that the demand is simply not there, demonstrates the City of Socorro and TXDOT are deliberately disregarding the needs of the common citizen and instead appeasing the interests of corporations and developers. While I understand that growth in the City is to be expected, the Arterial Project is not one that will address the needs of the City or its citizens. Instead, Arterial 1 is a ROW project that will serve the needs of commercial developers and cause harm to many concerned citizens. In addition to the expansion and ongoing construction of extending the Clint Cut-Off Road, located 2 miles from Anderson Rd.; commercial and industrial vehicles have alternative routes such as Horizon Blvd., which is located 4 miles from Anderson Rd. This Horizon Blvd. route already extends from Socorro Rd to Highway I-10. If the City of Socorro and TXDOT are looking for routes to connect Socorro Rd. to Highway I-10, then the committee and those responsible for identifying a proposed ROW should identify a different route that better serves the community and industrial businesses, without harming already existing houses and properties in existence. Arterial 1 will force traffic to come through residential neighborhoods, while having the Horizon Blvd option,then 4 miles later the Anderson ROW (proposed Arterial 1), then further down the road—1 mile later—the Clint Cut Off, this seems redundant and poorly planned. I oppose the relocation of the citizens for the development of Arterial 1 and seek that a reconsideration and that an alternative route be considered	Ordinances (https://costx.us/local-ordinances/). In compliance with state law, the city's Planning & Zoning Commission (https://costx.us/planning-zoning/) and City Council hold public hearings and issue notifications to property owners before any zoning changes or variances are approved. The City conducted a zoning assessment as part of the Socorro 2040 Comprehensive Master Plan, which included extensive public outreach. There is currently no planned City of Socorro M2 Heavy Industrial Zoning in the area as a result of the project. Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation's (TXDOT's) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. In addition, the City of Socorro is currently conducting detailed design for phase 1 and alternative analysis for phase 2 of the extension of Nuevo Hueco Tanks. However, this alignment is also on the north side of Socorro, between Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard. To the south of Socorro, the following roads currently provide access to the city; however, the routes are not direct or they are too far south to meet the objectives of the proposed project: FM 1110, Clint-San Elizario Road, and Clint Cut-off Road. The proposed Preferred Alternative would connect to I-10 approximately 2.58 miles south (eastbound along I-10) of Horizon Boulevard. This is about halfway between the existing Horizon Boulevard and Clint-San Elizario Road intersections, which meets the objectives of the project. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department.
89.	Bernard D. Felsen	6/5/2025	Email	Ladies and Gentlemen: Attached please find the objection from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Owner, LLC related to the proposed location of Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard), City of Socorro, Texas. Thank you. Bernard D. Felsen Attorney/Shareholder Direct: [REDACTED] Main: [REDACTED] Fax: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] vCard [REDACTED] ScottHulse.com ScottHulse PC The Value of Commitment ® One San Jacinto Plaza [REDACTED] [The attached letter reads as follows:] Via E-mail: lquimiro(a)costx.us and by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested City of Socorro Planning & Zoning Department 860 N. Rio Vista Rd. Socorro, Texas 79927 Attn: Lorraine Quimiro, City Planner of Socorro Via E-mail: Arteriall (@icf.com and by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested !CF/Blanton & Associates Attn: Arterial 1 5 Lakeway Centre Court, Suite 200 Lakeway, Texas 78734 Re: Objection to Proposed Location of Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) from I-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road), El Paso County, Texas Ladies and Gentlemen: <u>Introduction</u>	As part of the NEPA process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable, including avoidance and minimization of structures, such as the “Warehouse” at 11891 Alameda Avenue. In addition, the Project Team met with you to discuss your conceptual development at the “Affected Parcel.” However, based on the geometry of the proposed alignment and additional environmental and engineering constraints in the area, the design could not be shifted as you requested. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				This firm of Attorneys represents ██████████ Owner, LLC (the "Property Owner") regarding the Property Owner's land adjacent to the warehouse building located at ██████████. We have received and reviewed the May 2025 Newsletter attached hereto as Exhibit "A" that reflects the proposed location of Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) ("Arterial 1 "). For clarity, hereafter in this letter we will refer to the Property Owner's warehouse building located at ██████████ as the "Warehouse"; and we will refer to the Property Owner's land adjacent to the Warehouse, the land on which the City proposes to place Arterial 1, as the "Affected Parcel". Objection The Property Owner objects to the proposed location of the portion of Arterial 1 that "splits" the Affected Parcel. The Affected Parcel is scheduled to be used for a truck/trailer court for purposes of servicing the Warehouse (the "Truck/Trailer Court"), and is necessary not only for servicing the Warehouse but also for realizing the full utility of the Warehouse. The City of Socorro (the "City") is aware of the Property Owner's planned use of the Affected Parcel, having previously approved Property Owner's plans for the Truck/Trailer Court and having previously permitted the right to start construction on that Truck/Trailer Court project.¹ The City's proposed location of the Arterial 1 will not only cause compensable damage to the Affected Parcel, by destroying and rendering unsalvageable the planned Truck/Trailer Court project, but also will cause severe, compensable damage to the Warehouse by damaging the utility of the Warehouse to the Property Owner, to tenants, and to prospective tenants by rendering unavailable the planned Truck/Trailer Court, which is required for the Warehouse tenants, and which will significantly diminish and damage the fair market value of the Warehouse. The result to the City will be to increase the cost of Arterial 1 by increasing the compensation payable to the Property Owner for damage caused to both the Affected Parcel and to the Warehouse. We are providing with this letter, as Exhibit "B", a map of the Affected Parcel and surrounding properties. As you can see by examining Exhibit "B", there is plenty of vacant farmland upon which the City could situate an alternative (and less expensive) route for Arterial 1. Please see the vacant farmland lying on the opposite side of the drainage lateral that forms the southeastern boundary of the Affected Parcel, away from the Truck/Trailer Court. (Even if such a re-routing of Arterial 1 would situate a portion of Arterial 1 outside the city limits of the City of Socorro, such an alternative route would be well within the City of Socorro's extra territorial jurisdiction.)	

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Please also note that, when completed, the Truck/Trailer Court will increase the market value of the Affected Parcel, which will increase the City's property tax revenues from the Affected Parcel. However, if the City situates Arterial 1 so as to split the Affected Parcel (as currently proposed), the Truck/Trailer Court project will not be viable and the City will end up losing out on such increased property tax revenues. Furthermore, the City's acquisition costs for the adjacent farmland will be substantially less than the acquisition costs for the Affected Parcel (by several multiples). In order to find a resolution that works both for the City of Socorro and the Property Owner, we are certainly available to discuss alternatives. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. 1 The Truck/Trailer Court plans were approved by the City and the permit processed. However, ground-breaking and construction have been delayed by other unexpected exigencies that have arisen in connection with other projects.	
90.	William Skov	6/5/2025	Email	Good Afternoon, We attended the second public meeting virtually to review the latest alignment of the proposed Arterial 1 and want to express our full support for alternative 3a. This alignment does have some impact to properties we own; however, we fully understand the importance of adding critical infrastructure to meet transportation requirements in the growing Lower Valley. We own the following parcels affected by the proposed alignment: T4S, LTD.: [REDACTED] W D Skov Family Limited / Skov Family Farms: [REDACTED] Thank you, Bill Skov	Comments noted.
91.	Alonzo Velasquez	6/6/2025 and 6/12/2025 (forwarded by Myrian Apodaca, COS)	Email	[The attached comment card reads as follows:] Alonzo Velasquez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] People Opposed to Arterial 1	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 78 feet from your home and 37 feet from your property fence. Regarding the curve adjacent to your property, the curve and curve radius meet applicable design standards (the 2024 TxDOT Roadway Design Manual and the

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				I am a resident of Socorro, I have owned my property for 15 years I'm here writing today to strongly oppose the construction of the proposed 4-lane road that TxDOT and the city are planning near our property. This road, as designed, will sit just a few feet from our property line. One of the most concerning elements is the sharp curve being proposed – this is not only a safety hazard for drivers but a constant threat to nearby families. We are deeply worried about the potential for accidents right next to our homes. Noise pollution from increased traffic – especially from large commercial vehicle – will be unbearable. This is not just an inconvenience; it's a serious degradation of our quality of life. We chose to live here because of the peace and quiet. This road will destroy that. Additionally, there are real concerns about environmental impacts. This surrounding farmland is a part of our local heritage and economy. Disrupting it will have consequence for soil, water, and even local agriculture. Once this land is paved and polluted, it's gone for good. This road is not progress – its intrusion into our lives, our safety, and our environment. I urge the city and TxDOT to reconsider this plan and find an alternative that respects the people who live here. Thank you NO BUILD	AASHTO - A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 2018, 7th edition, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials). The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made. Please also see the responses to Comment #301, which also pertains to this property.
92.	Rocio Martinez	6/6/2025 and 6/13/2025	Email	Please see attached document. [The attached comment card reads as follows:] This is my comment form in reference to Arterial 1 Project Name: Rocio Martinez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Representing: The Martinez Family Comments: I'm against the Arterial 1 Project taking place in our area. I'm not saying this just to be against it but rather giving you my reasons of why this project should not take place. First of all, my family and I would be affected by this project directly because we live on the street that this project is supposed to be implemented through. We've lived in this street for more than 40 years. Just like many of my neighbors, we arrived here when there was no running water, no gas, and no sewer. It took years for our street to actually have all the services needed. Even with these drawbacks we managed to make a home. This is our home and we have nowhere else to go to. Now our past, our present, and our future is being jeopardized due to Arterial 1 project. The city is trying to destroy not only a couple of walls and a roof but a family home. A home we have built through the years and have so graciously worked for all of our	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 142 feet from your home and 110 feet from your property fence. Please note that after the public meeting, the project team revised the alignment at this location to minimize impacts to residences. We sent a newsletter in April of 2026 to let all previously affected or adjacent property owners know that the alignment was moved to the north. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				lives. This would greatly cause us an emotional hardship. To take our home is like taking our life away. This would significantly disrupt our life as we know it, increasing stress levels and depression among my family. We love our home and we love our neighborhood. We enjoy living in our quiet environment without the chaos of noise and traffic. We like being surrounded by trees and breathing in the fresh oxygen our trees provide. To bring a project like Arterial 1 is to bring in the traffic, the noise, the pollution, the destruction of vegetation and wild life. This project will also expose our community to speeders, traffic accidents, and other violators. Now, currently we have people driving through our street 50 to 60 miles per hour, which we haven't seen before. I have seen a couple of 18 wheelers crossing through our street blocking the entrance of the residents that live here. Again we had not seen this before. This is what you want to bring to our community and neighborhood by the proposition of the Arterial 1 Project. You claim you are trying to alleviate the traffic that surrounds us, the truth is you are just trying to make it worse. You also need to consider the conditions in which we live in. Most of our neighbors, just like us, live on fixed income. This is the only home we have. There is no compensation you can provide that can replace our home. I ask that you place yourself and your family and our shoes. I want you feel our pain, hurt, and emotional distress. I'm sure you would feel exactly the same way we do. It very easy to be indifferent to other people's hardship because it's not your family and loved ones who are being affected. It's easy to destroy other people's homes when it's not your own. However, you are elected officials who are selected to represent our interest and protect the Socorro community. I ask then that you serve your community and protect our community from being destroyed. A project like this needs extensive planning. Something that should have been done long before our neighborhood existed. My family and I ask that you find an alternative route to fulfill your project and where you are not threatening to destroy an already established neighborhood. We are not the best alternative, we are just another route. My family and I will do everything possible to keep our home and protect it from being destroyed and or taken away due to this Arterial 1 Project. I plea that you do us justice and reconsider other options. Thank You	The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation's (TxDOT's) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. In the early conceptual phases of the project, the El Paso MPO's Travel Demand Model was used as a tool to forecast traffic and travel throughout the region to assist with planning purposes. In addition, more detailed traffic analyses are being conducted during the schematic phase of the project. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made.
93.	David Avila	6/7/2025	Email	Hello, please see attached. Thank you, David Avila [The attached comment card reads as follows:] David E. Avila [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Self Alternative 3^a revised presents the best option as it will provide a new central route to I10 between Horizon Blvd and Clint Road. North Loop is congested and will benefit immediately due to the new housing developments that need better access to I10. Additionally, this new location can become a retail business hub that would benefit from traffic using a new overpass to the freeway from Socorro Road and from Horizon City in the future. A large commercial land parcel in the area also needs direct access to a public road. Both of these new additions would add to the city's tax base as well. Thank you. Regards, David Avila	Comment noted.
94.	Rebecca Raley-Hendrix	6/7/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Rebecca Raley-Hendrix Email [REDACTED] Zipcode [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis - community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
95.	Marie Raley	6/7/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Marie Raley Email [REDACTED] Zipcode [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: air quality impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					• traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
96.	Mat Talavera	6/7/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Mat Talavera Email [REDACTED] Zipcode [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
97.	Maria Antonia Raley	6/7/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Maria Antonia Raley Email [REDACTED] Zipcode [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
98.	Rebecca McLure	6/7/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Rebecca McLure Email [REDACTED] Zipcode [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
99.	Jim Raley	6/7/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Jim Raley Email [REDACTED] Zipcode [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
100.	Jacob McLure	6/7/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Jacob McLure Email [REDACTED] Zipcode [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
101.	Juan Martinez	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Juan Martinez Email [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED] Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					- community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
102.	Jose Ontiveros	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Jose Ontiveros Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis - community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
103.	Samantha Serna	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Samantha Serna Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
104.	Bernadette Villa	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants,	Comments noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Bernadette Villa Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
105.	Rodrigo Chavez	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Rodrigo Chavez	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
106.	Alicia Chavez	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Alicia Chavez Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
107.	Rod Chavez	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Rod Chavez Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
108.	Lizette Herrera	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors and friends, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Lizette Herrera Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: Socorro [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis - community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
109.	Ricardo Villa	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Ricardo Villa Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
110.	Daniel Borrego	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Daniel Borrego Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
111.	Edna Burciaga	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Edna Burciaga Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
112.	Jazmine Amador	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Jazmine Amador Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
113.	Edith Aguirre	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Edith Aguirre Email [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED] Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					- community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
114.	Ariel Prieto	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. ariel prieto Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis - community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
115.	Isaac Gonzalez	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Isaac Gonzalez Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
116.	Chrisitan Diaz	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants,	Comments noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Christian Diaz Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
117.	Alexandria Villa	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Alexandria Villa	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Email [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED] Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
118.	Melissa Martinez	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Melissa Martinez Email [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED] Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
119.	Felicia Chavez	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Felicia Chavez Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
120.	Isabel Herrera	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Isabel Herrera Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis - community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
121.	Jacqueline Amador	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Jacqueline Amador Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
122.	Juan Corona	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants,	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Juan Corona Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
123.	Jazmine Garcia	6/8/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Jazmine Garcia Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
124.	Ysela Alvarado	6/9/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Ysela Alvarado Email [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED] Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to:

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					- air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis - community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
125.	Luis Alvarado	6/9/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Luis Alvarado Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis - community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
126.	Aleenia Mania	6/9/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Aleena Mania Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
127.	John M. Mania	6/9/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. John Michael Mania Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
128.	Rosa A. Ramirez de Pedrueza & Arturo Pedrueza	6/9/2025	Email	[The attached comment card reads as follows:] Rosa Alma Ramirez de Pedrueza y Arturo Pedrueza [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Una servidora y mi esposo NO ESTAMOS DE ACUERDO con la construcción de la carretera ARTERIAL 1 por los puntos a continuación: 1. Contaminación ambiental 2. Daño ecológico por el deterioro o modificación del medio ambiente. 3. Ruido constante por dicha carretera 4. Forma de vida para nosotros los habitantes de este sector. 5. Peligro a nuestra vida y tranquilidad 6. La mayoría tenemos ya se caballos, gallinas, etc. 7. Comunidad que somos rural. Nunca recibimos aviso de parte de la ciudad de Socorro, por lo que no aceptamos este proyecto. 6/12/25 Translation: I and my husband DO NOT AGREE with the construction of the ARTERIAL 1 highway because of the following points: 1. Environmental contamination 2. Ecological damage due to the deterioration or modification of the environment. 3. Constant noise from this road. 4. Way of life for us, the inhabitants of this sector. 5. Danger to our life and tranquility 6. Most of us already have horses, chickens, etc. 7. We are a rural community. We never received notice from the city of Socorro, so we do not accept this project.	was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. See responses to comment #s 72, 259, 265, and 277, which also pertain to this property. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Las consideraciones de seguridad relacionadas con el proyecto para los usuarios del transporte público seguirán evaluándose e incorporándose a medida que avance el diseño del proyecto. El proyecto debe cumplir con los requisitos de la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA) y con las normas de seguridad vial. El proyecto incluiría un camino de uso compartido independiente para peatones y ciclistas. Además, el proyecto está diseñado para mejorar el tiempo de llegada de los servicios de emergencias debido a la construcción de un puente sobre la vía del tren. No solo reducirá los retrasos causados por el paso de los trenes, sino que eliminará la posibilidad de colisiones entre trenes y automóviles en ese lugar. En cuanto a un posible aumento de la delincuencia, este tema es responsabilidad del Departamento de Policía de la ciudad de Socorro. Se han ofrecido varias oportunidades de participar al público a lo largo de la fase de análisis de alternativas del proyecto, incluyendo una reunión pública virtual llevada a cabo en septiembre de 2021 y una reunión pública con personas interesadas llevada a cabo en enero de 2022. También se anunciaron y llevaron a cabo reuniones con los propietarios/ inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes en julio de 2024 y marzo de 2025, y cuando se solicitaron a lo largo del proceso del proyecto. Se llevo a cabo una segunda reunión pública en mayo de 2025. Los métodos de comunicación se adaptaron para cada evento según el propósito de la reunión y las lecciones aprendidas de eventos anteriores. Se utilizaron varios tipos de notificaciones para cada reunión. A todos los propietarios y inquilinos adyacentes a la Alternativa Preferida (incluso si no se verían directamente afectados) se les envió por correo una notificación y un boletín informativo del proyecto con la fecha, la hora y el lugar de la reunión, tanto en inglés como en español. El boletín también se colocó (a mano) en las puertas de entrada o portones accesibles de todas las propiedades ubicadas junto a las alternativas discutidas en las diversas reuniones. Además, se publicó un aviso público en dos periódicos locales (uno en inglés y otro en español) y tanto el aviso como el boletín se enviaron por correo electrónico a todas las direcciones de correo electrónico disponibles. También se aceptarán y revisarán comentarios del público en cualquier momento a lo largo de la vida del proyecto; sin embargo, solo se documentarán formalmente aquellos relacionados con las reuniones o audiencias públicas. El equipo del proyecto ha hecho todo lo posible para garantizar la transparencia del proyecto y la concientización pública, lo que incluye tanto una amplia difusión de los avisos de reuniones públicas (a través de notificaciones en periódicos y redes sociales) como una distribución específica de avisos e información a los propietarios directamente afectados por el proyecto (mediante el envío directo de avisos por correo y boletines informativos de invitación entregados en mano). La información presentada en cada reunión se desarrolló utilizando los mejores datos

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					disponibles al momento de la reunión. Las alternativas propuestas y la información general se fueron actualizando entre reuniones a raíz de los cambios en las condiciones existentes (debido al desarrollo) y como resultado de los comentarios del público. Tenga en cuenta que se llevará a cabo una audiencia pública después de que se apruebe el documento ambiental. Esta audiencia se anunciará de la misma manera que las reuniones públicas previas. Consulte las respuestas a los comentarios números 72, 259, 265 y 277, que también se refieren a esta propiedad.
129.	Esmeralda Arroyos	6/9/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Esmeralda Arroyos Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
130.	Randall Knott	6/10/2025	Email	Here is the comment form that I'm submitting to you all, thanks. Randy Knott Randall Knott Valle Real Estate Licensed Broker in Texas [The attached comment card reads as follows:] I own the property at [REDACTED] with almost 700 ft of frontage. The right of way the project is asking for is 110 ft. The entire extra feet of right away needed by this project is all on my side of the existing R.O.W. of Anderson Road. I rent out the land and the manufactured homes. The ROW for Arterial 1 will take out 1 unit. If left as is it may take out an additional 2 units. Because there may not be enough of a buffer between Arterial 1 and the additional 2 units affected, I’m requesting the ROW be pared down so as not to affect these 2 rentals. 110’ ROW is not needed and is excessive.	Kim Johnson (ICF) replied to this email to acknowledge receipt on 6/10/2025. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Currently, the schematic includes proposed ROW on both sides of Anderson Road at this location; however, more of the proposed alignment would impact your property. There are several residential structures along this existing curve, which makes it difficult to avoid impacts. However, during detailed design (also known as PS&E), the engineering team will analyze if it is viable to reduce the footprint at this location in order to reduce impacts to parcels on both sides of the road. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/
131.	Norma Miner	6/10/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Norma Miner Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
132.	Alvaro	6/10/2025	Email	PLEASE stop Arterial 1 Project in Socorro, TX. I have lived in this community for 45 years. This project will have a highly negative impact on all the surrounding areas that consist of farmland, old communities, and wildlife habitat. The city continues to reject this project on all the previously proposed areas. The city of Socorro has and continues to neglect all the	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				existing communities that have been here before all the new growth that has taken place within the last 20years. Some of these communities tax dollars have helped build the city and still have no sidewalks, some with no connection to city sewage, dirt roads, old roads with no flood drainage reservoirs, etc. The Arterial 1 project will not be a benefit to the city or the surrounding communities. Thank you.	minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
133.	Julie Lozoya	6/10/2025	Email	Sharing my comments to Reject arterial 1 project in Socorro Texas as it will have a negative impact on the surrounding community. Sent from my iPhone	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
134.	Jacob Lozoya	6/10/2025	Email	Don't build the road as their are already too many corporate business's and warehouses as their is to farmland. There will be community disputes with older retired residents. Instead we should aim to fix neighborhoods such as roads and sidewalks to neighborhoods that don't have them after years of city building.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis - community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. The proposed roadway would include shared use paths for bicycles and pedestrians.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
135.	Jonathan Castro	6/10/2025	Email	Good evening, Please consider this a comment to refrain from making arterial one on Vineyard Rd and to consider other alternatives. Thank you, Jonathan Castro	Comments noted. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made. Please note that the currently proposed preferred alternative (Alternative 3a Revised) does not impact Vineyard Road.
136.	Alba Sierra	6/11/2025	Email	Socorro City Council/To all concerned; The Arterial 1 project in Socorro Tx results in an unsustainable farming community and will affect the way of life for the local residents in the area. The Arterial 1 project negatively impacts the families/children's daily activities due to the environmental impact a high traffic arterial pass brings with it, such as, environmental changes, gas fumes, noise, and loss of their land that will be needed to build the arterial lanes. The Arterial 1 project impacts the local producers' financial matters. The end result should focus on • the least interruption to the local residents, • local residents lifestyle and wellbeing, • financial matters, • overall community stability. • avoidance of environmental changes and disruptions Therefore Strongly Recommend NO BUILD !!!! Regards; Alba Sierra	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department.
137.	Claudia Mendoza	6/11/2026	Email	I'd like to know if my house is one of the 12 houses directly affected by the project, I reside at [REDACTED]. I just want to know so I can find out what's the next step, thank you Claudia Mendoza Sent from my iPhone	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 30 feet from your home and 18 feet from your property fence. The next step for the project team will be to complete the preliminary design and environmental process. See the response to Comment #271, which also pertains to this property. If you would like more information about the right-of-way acquisition process, even though your home would not be impacted, please see the link, below: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/
138.	Victor Maguregui	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Victor Maguregui [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I believe that doing the new road is unfair to people with built and established homes.	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/
139.	Martin Siguientes	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Martin Siguientes [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I don’t agree with this, because I would not like to see what is left of our lands to be reduced. I won’t like to see more polution and more traffic in our city.	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/
140.	Patricia Morales	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Patricia Morales [REDACTED] Yo Patricia Morales no estoy de acuerdo en que quiten las nogaleras y a las personas que viven allí Translation: I Patricia Morales do not agree with the removal of the walnut trees and the people who live there.	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis - community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: - impactos a la calidad del aire

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					- análisis del ruido del tráfico - impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) - impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios - impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción - impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida.
141.	Luisandra Juarez	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Luisandra Juarez [REDACTED] No Arterial 1 No build Option	Comments noted.
142.	Gloria Hernandez	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Gloria Hernandez [REDACTED] No estoy de acuerdo Con este proyecto No build option! Translation: I do not agree With this project No build option!	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
143.	Maria Campolla	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Maria Campolla [REDACTED] [REDACTED] No estoy de acuerdo con este proyecto! Translation: I do not agree with this project!	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
144.	Luz Martinez	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Luz Martinez [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				No al proyecto arterial I No build option Translation: No to arterial project I No build option	
145.	Rosalba Nieto	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Rosalba Nieto [REDACTED] No estoy de acuerdo con el proyecto. No build option! Translation: I do not agree with the project. No build option!	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
146.	Rogelio Esparza	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Rogelio Esparza [REDACTED] No to Arteria 1 No build option	Comments noted. Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
147.	Monica Davila	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Monica Davila [REDACTED] No estamos de acuerdo Translation: We disagree	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
148.	Raul Rodriguez	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Raul Rodriguez [REDACTED] No to Arterial 1 No build option	Comments noted.
149.	Gustavo Grado	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Gustavo Grado [REDACTED]	Comments noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				No to Arterial 1 No build option	
150.	Juana Rodriguez	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Juana Rodriguez [REDACTED] No a la Arterial 1 No build option Translation: No to Arterial 1 No build option	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
151.	Lucy Sifuentes	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Lucy Sifuentes [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I would not like to see more polution, traffic added to our city. Also I don't agree with our farmers, land be reduce to this	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
152.	Rebeca Espino	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Rebeca Espino [REDACTED] No estoy de acuerdo con este proyecto. No build option! Translation: I do not agree with this project. No build option!	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
153.	Socorro H	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Socorro H [REDACTED] No estoy de acuerdo con abrir la Anderson y la Bauman, van a traer mas contaminación y trafico pesado. Translation: I do not agree with opening Anderson and Bauman, they will bring more pollution and heavy traffic.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
154.	Claudia Lazcuno	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Claudia Lazcuno [REDACTED] [REDACTED] No a este proyecto No Built option Translation: No to this project No Built option	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
155.	Nanai Ibarra	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Nanai Ibarra [REDACTED] No a este proyecto No build option Translation: No to this project No build option	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
156.	Veronica Hugo	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Veronica Hugo [REDACTED] No built option No to Arterial 1	Comments noted.
157.	Leticia Espinoza	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Leticia Espinoza [REDACTED] [REDACTED] No build option No queremos este proyecto Translation: No build option We don't want this project	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
158.	Mike Saldana	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Mike Saldana [REDACTED] No a este projeto No build option! Translation: No to this project No build option!	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
159.	Jenny Games	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:]	Comments noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Jenny Games [REDACTED] [REDACTED] No estoy de acuerdo con este proyecto! Translation: I do not agree with this project!	Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
160.	Terry Saldaña	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Terry Saldaña [REDACTED] [REDACTED] No build option No a este proyecto! Translation: No build option No to this project!	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
161.	Maribel Martinez	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Maribel Martinez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] No a este proyecto No build option Translation: No to this project No build option	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
162.	Luz Banda	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Luz Banda [REDACTED] [REDACTED] No estoy de acuerdo con este proyecto! Translation: I do not agree with this project!	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
163.	Lucero Muniz	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:]	Comments noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Lucero Muniz [REDACTED] [REDACTED] No queremos este proyecto No build option. Translation: We do not want this project No build option.	Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
164.	Triston Juarez	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Triston Juarez [REDACTED] No to Arterial 1 No build option	Comments noted.
165.	Abigal Moranz	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Abigal Moranz [REDACTED] No to Arterial 1 no build option.	Comments noted.
166.	Perla Yadira De La Torre Ruiz	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Perla Yadira De La Torre Ruiz [REDACTED] [REDACTED] No estoy de acuerdo con este proyecto. Translation: I do not agree with this project.	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
167.	Roberto Hugo	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Roberto Hugo [REDACTED] No to Arterial 1 No build option.	Comments noted.
168.	Martin Sifuentes	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Martin Sifuentes [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				I don't agree with this, because I would not like to see what is left of our lands to be reduced. I want like to see more polution and more traffic in our city.	undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.
169.	Wendy L. Zamora	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Wendy L. Zamora [REDACTED] [REDACTED] No queremos este proyecto No build option Translation: We do not want this project No build option	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
170.	Jesus Mendez	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Jesus Mendez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Jesus Mendez	Comments noted. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Tenemos 19 años viviendo en esta propiedad porque queríamos estar mas seguros con todos nuestros animales y ahora con los proyectos nuevos que están pleaneando nos estarían quitando nuestra seguridad. Por lo tanto les pedimos no seguir con estos proyectos que nos afectarían demasiado. No estamos de acuerdo! Jesus Mendez Translation: We have been living in this property for 19 years because we wanted to be more secure with all our animals and now with the new projects that are being planned they would be taking away our security. Therefore we ask you not to continue with these projects that would affect us too much. We do not agree! Jesus Mendez	detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Las consideraciones de seguridad relacionadas con el proyecto para los usuarios seguirán evaluándose e incorporándose a medida que avance el diseño del proyecto. Las consideraciones de diseño relacionadas con las actividades agrícolas y ganaderas se incorporarán durante la fase de diseño detallado (también conocida como fase PS&E). Esto puede incluir la incorporación de aberturas en la mediana en ubicaciones estratégicas, así como la optimización de señales de seguridad y marcas viales. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
171.	Myrna Bencomo	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Myrna Bencomo [REDACTED] [REDACTED] No a este proyecto No build option Translation: No to this project No build option	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
172.	Jasmin J. Martinez	6/11/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Jasmin J. Martinez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] No a este project no build option Translation: No to this project no build option	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
173.	Nancy V. Castorena	6/12/2025 (forwarded by Myrian Apodaca, COS)	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Nancy V. Castorena [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Soy propietaria de [REDACTED] tengo 2 meses que compramos esa propiedad y no estamos de acuerdo con este proyecto yo que acabamos de comprar y no es fácil el tramite tenemos niños pequeños en la escuela y sería muy difícil para nosotros. También esto ocasionaría mucho ruido contaminación accidentes y mas. Translation: I am owner of [REDACTED] I have 2 months that we bought that property and we do not agree with this project I we just bought and it is not easy the procedure we have small children in school and it would be very difficult for us. Also this would cause a lot of noise pollution accidents and more.	Comments noted. Your home/property at [REDACTED] was previously impacted based on the design presented at Public Meeting #2. However, since that time, the project team revised the alignment at this location to minimize impacts to residences, including your home. We sent a newsletter in April of 2026 to let all previously affected property owners know that the current alignment was moved to the north and no longer directly impacts their homes. As part of the NEPA process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable, including avoidance and minimization of farms in the area. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Su vivienda/propiedad ubicada en [REDACTED] se vio afectada anteriormente según el diseño presentado en la Reunión Pública #2. Sin embargo, desde entonces, el equipo del proyecto revisó el diseño en esta ubicación para minimizar los impactos en las viviendas, incluyendo a la suya. En abril de 2026 enviamos un boletín informativo para informar a todos los propietarios/inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes que el diseño actual se había desplazado hacia el norte y ya no afectaba directamente a sus viviendas. Como parte del proceso de la NEPA, el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos donde fuera factible, incluyendo la prevención y minimización de los impactos en las granjas de la zona. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
174.	Manuela Martinez	6/12/2025 (forwarded by Myrian Apodaca, COS)	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Manuela Martinez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] yo no estoy de acuerdo con el proyecto Arterial 1. Yo he vivido en mi casa mas de 40 años y no es justo que me quieran quitar mi casa por un proyecto así. Yo ya tengo 82 años y quiero vivir agusto los últimos anos que me quedan. Yo vivo muy tranquila en mi casa sin ruidos, sin contaminacion de los carros y respiro aire puro. Traer este proyecto a nuestra comunidad es traer el ruido de los carros, la contaminacion ambiental, las destrucción de muchos hogares y destrucción de la vegetación y de aire puro. Este es el hogar mio y de mis hijos yo les pido encuentren otras alternativas y no nos quiten nuestros hogares. Ustedes son servidores electos públicos y tienen la obligación de proteger nuestras comunidades. Yo les pido que oigan la voz de la comunidad t paren este proyecto. No destrullen las comunidades ya establecidas. Les pido que busquen otras alternativas. Translation: I don't agree with the Arterial 1 project. I have lived in my house for more than 40 years and it is not fair that they want to take my house for a project like this. I am already 82 years old and I want to live the last few years I have left. I live very quietly in my house with no noise, no pollution from cars and I breathe clean air. To bring this project to our community is to bring the noise of the cars, the environmental pollution, the destruction of many homes and destruction of vegetation and clean air. This is my home and my children's home and I ask you to find other alternatives and not take away our homes. You are elected public servants and you have an obligation to protect our communities. I ask you to listen to the voice of the community and stop this project. Do not destroy established communities. I ask you to look for other alternatives.	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 169 feet from your home and 93 feet from your property fence. Please note that after the public meeting, the project team revised the alignment at this location to minimize impacts to residences. We sent a newsletter in April of 2026 to let all previously affected or adjacent property owners know that the alignment was moved to the north. As part of the NEPA process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable, including avoidance and minimization of farms in the area. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. No se propone la adquisición de ningún derecho de paso dentro de su propiedad ubicada en [REDACTED]. El borde del pavimento de la vía quedaría a aproximadamente 169 pies de su casa y a 93 pies de la cerca de su propiedad. Tenga en cuenta que, después de la reunión pública, el equipo del proyecto revisó el diseño en esta ubicación para minimizar los impactos a las viviendas. En abril de 2026 enviamos un boletín informativo para informar a todos los propietarios/inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes que el diseño se había desplazado hacia el norte. Como parte del proceso de la NEPA, el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos donde

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					fuera factible, incluyendo la prevención y minimización de los impactos en las granjas de la zona. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento. El proyecto propuesto ha incluido un exhaustivo proceso de análisis de alternativas a lo largo de los últimos años (este proceso se resumirá en la próxima Evaluación Ambiental). En la segunda reunión pública llevada a cabo en marzo de 2025, se presentó la Alternativa Preferida para recabar comentarios del público. Estos comentarios, incluyendo el suyo, se han tomado en cuenta en el desarrollo de la Alternativa Preferida dentro de lo posible. De acuerdo con el proceso de la NEPA, el equipo de consultores está analizando actualmente la Alternativa Preferida ajustada y presentará los resultados de este análisis en una próxima audiencia pública.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Por lo tanto, en este momento, no se analizarán rutas alternativas adicionales. Sin embargo, el estudio detallado de la Alternativa Preferida y la audiencia pública podrían dar lugar a un posible refinamiento de la alternativa. Además, la alternativa de No Construir seguirá siendo considerada hasta que se finalice el proceso ambiental (o de la NEPA) y se tome una decisión.
175.	Lorenzo Maynes Jr.	6/12/2025 (forwarded by Myrian Apodaca, COS)	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Lorenzo Maynes Jr. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] me and my family have been living here at this address for 42 years 3 generations. Our children were born here & grew up in this house. My wife Irma age 66 suffered a stroke 7 years ago and in a wheelchair she is on social security & medicare I am waiting for 2 surgeries and will soon be on social security & medicare. I am 65 years old right now 66 in September 2025, please do not take my home away from us we cannot buy a house because we cant afford to on fixed income & to retire. Please have a heart and please don't leave us as seniors to struggle as an old ag please, thank you. Please don't take our home away from us.	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 138 feet from your home and 108 feet from your property fence. Please note that after the public meeting, the project team revised the alignment at this location to minimize impacts to residences. We sent a newsletter in April of 2026 to let all previously affected or adjacent property owners know that the alignment was moved to the north. As part of the NEPA process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable, including avoidance and minimization of farms in the area.
176.	Esteban Guerrero	6/12/2025 (forwarded by Myrian Apodaca, COS)	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Esteban Guerrero [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I would like to oppose to Arterial project 1 especially route 3, as I have a 2nd home at [REDACTED]. I suffer from PTSD and have been away from the city, noise helps me a lot. I have been able to use less prescribed medication as in the bejar neighbor hood its really quiet with no thru traffic and been able to encounter with farm animals, take walks and enjoy wildlife animals around the area,	Comments noted. Your property at [REDACTED] is approximately 0.13 mile from the proposed Arterial 1 right-of-way and would not be affected by the proposed project. Please also see the response to Comment #282, which also references this property. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					- threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.
177.	Sandra Castro	6/12/2025 (forwarded by Myrian Apodaca, COS)	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Sandra Castro [REDACTED] [REDACTED] A quien corresponda, estamos en total desacuerdo de la decisión que ustedes quieren tomar sobre nuestras propiedades, sin pensar que tan afectados saldría mi familia con sus planes de construir sobre nuestros sueños y esfuerzos que se hicieron para nosotros tener nuestra casa. No cedo ala desicion que quieran tomar, en esta propiedad, tengo una persona con demencia que nesesita 24/7 hrs el cuidado y mas que nosotros será la primera afectada y violando nuestros derechos. [REDACTED] Sandra Castro Translation: To whom it may concern, we are in total disagreement with the decision that you want to take on our properties, without thinking how affected my family would be with your plans to build on our dreams and efforts that were made for us to have our home. I do not yield to the decision you want to take, in this property, I have a person with dementia who needs 24/7 hrs care and more than us will be the first affected and violating our rights. [REDACTED] Sandra Castro	Comments noted. Your property at [REDACTED] is approximately 278 feet from the proposed Arterial 1 right-of-way and would not be affected by the proposed project. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Su propiedad, ubicada en la calle [REDACTED], se encuentra a aproximadamente 278 pies del derecho de paso de la Arterial 1 propuesta y no se vería afectada por el proyecto propuesto.
178.	Maria Magdalena Rey	6/12/2025 (forwarded by Myrian Apodaca, COS)	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Maria Magdalena Rey [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Referente al proyecto quiero decirles que no estoy de acuerdo con ello por la razón de que aquí somos pura gente de la tercera edad llegamos jóvenes cuando no teníamos ningún servicio ya sufrimos bastante. Envejimios nos llegaron enfermedades y se me hace injusto que nos quieran desalojar ya el tiempo y la edad no nos de para construir o comprar en otra parte con estos precios de locura aparte el trafico, ruido smog de tanto carro. Por favor tengan compasión por nosotros. En la junta mencionaron que en la calle Sylvia es menos gente la que se va a ver afectada pero esta poca gente que	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 158 feet from your home and 108 feet from your property fence. Please note that after the public meeting, the project team revised the alignment at this location to minimize impacts to residences. We sent a newsletter in April of 2026 to let all previously affected or adjacent property owners know that the alignment was moved to the north. Please see additional responses to Comment #s 179, 268, 269, and 270, which also pertain to this property.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				vivimos aquí también tenemos corazón y sentimientos, por favor de corazón se los pedimos busquen otras alternativas donde no se vean afectadas personas, nuestra historia esta aquí sin mas atte: Luis & Magdalena Rey Translation: Regarding the project I want to tell you that I don't agree with it for the reason that we are all senior citizens here, we came here young when we didn't have any services and we suffered enough. We got old, we got sick and I think it is unfair that they want to evict us because time and age do not allow us to build or buy somewhere else with these crazy prices besides the traffic, noise and smog of so many cars. Please have compassion for us. In the meeting they mentioned that on Sylvia street less people will be affected but these few people who live here also have heart and feelings, please from the bottom of our hearts we ask you to look for other alternatives where people will not be affected, our story is here without further ado atte: Luis & Magdalena Rey	The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. No se propone la adquisición de ningún derecho de paso dentro de su propiedad ubicada en [REDACTED]. El borde del pavimento de la vía quedaría a aproximadamente 158 pies de su casa y a 108 pies de la cerca de su propiedad. Tenga en cuenta que, después de la reunión pública, el equipo del proyecto revisó el diseño en esta ubicación para minimizar el impacto a las viviendas. En abril de 2026 enviamos un boletín informativo para informar a todos los propietarios/inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes que el diseño se había desplazado hacia el norte. Consulte las respuestas adicionales a los comentarios números 179, 268, 269 y 270, que también se refieren a esta propiedad.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida.
179.	Luis A. Rey	6/12/2025 (forwarded by Myrian Apodaca, COS)	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Luis A. Rey [REDACTED] [REDACTED] A quien corresponda: No estoy de acuerdo con este proyecto porque aquí nos vamos a ver afectados bastantes gentes que somos las personas que vivimos aquí entre 1982 y 1983 y ahora la nueve generación que esta llenando enfrente de nuestras casas que ellos están comprando y nadie les aviso lo que esta pasando se me hace injusto que halla la posibilidad de desalojo porque para nosotros los de la 3ra edad es muy difícil volver a comenzar de nuevo y si nos salvamos y de todas maneras hacen la calle estva a parecer pista de carro se los puedo asegurar, creo que en ves de haber un crecimiento va a	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 158 feet from your home and 108 feet from your property fence. Please note that after the public meeting, the project team revised the alignment at this location to minimize impacts to residences. We sent a newsletter in April of 2026 to let all previously affected or adjacent property owners know that the alignment was moved to the north. Please see additional responses to Comment #s 178, 268, 269, and 270, which also pertain to this property.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				empeorar la situación. Ojala encontraran otro lugar donde no impacten a la gente Luis Armando Rey Translation: To Whom It May Concern: I do not agree with this project because the people who lived here between 1982 and 1983 will be affected and now the new generation that is filling up in front of our houses that they are buying and nobody told them what is happening. I think it is unfair that there is the possibility of eviction because it is very difficult for us seniors to start over and if we are saved and anyway they make the street look like a car track I can assure you, I think that instead of growing, the situation is going to get worse. I wish they would find another place where they don't impact the people Luis Armando Rey	Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. No se propone la adquisición de ningún derecho de paso dentro de su propiedad ubicada en [REDACTED]. El borde del pavimento de la vía quedaría a aproximadamente 158 pies de su casa y a 108 pies de la cerca de su propiedad. Tenga en cuenta que, después de la reunión pública, el equipo del proyecto revisó el diseño en esta ubicación para minimizar el impacto a las viviendas. En abril de 2026 enviamos un boletín informativo para informar a todos los propietarios/inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes que el diseño se había desplazado hacia el norte. Consulte las respuestas adicionales a los comentarios números 178, 268, 269 y 270, que también se refieren a esta propiedad. Se han ofrecido varias oportunidades de participar al público a lo largo de la fase de análisis de alternativas del proyecto, incluyendo una reunión pública virtual llevada a cabo en septiembre de 2021 y una reunión pública con personas interesadas llevada a cabo en enero de 2022. También se anunciaron y llevaron a cabo reuniones con los propietarios/ inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes en julio de 2024 y marzo de 2025, y cuando se solicitaron a lo largo del proceso del proyecto. Se llevo a cabo una segunda reunión pública en mayo de 2025. Los métodos de comunicación se adaptaron para cada evento según el propósito de la reunión y las lecciones aprendidas de eventos anteriores. Se utilizaron varios tipos de notificaciones para cada reunión. A todos los propietarios y inquilinos adyacentes a la Alternativa Preferida (incluso si no se verían directamente afectados) se les envió por correo una notificación y un boletín informativo del proyecto con la fecha, la hora y el lugar de la reunión, tanto en inglés como en español. El boletín también se colocó (a mano) en las puertas de entrada o portones accesibles de todas las propiedades ubicadas junto a las

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					alternativas discutidas en las diversas reuniones. Además, se publicó un aviso público en dos periódicos locales (uno en inglés y otro en español) y tanto el aviso como el boletín se enviaron por correo electrónico a todas las direcciones de correo electrónico disponibles. También se aceptarán y revisarán comentarios del público en cualquier momento a lo largo de la vida del proyecto; sin embargo, solo se documentarán formalmente aquellos relacionados con las reuniones o audiencias públicas. El equipo del proyecto ha hecho todo lo posible para garantizar la transparencia del proyecto y la concientización pública, lo que incluye tanto una amplia difusión de los avisos de reuniones públicas (a través de notificaciones en periódicos y redes sociales) como una distribución específica de avisos e información a los propietarios directamente afectados por el proyecto (mediante el envío directo de avisos por correo y boletines informativos de invitación entregados en mano). La información presentada en cada reunión se desarrolló utilizando los mejores datos disponibles al momento de la reunión. Las alternativas propuestas y la información general se fueron actualizando entre reuniones a raíz de los cambios en las condiciones existentes (debido al desarrollo) y como resultado de los comentarios del público. Tenga en cuenta que se llevará a cabo una audiencia pública después de que se apruebe el documento ambiental. Esta audiencia se anunciará de la misma manera que las reuniones públicas previas. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida.
180.	Lucia Estrada	6/12/2025 (forwarded by Myrian Apodaca, COS)	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Lucia Estrada [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Mi opinion sobre el proyecto del que se esta hablando pienso que no es justo. Ya no tenemos edad ni dinero para empezar de nuevo. Aquí sufrimos mucho con todas las carencias que teníamos. Logramos construir a base de sacrificios. Limitándonos de muchas cosas para lograr lo que hoy tenemos. Aquí crecieron nuestros hijos que también sufrieron bastante ya que nisiquiera teníamos lo principal que es el agua. Tenemos aquí mas de 40 años y apenas logramos que nos pusieron el gas. Ojala y mediten bien este proyecto porque al igual que ustedes somos personas que solo vivimos de nuestro trabajo! Espero que se toquen el corazón antes de tomar esta decisión donde seremos afectados injustamente. Gracias x la atención que espero le den a nuestras peticiones. Atte Lucia y Ricardo Estrada Translation: My opinion about the project that is being talked about is that it is not fair. We don't have the age and we don't have the money to start over. We suffered a lot here with all the shortages we had. We managed to build based on sacrifices. We limited ourselves of many things to achieve what we have today. Our children grew up here and they also suffered a lot because we didn't even have the main thing, that is water. We have been here for more than 40 years, and we barely managed to get gas. I hope you think about this project because like you we are people who only live from our work! I hope you touch your hearts before making this decision where we will be unfairly affected. Thank you for the attention I hope you will give to our requests. Attentive Lucia and Ricardo Estrada	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 160 feet from your home and 105 feet from your property fence. Please note that after the public meeting, the project team revised the alignment at this location to minimize impacts to residences. We sent a newsletter in April of 2026 to let all previously affected or adjacent property owners know that the alignment was moved to the north. Please see responses to Comment #s 41 and 292, which also pertain to this property. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. No se propone la adquisición de ningún derecho de paso dentro de su propiedad ubicada en [REDACTED]. El borde del pavimento de la vía quedaría a aproximadamente 160 pies de su casa y a 105 pies de la cerca de su propiedad. Tenga en cuenta que, después de la reunión pública, el equipo del proyecto revisó el diseño en esta ubicación para minimizar el impacto a las viviendas. En abril de 2026 enviamos un boletín informativo para informar a todos los propietarios/inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes que el diseño se había desplazado hacia el norte. Consulte las respuestas a los comentarios números 41 y 292, que también se refieren a esta propiedad.
181.	Erick Mota	6/12/2025	Email	Sent from my iPhone [The attached comment card read as follows:] Erick Mota	Comments noted. Your property at [REDACTED] would be directly impacted by the proposed project. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. The proposed alignment will continue to be

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				I worked really hard to get this house. I pride myself in the fact that I got this house at my young age. I took pride in the fact that this meant a new chapter for my family. These proposed changes would devastate my life.	refined during the detailed design phase, and the engineering design team will attempt to avoid relocations where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ Please see responses to Comment #s 66 and 263, which also pertain to this property.
182.	Peggy H. Restivo	6/12/2025	Email	To Whom It May Concern: Please find attached my completed Comment Form for Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) supporting Alternative 3a Revised. Best regards, Peggy Hilley Restivo, CPA Hilley Family Partnership, Ltd. Hilley Farms LLC [The attached comment card read as follows:] Peggy Hilley Restivo Hilley Family Partnership, Ltd. and Hilley Farms LLC and Self The NEPA study demonstrated that the preferred route for Arterial 1 is Alternative 3a Revised. My decision is based on the same reasons as outlined in my prior comments submitted on July 13, 2024 (see attached). Alternative 3a Revised Route will be the best route to decrease traffic congestion not only on Texas 20, but on North Loop and Socorro Road as well. Peggy Hilley Restivo June 12, 2025	Comments noted. As noted in Ms. Restivo’s comment, July 13, 2024, comments were attached. Because the 2024 comments refer to previously proposed alternatives, no responses to those comments are provided in this response matrix.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
183.	Alejandra Martinez	6/12/2025	Email	Good afternoon, Hope you are doing great My name is Alejandra Martínez I'm a member of City of Socorro and a potential community member to be impacted if this Arterial 1 project gets approved. My husband and my self move to this community last year on July 2024 to our dream home which is located in Iron Hollow a street that is very close to Anderson st. We move to this community because of the green and quiet community. Since we purchased our home we understood that travel time that will take to other stores or event to work. I work near Copia and Alameda and sometimes in dyer street for a nonprofit and I understood that I will need to take time for me to always be on time and it has been like this for almost a year now. This community is a disadvantage community in all their areas: financial, education and social and many of the times that is why projects like this don't take people's voices as seriously, however please remember that we are the ones suffering the consequences of these decisions. The county already have a problem with transportation and construction why bring this here. The county already have a problem with drinking and driving issues, accidents and traffic deaths, why do we need to bring those here. It was mentioned that this will also build bicycle lines, however in really how many people even have a bicycle? How many will even use those lines if they will prefer to purchase food or other necessities instead of a bicycle again remember that we are a disadvantage community. Building this arterial 1, in really will help all the community? If there are other bicycle lanes around the city of El Paso and people don't even use them. As I drive through the City of Socorro every day because of work, us a community member I have different options of streets to go out of Socorro, instead of building please fix the existing roads as this can benefit better the traffic. I also notice that the 8 wheelers that go through this community most of them just deliver items or use for construction purposes as many shops are in the city. This community is also a food desert which we don't have a lot of opportunities for fresh food so instead of building this street bring more groceries stores to develop a healthier community. This arterial street will impact our environment, the County does not have green areas that can help with the pollution of the overall city and removing this green areas will eliminate areas that support cleaning in some capacity our city. Also you will eliminate ecosystems of our city. This change will never will be able to come back as it is today. This is not the same as the case of the red bugs that we had last year that also impacted everyone. Instead of	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Under 23 USC 217(g)(1), FHWA requires the following:

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				this arterial project let's come as a community and make it green to help with global warming. As our officials please take of our community, of the children, of everyone here don't destroy our community, our peace and our mental and overall health. Please take us in consideration. I want for my children to grow without any potential health problems because living next to a road that will only bring negative consequences and effects to the city and our lives. Please love our community. Best regards/Saludos cordiales, Alejandra Martínez, MPH [The following comment card was attached to the 6/13/2025 email:] Alejandra Martinez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Community voice My name is Alejandra Martinez, I live in the City of Socorro, close to where the proposed Arterial 1 project would be built. My husband and I moved here in July 2024 because we were drawn to the peaceful and green environment. Though we knew commuting would take time we accepted that for the sake of living in a quite, healthy place. This community already faces many disadvantages financial, educational and social – which often leads to our voices being ignored. Projects like this risks bringing more traffic, accidents and pollution to an area that is already struggling. We don't need more roads we need better infrastructure, safer streets, access to fresh food, and environmental protection. Instead of destroying green space, we should be improving it for the health and future of our children I urge you to consider the long-term impact on our lives and truly listen to the concerns of our community Please protect City of Socorro	"Bicyclists and pedestrians shall be given due consideration in the comprehensive transportation plans developed by each metropolitan planning organization and State in accordance with sections 134 and 135, respectively. Bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways shall be considered, where appropriate, in conjunction with all new construction and reconstruction of transportation facilities, except where bicycle and pedestrian use are not permitted." In accordance with this law, the proposed project includes the construction of a four-lane divided roadway with pedestrian elements and illumination. The pedestrian elements include a shared-use path. Shared-use paths are off-street paths for pedestrians and bicycle use, typically ranging from 8 to 12-foot wide separated from vehicular traffic. Shared-use paths are an added amenity that provide accessible, two-way travel for walkers, runners, bicyclists and wheelchair use. The shared use path proposed for Arterial 1 would not be for bicyclists only, rather for walkers, runners, and cyclists.
184.	Harvey Hilley	6/12/2025	Email	To Whom it May Concern, I am attaching my Arterial 1 Comment Form for the 052125 Public Meeting. Best Regards Harvey Hilley [The attached comment card read as follows:]	Comment noted. As noted in Mr. Hilley's comment, his comments from October 10, 2021 were attached. Because the 2021 comments refer to previously proposed alternatives, no responses to those comments are provided in this response matrix.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Harvey D. Hilley Jr. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] self, Hilley Farms LLC, and Hilley Family Partnership LTD I feel that the NEPA study demonstrated that the preferred route for Arterial 1 is Alternative 3A revised. I agree with this conclusion as is documented in my pervious comments from the October 2021 and July 2024 meetings, I have attached these comments for your reference. The revised Alternative 3A route will be the best route to decrease the truck and car traffic on Texas 20. It will also reduce the traffic on North Loop and Socorro Roads. Sincerely, Harvey D. Hilley Jr. Included: two attachments	
185.	Ignacio Sierra	6/12/2025	Email	Thank you! Ignacio Sierra [The attached comment card read as follows:] Ignacio Sierra [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I live on [REDACTED] I'm in complete opposition of the viable Alternative 3A of Arterial 1. I'm completely in disagreement with this project the city of Socorro TX is pushing for with extreme vengeance. This road will destroy what ever wild life still exists in this area. It will cause great damage to the agricultural land that now exists. I have been a rancher and a farmer for most of my life. This road will definitely impact my and my family way of living as well as our only income we have which is ranching. The city of Socorro is more interested in the income this road will being instead of focusing on there citizens who will be impacted directly or indirectly. There for my stand is no Build!!	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping. Please also see responses to Comment #s 77, 78, 79, and 80, which also pertain to this property.
186.	Jessica Reyna	6/12/2025	Email	Email to: Arterial1@icf.com [The attached comment card read as follows:] Jessica Reyna [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I am writing this letter to express my strong opposition to allowing the project of 4-lane exit running from I-10 to Socorro Rd. First of I, as residents/property owners, it came as quite a surprise to my family and extended family and neighbors to hear that Anderson Rd was the proposed road for such project. I feel that our of the entire city, the towns that are left with the most natural views are Clint, San Elizario and Socorro. These towns are lucky to still have such history in them and I don't think you realize what an impact this will have in the long run and how much youwill need those areas in the future. I am shocked and somewhat suspicious that as some of the people that would be most affected by this proposal, was have never been notified by anyone from your offices. We have only recently heard of this proposal by word of mouth from our neighbors. A primary concern for my brother's house who will be the most affected is he will have to demolish and lose part of his house along with portion of his land. Another issue that also does not seem to be adequately considered is the noise and increased traffic drunk drivers who are increasing at the speed of light in this city. This area was not structured to implement such a flow of heavy traffic, with houses so close to the proposed site and a valley where noise travels freely. The noise would be unacceptable for this rural community. It is my desire that you will read this letter and take this in consideration for your decision in this proposal. Jessica Reyna	Comments noted. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department.
187.	Kathy McDaniel	6/12/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Kathy McDaniel [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Self We came to Socorro in 1992 for the open spaces and to have our horses. This project is eroding the open spaces and the quiet. I am concerned about the noise pollution and the air pollution this proposed road will cause. I do not like the idea of a four-lane road so close to my home. I am in favor of the NO Build option.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department.
188.	Jeremy Hendrix	6/12/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. My name is Jeremy Hendrix, I live in the Ranch Viejo section off North Loop and I stand before you not just as a concerned resident—but as someone who has sacrificed nearly everything for this country. I proudly served 28 years in the United States Army, retiring as a Sergeant Major. I deployed to Iraq four times, enduring every phase of the conflict—from the initial insertion in Nasiriyah to the final withdrawal. I earned all five campaign stars. But more than that, During those four deployments which totaled 5 years I brought home invisible scars that I live with every single day. I am 100% disabled, and battling PTSD. I may look able-bodied, but please don't mistake that for whole. My entire life up to this point I have been a Floridian until I discovered El Paso. while in this amazing city, I earned my master's degree from UTEP, I fell in love with the local culture and the food, and—most importantly—I found peace here. I met my wife, a local beauty who helps keep me balanced and sane, but most importantly, we bought a beautiful home at the end of a quiet, dead-end road. One way in, one way out. It is the kind of place where your neighbors—many of them retired border patrol, law enforcement, or fellow veterans—look out for each other. It's safe. It's calm. It's exactly what I needed to heal. That is until a flyer showed up. It said a four-lane road was being planned—right through our neighborhood. With sidewalks. A bridge over the canal. Over the railroad. Suddenly, our haven was no longer secure. This isn't just about property lines. This is about losing the one place I finally felt okay again. The home I thought would be my sanctuary where I could finally stop surviving and start living. And now, it's being taken—not by force, but by policy. We're told this road is progress. But at what cost? What is the price for families who have built their lives here? Of veterans like me who came here to escape noise and trauma—only to have it brought right to our doorstep? I've sacrificed for this country. I've done my part. I'm not asking for special treatment. I'm just asking for a chance to live in peace—an opportunity to keep what little peace I've finally found. My sanctuary is more to me than some roadway being built beside my property with a bridge overlooking my entire backyard with zero expectation of privacy ever again. A bridge planned to be 30 feet tall will allow every car and truck, every pedestrian, and every	Comments noted. Thank you for your service. Based on your provided address, the proposed project would be adjacent to your property, but would not require right of way from your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 110 feet from your home Direct impacts to homes in the Rancho Viejo neighborhood were avoided by routing the preferred alternative south of Rancho Viejo. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				onlooker to see everything going on in all our yards. The Noise and headlight shining down scared our horses and our animals and forever changed our lives. Air pollution is another issue that concerns me. Please—don't take that from me. Please don't take that from us. Thank you. I ask that you all choose the No Build option for Arterial 1. jeremy hendrix Email [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED] Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Please see responses to Comment #s 201 and 202, which also pertain to this property.
189.	Alejandro Hernandez	6/13/2025	Email	Here is the comment form. I am opposed to the build. Alejandro Hernandez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [The attached comment card read as follows:] Alejandro Hernandez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] My home The Arterial 1 project will disrupt the way of life for our community. We moved out here to get away from the city congestion and fast paced way of life. The project will bring in contamination to our lands by increasing the around of through traffic. Upon morning or evening congestion, people will look for roads that avoid the congestion. This will increase the traffic through Coker Rd. putting in danger our kids, animals and people on horseback. Another way that the project will affect the community is by taking away the right of enjoyment from us. Having farm land allows us to see all the wild life that flourish from undisturbed land. The Arterial 1 project will run wildlife out of the area affecting our much needed ecosystem.	Comments noted. Based on the provided address and the current project design, the proposed Arterial 1 roadway would be constructed approximately a half mile from your home. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department.
190.	Leonardo Salazar	6/13/2025	Email	New Property Owner of [REDACTED] - as of June 11, 2025; Previously parents home since they bought undeveloped ½ acre San Ysidro property. [The attached comment card read as follows:] Leonardo Salazar [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Self – property owner I attended May 21, 2025 virtual meeting and concur wholeheartedly with decision of Arterial 1 Options 3A or 3B. Alternatively, other options such as future 3C or 4 are preferred as too much Socorro History along Bauman Rd. Based on expectations of the Socorro Rd to Bauman to North Loop option taken of the table I have purchased my parents Amadeo & Lorenza Contreras property which they planned, developed over 40 plus years while fighting for water, getting involved with EPISO, Fr. Roland, Fa. Celina, attending Austin State Capitol to speak on behalf of Colonias, also ABQ event, serving at San Felipe de Jesus parish from its founding, 1st kevmes @ 250 Bauman Rd. Being featured in Dallas Morning Newspaper “Out of the Colonias” article and one page 302 in “Latinos, A Biography Of The People by Earl Shorris. From An Engineering Perspective, the 375 to Socorro Rd to Glovieta Rd to I-10 Bypass makes tremendous sense similarly to Houstons 6 & 8 loop, with 375 being the inner loop & Socorro Rd to Clint to I-10 the outer loop. I will run thru Chat GPT & AI Tools for best fit North Star 2040 predictive modeling. Hope you do same!	Comments noted.
191.	Diana Casillas	6/13/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Diana Casillas [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Resident Not in favor of Arterial 1 project. Do not build.	Comment noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
192.	Cecilia Lindsey	6/13/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Cecilia Lindsey [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Resident Not in favor of Arterial 1 project. Do not build.	Comment noted.
193.	Korina Bustamante	6/13/2025	Email	Hello, my name is Korina Bustamante and I am a resident of Socorro, Texas. I want to express my support for Revised Option 3A for the Arterial 1 Project in Socorro, Texas. I also want to express my opposition to any other alternative routes or "no-build alternatives." I reiterate my support for Revised Option 3A as the best option for our neighborhood. Thank you for your time and consideration.	Comments noted.
194.	Sophia Bustamante	6/13/2025	Email	Hello, my name is Sophia Bustamante and I am a resident of Socorro, Texas. I want to express my support for Revised Option 3A for the Arterial 1 Project in Socorro, Texas. I also want to express my opposition to any other alternative routes or "no-build alternatives." I reiterate my support for Revised Option 3A as the best option for our neighborhood. Thank you for your time and consideration.	Comments noted.
195.	Christopher Trujillo	6/13/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Christopher Trujillo Email [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED] Street Address: [REDACTED]. Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment)

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					- community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
196.	Moses Virgen	6/13/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I’ve lived in Socorro, Texas for 48 years, and the proposed project on Vineyard would be devastating to our way of life. Vineyard is more than just a road—it’s where we ride horses, raise our families, and maintain a rural lifestyle that’s been here for generations. Our ranches directly face Vineyard, and turning it into a high-traffic corridor or commercial zone would destroy the quiet, open environment we depend on. This project doesn’t just disrupt land—it threatens a culture and community that’s been thriving here long before any development plans. Moses Virgen Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. Please note that the currently proposed alternative (Alternative 3a Revised) does not follow or use right of way from Vineyard Road. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis - community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
197.	Aldo J. Flores	6/13/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Aldo J Flores Email [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED] Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
198.	Noah McLure	6/13/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Noah McLure [REDACTED]	Comment noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				No Build I oppose this build.	
199.	Maria Raley	6/13/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Maria Raley [REDACTED] I oppose this build. It will negatively impact the lives of alot of people who you have not considered. There is a road not 2 miles - Clint cut off that can be developed further and this neighborhood – area – homes – spared. - I have lived in Socorro for 50 years +. And I hate that you are turning it into a warehouse area. Look at our roads. You are not listening to the people you are going to directly affect by building a major roadway right by their homes, taking some homes and land for some. Shame on you. M. Raley	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation’s (TxDOT’s) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. In addition, the City of Socorro is currently conducting detailed design for phase 1 and alternative analysis for phase 2 of the extension of Nuevo Hueco Tanks. However, this alignment is also on the north side of Socorro, between Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					To the south of Socorro, the following roads currently provide access to the city; however, the routes are not direct or they are too far south to meet the objectives of the proposed project: FM 1110, Clint-San Elizario Road, and Clint Cut-off Road. The proposed Preferred Alternative would connect to I-10 approximately 2.58 miles south (eastbound along I-10) of Horizon Boulevard. This is about halfway between the existing Horizon Boulevard and Clint-San Elizario Road intersections, which meets the objectives of the project.
200.	Jim W. Raley	6/13/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Jim W. Raley [REDACTED] I do not agree w/ this build. Why take away from long time home owners when you have a perfectly good road – the Clint cutoff. You are causing more pain and suffering on your residents and their rightful property. If this was your home, would you be in favor of this build? Of course not! You do not see the people on horseback riding, the farms, the way of life here. Fic the existing roads before you start a new mess and take away from long time Socorro residents. You are not listening, you only care about the money, not your people and their well being and homes. Jim W. Raley	Comments noted. Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation’s (TxDOT’s) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. In addition, the City of Socorro is currently conducting detailed design for phase 1 and alternative analysis for phase 2 of the extension of Nuevo Hueco Tanks. However, this alignment is also on the north side of Socorro, between Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard. To the south of Socorro, the following roads currently provide access to the city; however, the routes are not direct or they are too far south to meet the objectives of the proposed project: FM 1110, Clint-San Elizario Road, and Clint Cut-off Road. The proposed Preferred Alternative would connect to I-10 approximately 2.58 miles south (eastbound along I-10) of Horizon Boulevard. This is about halfway between the existing Horizon Boulevard and Clint-San Elizario Road intersections, which meets the objectives of the project. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: - air quality impacts - traffic noise analysis

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					- community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) - community and neighborhood impacts - threatened and endangered species habitat impacts - jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made.
201.	Jacob McLure	6/13/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Jacob McLure [REDACTED] I am not in favor of this build. You are taking my home and my property. The people along this route many have spoken against it with concerns about our health and homes. Many of us were not told about this issue and now this stress has caused health problems. No build should be the only answer as out small community, neighborhood will be forever destroyed by this major road. Come see what you are going/trying to destroy.	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 110 feet from your home and 18 feet from your property fence. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				No build. Jacob McLure	was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Please see responses to Comment #s 188 and 202, which also pertain to this property.
202.	Rebecca A. Raley-Hendrix	6/13/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Rebecca a Raley-Hendrix [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Tres Caballos area I oppose this build as it is right by my home. I have about 2 acres and many many animals. This major road will affect my health and well being. It makes absolutely no sense to make another major road when you have the Clint cut off connecting to I-10 not less than 2 or so miles away mixing in warehouses with residential is poor planning and taking away from our beautiful little town. I have moved away a come back and it is truly sad that you'll fail to see what you are turning our home town (our gem) into. Progress should not come at the cost you are asking for. Who wante a warehouse next to our home? Keep the warehouses by I-10, not near residential areas. We are farm land residences who have large properties you are trying to take away. My husband has severe PTSD and our home, our farm is his therapy. He deserves what he earned. Have any of you or can any of you say the same thing? Lost someone in war? I guarantee not. Respectfully – Rebecca a Raley-Hendrix	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 110 feet from your home and 18 feet from your property fence. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation’s (TxDOT’s) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. In addition, the City of Socorro is currently conducting detailed design for phase 1 and alternative analysis for phase 2 of the extension of Nuevo Hueco Tanks. However, this alignment is also on the north side of Socorro, between Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard. To the south of Socorro, the following roads currently provide access to the city; however, the routes are not direct or they are too far south to meet the objectives of the proposed project: FM 1110, Clint-San Elizario Road, and Clint Cut-off Road. The proposed Preferred Alternative would connect to I-10 approximately 2.58 miles south (eastbound along I-10) of Horizon Boulevard. This is about halfway between the existing Horizon Boulevard and Clint-San Elizario Road intersections, which meets the objectives of the project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Please see responses to Comment #s 188 and 201, which also pertain to this property.
203.	Stephanie V. Perez	6/13/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] STEPHANIE V PEREZ [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. TO WHOM THIS MAY CONCERN, I HAVE BEEN COMING EVERYDAY HERE TO MY PARENTS RANCH ABOUT 7 YEARS OR MORE SINCE THEY MADED THE DECISION TO MOVE FROM EAST EL PASO TO SOCORRO.I HAVE SEEN THEM RELAX AND BE MORE AT EASE BEING HERE. THEY HAVE BUILT THEIR FORVER HOME FOR NOT ONLY THEMSELVES BUT FOR THIER ADULT CHILDREN AND THEIR GRANDCHILDREN. THIS GREATLY EFFECTS ME PERSONALLY BECAUSE BEING HERE HAS TAUGHT ME A DIFFERENT WAY OF	Comments noted. Your property at [REDACTED] would be impacted based on the current design, but your home is not within the proposed ROW. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				LIFE AND HAS HELPED WITH MY QUALITY OF LIFE MENTALLY AND EMOTIONALLY. SUCH AS, LEARNING TO TAKE BIGGER CHALLENGES IN THE FORM OF ANIMALS I NEVER THOUGHT WE COULD HAVE THE PRIVILEGE OF EXISTING WITH. WE HAVE CHICKENS, DONKEY, DOGS, HORSES ALL WHOM DEPEND ON US JUST AS MUCH AS WE ON THEM. THIS AREA HAS TAUGHT ME PEACE AND PATIENCE WITH THE UNKOWN . MY SON WHO IS NOW 14YRS OLD HAS LEARNED THIS PEACE AND HAS BEGUN TO LEARN THESE ANIMALS AND WAY OF LIFE. THIS PROJECT YOU THINK WILL MAKE SOCORRO BETTER WILL ONLY TAKE AWAY FROM US ALL. YOU WILL HURT THIS AREA IN A WAY THAT YOU CAN NO LONGER RESTORE . THAT HARM IT WILL DO TO MYFAMILY AND ANIMAL IS UNFATHOMABLE. NO BUILD!! LEAVE US WITH THE ONLY PEACE WE HAVE!! MAKE SOCORRO BETTER WITHOUT TEARING DOWN FAMILY HOMES, ANIMALS AND FARMLANDS WHICH THRIVE DAILY WITH ALL OUR HARD WORK, SWEAT, AND TEARS.	Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
204.	Yvonne Perez	6/13/2025	Email	Yvonne Perez Rosman Co. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [The attached comment card read as follows:] Yvonne Perez & Fernando Perez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Anderson Rd & Socorro Community We moved from El Paso because it's growing so much and at our age we don't want to deal with the traffic, the noise and all that comes with a big city. This freeway you are trying to build will bring too much noise, pollution, accidents. We have plants, horses, chickens etc. and that is not going to be good for them. I have grandkids that like to be outside. Mu husband and I like to walk outside. We like to water out trees. I see kids being picked up for school in the mornings.	Comments noted. Your property at [REDACTED] would be impacted based on the current design, but your home is not within the proposed ROW. Please note that although the proposed Arterial 1 roadway is a four-lane road, it would not be or function as a freeway. The proposed design, including speed limits and similar aspects, would be more similar to Horizon Boulevard. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department.
205.	Adrian Perez	6/13/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Adrian Perez [REDACTED] [REDACTED] this project being proposed will affect my family, my neighbors and myself in the following ways. This road will cause noise pollution, affecting sleep, which leads to an unstable mental state due to interrupted sleep. The traffic in our front yard, how long will it take just to leave my home because of the traffic. We all have animals, our home has a horse, donkey, chickens, and dogs. What if one of those dogs gets out even though we have a gate, they could get run over. It would be heartbreaking to lose a family pet. Then there's accidents, all around El Paso drunk drivers crash in to homes and fences/walls, this will open us up to those possibilities. I don't want someone getting hurt, a car accident could be very bad. This form is not long enough to write all my concerns, but in short, this will affect our community and as a resident I'm asking you to please consider.	Comments noted. Your property at [REDACTED] would be impacted based on the current design, but your home is not within the proposed ROW. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping.
206.	Adair Reyna	6/13/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Adair Reyna [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Anderson Rd/Rancho Viejo Am adair Reyna and I don't want the city to buid this road heading to the highway because it affects my new house my dad barely build this house and I been feeling okay in it and happy ive always wanted to be in a real house with my own bedroom and now that the city is trying to destroy my house to buid a freeway am so sad because of this. I don't know why they would want to buid a freeway here in Anderson rd if they know that there are ranches aroud here and that people here love peace city of soccoro please don't buid this road it affects my home and the community of Anderson. Ive been living here for 4 years calm I don't know why they/rude would want to build this	Comments noted. Your property at [REDACTED] would be directly impacted by the proposed project. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. The proposed alignment will continue to be refined during the detailed design phase, and the engineering design team will attempt to avoid relocations where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				road here if he knows that the community around Anderson try to stay away from the city. PLEASE DON'T BUILD THIS ROAD.	More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ Please note that although the proposed Arterial 1 roadway is a four-lane road, it would not function as a freeway. The proposed design, including speed limits and similar aspects, would be more similar to Horizon Boulevard. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Please see responses to Comment #'s 60, 248, and 280, which also relate to this property.
207.	Samuel Bravo	6/13/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Samuel Bravo Email [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED] Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
208.	Joe L. Serafin	6/13/2025	Email	Hello, Please find attached a PDF document containing a letter from TRLA (Texas RioGrande Legal Aid) along with letters of support for the 3A Revised Option, for the Arterial 1 project in Socorro, Texas. Each resident has signed their name on an individual comment form, to ensure that each person is counted individually, and not all as 1. Also, please be made aware that we have also sent original copies via overnight UPS to your office to be counted. We were made aware that overnight delivery of the documents was not possible, due to the Office being closed. I have spoken with several members of your organization to make them aware of this, and we were informed that the forms would still be counted as they were mailed out before the due date; here is the tracking number in case you should need it: 1ZV9986F015201131 We wish to thank you for your time and attention to this important matter, and feel confident that our voice will be heard, given the assurances of Kim Johnson, Lauren Macias-Cervantes and Sal that all of our documents will be accepted and counted individually. If you have any questions or if I can be of any assistance, please feel free to contact me; me information is listed below. Again, thank you for your time and consideration. Kind Regards, Joe L. Serafin [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Kim Johnson (ICF) sent the following email to Mr. Serafin on 6/13/2025: This is to confirm that I received your email and attachment. Thank you for speaking to me earlier today. Kim Additional response from the Arterial 1 Project Team: Comments noted. Each individual comment/response is provided in this matrix.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
209.	Paola Comacho Texas RioGrande Legal Aid	6/13/2025	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] June 12, 2025 VIA EMAIL at Arterial1@ic.f.com City of Socorro & Texas Department of Transportation Attn: Arterial I 5 Lakeway Centre Ct., Suite 200 Lakeway, TX, 78734 Re: Bauman Road Community Comments - Arterial I Project, Environmental Review Phase To the City of Socorro and Project Stakeholders, Texas RioGrande Legal Aid, Inc. (TRLA) continues to represent residents of the Bauman Road community in relation to the proposed A11erial I (1682 Boulevard) Project from I-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road). As the project transitions into the environmental studies and engineering design phase under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), we write these public comments to address key matters on behalf of the Bauman Road residents following the designation of Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. The Bauman Road community supports the selection of Alternative 3A Revised, as it is the only alternative that accomplishes project goals while minimizing environmental and community impacts. Please see the public comments from individual residents that are attached to this letter. TxDOT' s preference for Alternative 3A Revised reflects NEPA' s goal of informed decision making because it stems from years of consistent public engagement by the Bauman Road residents. For over four years, this community has made its position clear: any alignment-such as Alternatives I, IA, IB, or 1 C-that would displace Bauman Road residents or subject them to adverse impacts is unacceptable. The selection of Alternative 3A Revised affirms that viable, less harmful alternatives exist. We appreciate that after a series of alternatives, workshops and meetings over the course of 4 years, the project team went a step further to develop "Alternative 3a Revised to farther reduce impacts." However, as NEPA practitioners and community advocates, we understand that the designation of a Preferred Alternative is not equivalent to final selection. For this reason, we write to clarify expectations as the project moves through its next legal and procedural stages. A. Understanding the NEPA Framework 1. TxDOT must Ensure Meaningful Public Participation	Comments noted. A. 1. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. 2. An Environmental Assessment will be prepared for the proposed project in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). If it is determined that the proposed action would have a "significant environmental impact" then either the No Build Alternative would be

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				NEPA requires meaningful public participation. The public must be provided an opportunity to comment on the project, including on the agency's analysis and any data and studies supporting that analysis. In addition, should any new information on the project come to light, TxDOT must keep the public informed. 2. TxDOT Must Prepare an EIS if there are Significant Impacts on the Environment Under NEPA, agencies are required to take a "hard look" at its proposed action and carefully assess potential environmental impacts. If the agency determines that its proposed action would not have a "significant environmental impact," then it may prepare an environmental Assessment (EA). O'Reilly v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng'rs, 477 F.3d 225, 228 (5th Cir. 2007). However, an EIS is required if the project threatens to "significantly affect the quality of the human environment." Given the significant difference in environmental impacts between Alternative 3A to other alternatives--most notably the other alternatives' increase in displacement and flood risks--selecting an alternative other than 3A implicates significant impacts and the preparation of an EIS. 3. TxDOT Must Consider Direct, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts. TxDOT must analyze all direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that are "reasonably foreseeable." City of Dallas, Tex. v. Hall, 562 F.3d 712, 719 (5th Cir. 2009). Given that the project alternatives threaten to displace and impact environmental justice communities, TxDOT must complete a thorough environmental justice analysis. This analysis must demonstrate: • The necessity of selecting that alignment over less harmful options, and • The specific mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate adverse impacts. In addition, TxDOT must include an analysis of cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts are defined as "the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions." 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7. Thus, TxDOT must consider cumulative impacts such as flooding, noise, traffic, and pollution that stem from the combination of past, present and future developments and land-use changes.	chosen, the project would be revised, or an Environmental Impact Statement would be prepared. 3. Recent developments under the current administration have changed the federal approach to indirect and cumulative impacts and environmental justice (EJ) population impacts, rescinding the policies that governed the ability to address associated regulations based on previous executive orders. However, the environmental process is governed by laws like the Civil Rights Act and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). In Addition, the City will follow standard procedures for impacts to communities and resources. B. Comments Noted. C. Comments Noted. Also, see Response to A.1, above, regarding notification of available documents and the upcoming public hearing.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				B. Bauman Residents' Requests as Environmental Review Proceeds As active and informed stakeholders, the Bauman Road residents respectfully submit the following priorities: 1. Alternative 3A Revised is the best option. Residents of Bauman Road support Alternative 3A Revised because it meets project objectives, avoids engineering and environmental constraints, and will displace the least amount of residents. 2. Restrict Commercial and Freight Traffic in Residential Zones. Any final design must account for traffic type and volume. Routes that bring commercial trucking or heavy freight traffic through residential corridors pose unacceptable safety, environmental, and quality-of-life risks. 3. Ensure Transparency and Document Accessibility. To support informed engagement and regulatory compliance, residents request that: • A public-facing website be maintained with updates, documents, and meeting summaries; • The Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) or Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and all related technical reports be released as early as possible; • All public comment timelines are clearly and consistently communicated, with any discrepancies from earlier notices corrected. 4. Incorporate Regional Land Use Considerations. Recent development patterns-including the conversion of farmland into high-density residential zones-have introduced new traffic and drainage challenges. The environmental studies must address how these patterns contribute to cumulative and direct and indirect impacts, especially in downstream communities like Bauman. TxDOT and the City of Socorro should also consider adding a public transportation component to the project, as this would further enhance the regional mobility goals of the project and also serve as a valuable mitigation strategy to reduce adverse impacts. C. A Constructive Path Forward The Bauman Road community is not asking for special treatment-only a fair and lawful process. These residents have invested decades building their homes, families, and lives in a neighborhood that was once neglected but	

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				never abandoned. They have earned their seat at the table, and they bring with them not only lived experience but a clear understanding of the applicable legal standards. As this project continues to advance, our clients look forward to continued collaboration with the City and TxDOT. They are engaged, informed, and committed to working within the NEPA framework to ensure a transportation solution that is both equitable and sustainable for all communities involved. We respectfully request confirmation of receipt of this letter and ask to be notified when the draft environmental studies become available for public comment. Sincerely, is/ Paola Camacho Paola Camacho Staff Attorney Texas RioGrande Legal Aid [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	
210.	David Colon	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date: Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria.	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Residents' signature David Colon June 11 '25 Address: [REDACTED]	The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
211.	Guadalupe Segel	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date:	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without	However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Guadalupe Segel Residents' signature Address: [REDACTED]	
212.	Ricardo de Lucio	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Atentamente, Ricardo de Lucio Ricardo de Lucio Dirección: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
213.	Angela Torres	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date: Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT,	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process.	3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Residents' signature Angela Torres Address: [REDACTED]	
214.	Jorge	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos sería devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono.	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Atentamente, Jorge Dirección: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
215.	Fatima Dominguez Torres	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date: Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely,	4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Residents' signature Fatima Dominguez Torres Address: [REDACTED]	
216.	Antonio Alberto	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road.	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Atentamente, Antonio Alberto Dirección: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
217.	Paulina Olvio	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date: Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Residents' signature Paulina Olvio Address: [REDACTED]	Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
218.	Sylvia Chaves	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español.	2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Atentamente, Silvia Chaves Direccion: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
219.	Lorenzo Ramirez	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Atentamente, Lorenzo Ramirez Dirección: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
220.	A. Ramos	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final.	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, A. Ramos 6/11/2025 Direccion: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
221.	Elizabeth Horta	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date: Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Residents' signature Elizabeth Horta Elizabeth Horta Address: [REDACTED]	The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
222.	Gaeia Mandoyn	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por:	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard.	2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, Gaeia Mandoyn Direccion: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
223.	Lorena S. Tobias	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Lorena S. Tobias Address: [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED] Date: 6/12/25 Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Residents' signature Lorena Address: [REDACTED]	approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
224.	Arturo Silvestre	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road)	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y	However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, Arturo Silvestre Direccion: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
225.	Ratico	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores,	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, Ratico Direccion: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
226.	J. Guadalupe Betancourt	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road)	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y	However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, J. Guadalupe Betancourt Direccion: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
227.	Lisa Betancourt	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores,	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, Lisa Betancourt Direccion: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
228.	Sylvia & Antonio Garza	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road)	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y	However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, Sylvia y Antonio Garza Direccion: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
229.	Maria J. Ortiz	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores,	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, Maria J. Ortiz Direccion: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
230.	José Luis Ortiz	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road)	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y	However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, Jose Luis Ortiz Direccion: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
231.	Maria De Lucia	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores,	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, Maria De Lucia Direccion: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
232.	Antonio Gallegos	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road)	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y	However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, Antonio Gallegos Direccion: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
233.	Juan A. Zavala	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date: Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Residents' signature Jaun Antonio Zavala Address: [REDACTED]	
234.	Henry Cordova	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date: Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely,	4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Residents' signature Henry Cordova Address: [REDACTED]	
235.	Rocio Silvestre	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date: Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route.	1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Residents' signature Rocio Silvestre Address: [REDACTED]	
236.	Jay Cordova & Teresa Cordova	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date: Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria.	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Residents' signature Jay Cordova Teresa Cordova Address: [REDACTED]	The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
237.	Irma Cordova	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date:	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without	However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Residents' signature Irma Cordova Address: [REDACTED]	
238.	Maria E. Cordova	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date: Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship.	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Residents' signature Maria Elena Cordova Address: [REDACTED]	
239.	Raymundo Silvestre	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA.	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente,	constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Raymundo Silvestre Direccion: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
240.	Raul Cordova	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date: Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road.	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Residents' signature Raul Cordova Address: [REDACTED]	
241.	Linda Hemme	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date: Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Residents' signature Linda Hemme Address: [REDACTED]	Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
242.	Alma C. Hemme	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address:	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Email: Date: Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and	2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Alma C Hemme (Alma C. Hemme Residents' signature Angela Torres Address: [REDACTED]	
243.	Anne Marie Hemme	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Submitted by: Address: Email: Date: Project: Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) Project- From 1-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road) Agency Contact: arterial1@icf.com Dear City of Socorro and TxDOT, I am a resident of the Bauman/Vineyard Road community, and I am submitting this public comment in response to the environmental review phase of the Arterial 1 Project. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and to be part of the NEPA process. First, I want to thank the City for recognizing our voices and identifying Alternative 3A Revised as the Preferred Alternative. This is the first time in this process that our community has felt acknowledged. Alternative 3A revised avoids direct harm to Bauman/Vineyard Road and reflects the concerns our neighborhood has raised for over four years. We support this decision as it recognizes that Alternative 3A Revised is the best option based on NEPA's criteria. I want to express our strong opposition to any reconsideration of Alternatives 1, 1A, 1 B, 1C, which would significantly impact or displace our homes and does not meet the NEPA criteria. Bauman/Vineyard Road is a historically underserved colonia community, and many of us are seniors, low-income, or living with health conditions. Displacing our neighborhood would be devastating and unjust. The EPA has already identified our area as	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				disadvantaged, and routing a highway through it would only compound decades of hardship. As you develop environmental technical reports and engineering design, I respectfully request that the following be addressed: 1. Preserve Alternative 3A Revised or another option that completely avoids Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Ensure no commercial truck or freight traffic is allowed through residential neighborhoods, including any final selected route. 3. Make all studies, maps, and project updates accessible to the public, especially in both English and Spanish. 4. Consider how nearby development has worsened flooding, traffic, and drainage, and make sure this project does not increase those problems for downstream areas like Bauman/Vineyard. Lastly, I want to be clear that we are engaged and paying attention. We are not against progress-but we ask that progress be fair, informed, and respectful of communities that have long been overlooked. Bauman/Vineyard residents have built their homes from nothing, without basic utilities, and have worked for decades to protect what little we have. We simply ask that the City and TxDOT continue to recognize and follow the NEPA process. Thank you for taking this comment into account. I look forward to reviewing the full environmental technical report and engineering design, and staying involved in this process. Sincerely, Anne Marie Hemme Residents' signature Anne Maria Hemme Address: [REDACTED]	
244.	H B	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT:	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas.	4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, H B Direccion: [REDACTED] r. For translation, see Comment #211.	La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
245.	Leticia [last name undecipherable]	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Dirección: Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos sería devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono.	Comments noted. - Comment noted. - Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. - Comment noted. - Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. - Sus comentarios han sido anotados.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, Leticia Direccion: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
246.	Juan Monamy	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Juan Monamy Dirección: [REDACTED] Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT:	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos seria devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono. Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas.	4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, J Direccion: XXXXXXXXXX For translation, see Comment #211	La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
247.	Maria Monamy	6/13/25	Email	[The attached letter reads as follows:] Comentario Publico - Fase de Revisión Ambiental NEPA Presentado por: Maria Monamy Dirección: XXXXXXXXXX Correo electrónico: Fecha: Proyecto: Proyecto Arterial 1 (Bulevar 1682) - Desde la 1-10 hasta FM 258 (Socorro Road) Contacto del Proyecto: arterial 1@icf.com A la Ciudad de Socorro y TxDOT: Soy residente de la comunidad de Bauman/Vineyard Road y presento este comentario publico en respuesta a la lase de revisión ambiental del Proyecto Arterial 1. Agradezco la oportunidad de participar y de que se escuche nuestra voz como parte del proceso de NEPA. Primero, quiero agradecer a la Ciudad por reconocer nuestras preocupaciones y por identificar la Alternativa 3A Revised como la Alternativa Preferida. Esta es la primera vez en este proceso que nuestra comunidad siente que fue tomada en cuenta. La Alternativa 3A revised evita impactos directos a Bauman Road y refleja las preocupaciones que hemos expresado durante más de cuatro años. Apoyamos esta alternativa y esperamos que siga siendo la direccion elegida y designada for el proceso NEPA. Quiero expresar nuestro firme rechazo a cualquier reconsideración de las Alternativas 1, 1 A, 1 B, 1 C, ya que todas ellas afectarían gravemente o desplazarían nuestras vivencias y no siguen el proceso NEPA. Bauman/Vineyard Road es una comunidad históricamente marginada, reconocida coma colonia, y muchos de nosotros somos personas mayores, de bajos ingresos o vivimos con condiciones de salud. Desplazarnos sería devastador e injusto. La EPA ya ha identificado nuestra área coma una comunidad desfavorecida, y trazar una carretera por aquí solo agravaría décadas de abandono.	Comments noted. 1. Comment noted. 2. Restricting freight and commercial traffic through the proposed alignment would not meet the objectives of the project, as freight traffic currently utilizes the project area. However, proposed design elements such as raised medians and limited cross-street curb radii discourage large freight and commercial vehicles from entering adjacent, residential streets. 3. Comment noted. 4. Stormwater runoff generated throughout the roadway would be conveyed to multiple proposed stormwater retention ponds that would be constructed near the project alignment. Stormwater discharge into existing arroyos, canals, drains, and laterals is not permitted and is not being proposed for this project. Construction of warehouses, and conveyance of any runoff resulting from the construction of warehouses, is not part of the scope of this project. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 1. Sus comentarios han sido anotados.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Mientras completan los reportes ambientales, solicito respetuosamente que se tomen en cuenta los siguientes puntos: 1. Mantener la Alternativa 3A Revised o seleccionar otra opción que evite por completo Bauman/Vineyard Road. 2. Asegurar que no se permita el tráfico de camiones comerciales o de carga par vecindarios residenciales, incluyendo la ruta que se seleccione al final. 3. Hacer que todos los estudios, mapas y actualizaciones del proyecto estén disponibles al público, especialmente en inglés y español. 4. Considerar como el desarrollo reciente en áreas cercanas ha agravado los problemas de inundaciones, tráfico y drenaje, y garantizar que este proyecto no aumente esos problemas para comunidades como Bauman/Vineyard. Por último, quiero dejar claro que estamos atentos y seguiremos involucrados. No estamos en contra del progreso, pero pedimos que ese progreso sea justo, informado y respetuoso con las comunidades que históricamente han sido ignoradas. Los residentes de Bauman/Vineyard hemos construido nuestros hogares desde cero, sin servicios básicos, y hemos luchado por décadas para proteger lo poco que tenemos. Solo pedimos que la Ciudad y TxDOT continúen protegiendo nuestro vecindario, en lugar de imponernos más cargas. Gracias por tomar en cuenta este comentario. Espero poder revisar los reportes ambientales y continuar participando en este proceso. Attentamente, M Direccion: [REDACTED] For translation, see Comment #211.	2. Restringir el tráfico de carga y comercial a lo largo del alineamiento propuesto no cumpliría con los objetivos del proyecto, ya que actualmente el tráfico de carga utiliza el área del proyecto. Sin embargo, los elementos del diseño propuesto, como las medianas elevadas y los radios limitados en los cruces, disuaden a los vehículos grandes de carga y comerciales de ingresar a las calles residenciales adyacentes. 3. Sus comentarios han sido anotados. 4. La escorrentía de aguas pluviales generada a lo largo de la carretera se canalizaría hacia varios estanques de retención de aguas pluviales propuestos, que se construirían cerca del alineamiento del proyecto. No se permite el vertido de aguas pluviales en arroyos, canales, desagües y ramales existentes, y no se propone hacerlo en este proyecto. La construcción de bodegas, así como el desagüe de cualquier escorrentía resultante de dicha construcción, no forma parte del objetivo de este proyecto. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
248.	Darlene Reyna	6/13/2025	Email	[The attached comment card read as follows:] Darlene Reyna [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Anderson Rd/Rancho Viejo My name is Darlene and these are the reasons why I don't want my house to get affected. I don't want it to get affected because this was my dream house and my dream room. My Dad put a lot of effort to this house. I feel comfortable here because I have lived here for 5 years. I don't want this to happen many people don't want this either. LET US LIVE !WELL	Comments noted. Your property at [REDACTED] would be directly impacted by the proposed project. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. The proposed alignment will continue to be refined during the detailed design phase, and the engineering design team will attempt to avoid relocations where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Please see responses to Comment #'s 60, 248, and 280, which also relate to this property.
249.	Bernard D. Felsen	6/13/2025	Email	Ladies and Gentlemen: Attached please find [REDACTED] Owner, LLC's supplemental objections related to the proposed Arterial 1 highway project. Thank you. Bernard D. Felsen Attorney/Shareholder Direct: [REDACTED] Main: [REDACTED] Fax: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] vCard [REDACTED] ScottHulse PC The Value of Commitment ® [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [The attached document read as follows:] June 13, 2025 Via E-mail: lquimiro@costx.us and by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested City of Socorro Planning & Zoning Department 860 N. Rio Vista Rd. Socorro, Texas 79927 Attn: Lorraine Quimiro, City Planner of Socorro Via E-mail: Arterial I@icf.com and by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested ICF/Blanton & Associates Attn: Arterial 1 5 Lakeway Centre Court, Suite 200 Lakeway, Texas 78734	Comments noted. Please also refer to the responses to Comment #89.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Re: Supplemental Objection to Proposed Location of Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) from I-10 to FM 258 (Socorro Road), El Paso County, Texas Ladies and Gentlemen: As the Attorneys for [REDACTED], LLC (the "Property Owner"), we previously delivered objections to the currently proposed location of Arterial 1 (1682 Boulevard) ("Arterial 1"). A copy of the previous objection letter, dated June 5, 2025, is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" (the "Prior Objection Letter") and incorporated herein by reference for all purposes. We appreciated the opportunity to previously discuss this matter with the City of Socorro's representatives and the City's consultants, and we are now supplementing the Prior Objection Letter to further emphasize the detrimental effect that the proposed location of Arterial 1 has on the Property Owner's development. I have attached as Exhibit "B" an overlay of the Property Owner's Master Site Plan against the proposed Arterial 1 location. You will note that the section of the highway that is highlighted in red essentially splits the Property Owner's next development phase as set forth on the Master Site Plan. We have also referenced on Exhibit "B" for your consideration a proposed alternate route for the highway as highlighted in green. We believe such alternate route will result in reducing the cost and expense related to the construction of Arterial 1. Please note that all objections in the Prior Objection Letter still remain, but we believe the information in this supplemental letter further clarifies the issue related to the proposed Arterial 1 location through the Property Owner's development. We continue to be available to discuss this matter in further detail. Thank you for your consideration. Very truly yours, SCOTTHULSE PC Bernard D. Felsen For the Firm Cc: [REDACTED] Attn: Jerry Ayoub and Michelle Hajjar Note: the referenced letter from June 5, 2025, can be found in Comment #89.	
250.	Alexandra Ramos	6/13/2025	Email	Please see attached for my comments on arterial 1. Thank you,	Comments noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Alexandra [The attached comment card read as follows:] Alexandra & Andrew Ramos [REDACTED] [REDACTED] My household I oppose Alternative 3A revise all together. My house is right on Anderson and will always be at risk. On my last comment I was concerned that not everyone affected was actually informed it seems like whoever was in charge of distributing the notice purposely left out the farmers and everyone around so there would be less oppositions. I suggest you cut your loss on trying to connect Socorro rd to I-10. Instead invest in expanding N. loop. 2nd, stop allowing farmland to be converted into resident or commercial use if the roads cannot sustain more people. 3rd, Extend Bauman to I-10 and by that I mean starting from north loop like after Rojas elementary. Leave the people on Bauman but extend it since theres no houses. Theres a farm there but you can also avoid. Make them a good deal that will not compromise their peace. If you extend Bauman it will alleviate traffic from all the new houses and original residents. So im choosing for a No-Build in conclusion.	Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 34 feet from your home and 18 feet from your property fence. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment).

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made.
251.	Jeremiah Clark	6/13/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Jeremiah Clark Email [REDACTED] Address Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
252.	Jeremiah Clark	6/13/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & and members of the ICF Good evening. My name is Jeremiah L. Clark, and I'm here to speak in strong opposition to the Arterial 1 project. This project threatens to permanently alter the character and safety of our community. The proposed road will bring increased traffic, noise, light pollution, and industrial development directly into areas that are currently peaceful, residential, and agricultural. Families who have lived here for generations will lose not just quiet and comfort, but safety and a way of life. Our neighborhood is a place where people walk, ride horses, and drive ATVs. Children play outside. Quail, roadrunners, owls, cranes, ducks, raccoons, and even skunks still make their homes here. With the construction of a major roadway, these ways of life and the wildlife habitat that supports them will be lost. The noise and lights from heavy trucks and fast-moving traffic will replace the sounds of nature and peaceful evenings. The road also opens the door for industrial expansion that will consume farmland, pushing out small local farmers who already struggle to compete. What little farming remains will be bordered by noise and pollution, further threatening its viability. Furthermore, we are concerned about public safety. More traffic brings more accidents. More accidents mean more pressure on emergency services that are already stretched thin. Crime increases with population growth and poorly monitored infrastructure. Our local police and first responders will be forced to cover more ground with the same limited resources, putting all of us at greater risk. This project has also suffered from a lack of transparency. Communication with residents has been minimal. Many in the community were unaware of these plans until they were already far along. Mailings were limited, and notifications were sparse. To make matters worse, we've heard conflicting statements from city officials about who is even responsible for this project, further eroding public trust.	Comments noted. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Socorro is not just a place to be driven through. It is our home. Arterial 1 benefits developers and outside interests, not the residents who will be forced to live with its consequences. We urge the council to reconsider this project before irreversible damage is done. Thank you. Jeremiah Clark Jeremiah Clark Email ██████████ Address Street Address: ██████████ Postal / Zip Code: ██████	Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. The City of Socorro follows Chapter 211 of the Texas Local Government Code (https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/GetStatute.aspx?Code=LG&Value=211), which grants municipalities the authority to regulate land use, building heights, and lot sizes to protect public health and safety. The City implements these state statutes locally through its Unified Development Code (UDC) and Chapter 46 of the Local Ordinances (https://costx.us/local-ordinances/). In compliance with state law, the city's Planning & Zoning Commission (https://costx.us/planning-zoning/) and City Council hold public hearings and issue notifications to property owners before any zoning changes or variances are approved. The City conducted a zoning assessment as part of the Socorro 2040 Comprehensive Master Plan, which included extensive public outreach. There is currently no planned City of Socorro M2 Heavy Industrial Zoning in the area as a result of the project. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. Please also see responses to Comment #s 26, 251, and 258, which also pertain to this property.
253.	Isabel Cortez	6/13/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Isabel Cortez Email [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED] Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
254.	Patricia Cortez Rios	6/13/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants, I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Patricia Cortez Rios Email [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED] Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
255.	Simono Cortez	6/13/2025	Email	Stop Arterial Road 1. Dear City of Socorro Representatives & ICF consultants,	Comments noted. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				I am writing to express my concerns regarding Arterial 1 project Alternative 3A revision. This project would destroy the homes of my hard working neighbors, pollute our neighborhoods, and threaten our way of life. Once we destroy the agriculture communities of the lower valley there is no going back. I ask that you all chose the No build option for Arterial 1. Simono Cortez Email [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED] Street Address: [REDACTED] Postal / Zip Code: [REDACTED]	undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration’s right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable.
COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY VOICEMAIL					
256.	Juan Torres	5/13/2025	Voicemail	Yes. I’d like information about the project you’re going to do my name is Juan Torres call me at [REDACTED]. Thank you.	On 5/14/2025, Kim Johnson returned a call from Mr. Juan Torres, at [REDACTED]. He asked about the project, and she encouraged him to come to the public meeting and ensure his neighbors also received the notice. He said he will be there. He also mentioned pumps in their neighborhood and asked if she could help him with that issue. She told him we were not associated with that work, and encouraged him to call the institution who constructed it.
257.	Jessica Cuevas	5/20/2025	Voicemail	Yes, I like to just know this - if anybody can go? And, um, if this is the beginning or are they going to keep having different meetings? Thank you – I	Kim Johnson left a message for Ms. Cuevas on 5/25/25 providing her personal cell number so that she can walk Ms. Cuevas through the on-line materials or answer questions from the public meeting. Ms. Cuevas never returned the call.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				appreciate if you call, and you return my call. My name is Jessica Cuevas, and my number is [REDACTED] and today is Tuesday 4:05. Thank you.	
258.	Jeremiah Clark	5/22/2025	Voicemail	Hello my name is Jeremiah Clark I live at [REDACTED] I was calling to leave a comment about the arterial planning for the new road that's going to go through Anderson Road up to I10 my property is impacted by this change because based on the pictures we were exposed to last night at the meeting my property is within 50 feet of where the road is going to be. I purchased my home 8 years ago to the road and move further out away from the city to have more privacy and create the lifestyle that me and my family enjoy which is very much seclusion and privacy. This new road that's being proposed is going to eliminate a bunch of our privacy being that the elevation of the road is above our house and people within 50 feet of the road. This is totally unacceptable paid over 250000 for this property and we pay taxes every year and to have all of this noise and put the future planning of the city to put in the warehouses were going to have several trucks coming through that area there's going to be more traffic on that road then what we have now currently. It's going to impact the lifestyle that everybody in that Athena Community all of this area are people several people along the chosen path have just recently built homes within the last 2 years and now they're going to have to have them taken down or they're going to have their properties modified or confiscated its unacceptable. The city of Socorro does nothing for that area they're very few street lights most of the ditches don't have any guardrails around them we are not taking care of were not even considered citizens we get dismissed all the time none of our community were aware of this thing that was happening we were told by the engineering group that went out and did outreach and they put flyers on peoples fences and doors and stuff and several of our neighbors are unaware of this situation even now as exam where were mobilizing as a neighborhood were going to try to fight this we do not think it's acceptable we don't care that it's not involvement Avenue but one of the biggest advocates for putting the road on Anderson is the woman who organized the moment neighborhood we think that that's unacceptable and inappropriate for the city to allow that woman to show up on the news to be able to defend her property and force that road into our property after they organized and got a lawyer to fight the situation. I cannot tell you how much how much I feel like the government and the city doesn't support us in the past 8 years I've probably had 30-40 straight dogs in my neighborhood in my property I have...	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 230 feet from your home and 82 feet from your property fence. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro follows Chapter 211 of the Texas Local Government Code (https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/GetStatute.aspx?Code=LG&Value=211), which grants municipalities the authority to regulate land use, building heights, and lot sizes to protect public health and safety. The City implements these state statutes locally through its Unified Development Code (UDC) and Chapter 46 of the Local Ordinances (https://costx.us/local-ordinances/). In compliance with state law, the

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					city's Planning & Zoning Commission (https://costx.us/planning-zoning/) and City Council hold public hearings and issue notifications to property owners before any zoning changes or variances are approved. The City conducted a zoning assessment as part of the Socorro 2040 Comprehensive Master Plan, which included extensive public outreach. There is currently no planned City of Socorro M2 Heavy Industrial Zoning in the area as a result of the project. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					The proposed project has included an extensive alternative analysis process throughout the past several years (this process will be summarized in the upcoming Environmental Assessment). At the second Public Meeting held in March 2025, the Preferred Alternative was provided for public comment. These comments, including your comment, have been considered in refinement of the Preferred Alternative to the extent practicable. Per the NEPA process, the consulting team is now analyzing the refined Preferred Alternative and will present the findings of this analysis in an upcoming Public Hearing. Therefore, at this point in time, additional alternative routes will not be analyzed. However, the detailed study of the Preferred Alternative and the subsequent Public Hearing could lead to further alternative refinement. In addition, the No-build Alternative will continue to be considered until the environmental (or NEPA) process is complete and a decision is made. Please also see responses to Comment #s 26, 251, and 252, which also pertain to this property.
259.	Mrs. Pedrueza	5/28/2025	Voicemail	Buenas... Buenas tardes habla la señora pedrueza de aquí de [REDACTED] [REDACTED] me acabo de dar cuenta anoche del proyecto que traen con arterial 1 y yo nunca he recibido ningún documento ni sabía que había habido juntas. Entonces estamos en total desacuerdo, mi esposo y todos los vecinos de aquí de la Flor Preciosa. Si gustan mandarnos de pos la invitación porque no acudimos a juntas porque no tenemos noticias lo mencionó una vecina que vive más adelante si no no nos damos cuenta de los planes que traen verdad. Entonces le agradeceré que me envíen información o nos hagan la invitación formal porque estamos muy preocupados y en total desacuerdo. Mi teléfono es [REDACTED]. Muchísimas gracias. Translation: Good... Good afternoon, this is Mrs. Pedrueza here from [REDACTED] [REDACTED], I just became aware last night of the project that you are bringing with arterial 1 and I have never received any document nor did I know that there had been any meetings. So we are in total disagreement, my husband and all the neighbors here in Flor Preciosa. If you would like to send us the invitation because we do not attend meetings because we have no news, as a neighbor who lives further down the street mentioned, otherwise we would not be aware of the plans they have. Then I would be grateful if you could send me information or send us a formal invitation because we are very concerned and in total disagreement. My phone number is [REDACTED]. Thank you very much.	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED] no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 138 feet from your home and 100 feet from your property fence. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events. Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. Your contact information has been added to the list of interested parties. See responses to comment #s 72, 128, 265, and 277, which also pertain to this property. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados No se propone la adquisición de ningún derecho de paso dentro de su propiedad ubicada en [REDACTED]. El borde del pavimento de la vía quedaría a aproximadamente 138 pies de su casa y a 100 pies de la cerca de su propiedad. Se han ofrecido varias oportunidades de participar al público a lo largo de la fase de análisis de alternativas del proyecto, incluyendo una reunión pública virtual llevada a cabo en septiembre de 2021 y una reunión pública con personas interesadas llevada a cabo en enero de 2022. También se anunciaron y llevaron a cabo reuniones con los propietarios/ inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes en julio de 2024 y marzo de 2025, y cuando se solicitaron a lo largo del proceso del proyecto. Se llevo a cabo una segunda reunión pública en mayo de 2025. Los métodos de comunicación se adaptaron para cada evento según el propósito de la reunión y las lecciones aprendidas de eventos anteriores. Se utilizaron varios tipos de notificaciones para cada reunión. A todos los propietarios y inquilinos adyacentes a la Alternativa Preferida (incluso si no se verían directamente afectados) se les envió por correo una notificación y un boletín informativo del proyecto con la fecha, la hora y el lugar de la reunión, tanto en inglés como en español. El boletín también se colocó (a mano) en las puertas de entrada o portones accesibles de todas las propiedades ubicadas junto a las

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					alternativas discutidas en las diversas reuniones. Además, se publicó un aviso público en dos periódicos locales (uno en inglés y otro en español) y tanto el aviso como el boletín se enviaron por correo electrónico a todas las direcciones de correo electrónico disponibles. También se aceptarán y revisarán comentarios del público en cualquier momento a lo largo de la vida del proyecto; sin embargo, solo se documentarán formalmente aquellos relacionados con las reuniones o audiencias públicas. El equipo del proyecto ha hecho todo lo posible para garantizar la transparencia del proyecto y la concientización pública, lo que incluye tanto una amplia difusión de los avisos de reuniones públicas (a través de notificaciones en periódicos y redes sociales) como una distribución específica de avisos e información a los propietarios directamente afectados por el proyecto (mediante el envío directo de avisos por correo y boletines informativos de invitación entregados en mano). La información presentada en cada reunión se desarrolló utilizando los mejores datos disponibles al momento de la reunión. Las alternativas propuestas y la información general se fueron actualizando entre reuniones a raíz de los cambios en las condiciones existentes (debido al desarrollo) y como resultado de los comentarios del público. Tenga en cuenta que se llevará a cabo una audiencia pública después de que se apruebe el documento ambiental. Esta audiencia se anunciará de la misma manera que las reuniones públicas previas. Su información de contacto se ha agregado a la lista de partes interesadas. Consulte las respuestas a los comentarios números 72, 128, 265 y 277, que también se refieren a esta propiedad.
260.	Dupe Mata	5/28/2025	Voicemail	Hello, this is my name is Dupe Mata, and I have some questions on the arterial 1 1862 Boulevard project if somebody can please call me back I would greatly appreciate it. My number is [REDACTED]. Thank you.	Comments noted. The project team will follow up with Ms. Mata.
261.	Raquel Martínez	5/29/2025	Voicemail	Buenos días mi nombre es Raquel Martínez mi propiedad está en el [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Tenía preguntas sobre el proyecto. Gracias si me puede hablar al [REDACTED]. Translation: Good morning my name is Raquel Martinez my property is at [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. I had questions about the project. Thank you if you can talk to me at [REDACTED].	Comments noted. Your property at [REDACTED] would be impacted based on the current design, but your home is not within the proposed ROW. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ Please see response to Comment #76, which also relates to this property. Diana Guerrero (CEA) called the property owner twice. The first time the voicemail box was not available, the second time she was able to leave a voicemail in Spanish. To date, the property owner has not responded. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Su propiedad, ubicada en el [REDACTED], se vería afectada según el diseño actual, pero su vivienda no se encuentra dentro de la servidumbre de paso propuesta. La Alternativa Preferida se desarrolló para minimizar y evitar los desplazamientos donde sea posible. Durante la adquisición de los derechos de paso, la ciudad de Socorro seguirá el proceso de adquisición de derechos de paso de la Administración Federal de Carreteras, el cual incluye una evaluación de terceras partes, una compensación basada en el valor justo de mercado y asistencia para la reubicación, cuando corresponda. Este proceso incluirá una coordinación individual con cada propietario afectado una vez que comience el proceso de adquisición de los derechos de paso. No se anticipa que este proceso comience hasta que se apruebe el esquema y se finalice el proceso ambiental. La expropiación es la opción menos deseable para la ciudad, y se explorarán todas las posibilidades antes de que se implemente este proceso. Incluso en el caso de expropiación, se ofrecerá asistencia para la reubicación, cuando corresponda. Puede encontrar más información sobre este proceso aquí: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ Consulte la respuesta al comentario #76, que también se refiere a esta propiedad. Diana Guerrero (CEA) llamó dos veces a la dueña de la propiedad. La primera vez, el buzón de voz no estaba disponible; la segunda vez, pudo dejar un mensaje de voz en español. Hasta la fecha, la dueña de la propiedad no ha respondido.
262.	Unknown	5/29/2025	Voicemail	I don't want the road building in here. I have two parents here and it's going to be a lot of noise for them. So please don't want to build the road right here. Thank you, my phone number is one [REDACTED] you have any questions call me. I don't want this road right here. Thank you.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.
263.	Araceli Arias	6/3/2025	Voicemail	Buenos días mi nombre es Araceli Arias vivo en mi dirección es [REDACTED]. Mi comentario Es que yo acabo de agarrar mi casa en diciembre entonces estoy en desacuerdo con ese proyecto que están porque pues me quedaría sin casa y fue mucho sacrificio el que el que yo hice para obtener mi casa entonces yo no estoy de acuerdo con con ese proyecto. Gracias, buenas tardes. Translation: Good morning my name is Araceli Arias I live at my address is [REDACTED]. My comment is that I just got my house in December so I disagree with this project because I would be left without a house and it was a lot of sacrifice that I made to get my house so I don't agree with this project. Thank you, good afternoon.	Comments noted. Your property at [REDACTED] would be directly impacted by the proposed project. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. The proposed alignment will continue to be refined during the detailed design phase, and the engineering design team will attempt to avoid relocations where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ Please see responses to Comment #s 66 and 181, which also pertain to this property. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Su propiedad, ubicada en el [REDACTED], se vería directamente afectada por el proyecto propuesto. La Alternativa Preferida se desarrolló para minimizar y evitar los desalojos donde fuera posible. El diseño propuesto seguirá perfeccionándose durante la fase de diseño detallado, y el equipo de diseño de

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					ingeniería intentará evitar los desalojos donde sea posible. Durante la adquisición de los derechos de paso, la ciudad de Socorro seguirá el proceso de adquisición de derechos de paso de la Administración Federal de Carreteras, el cual incluye una evaluación de terceras partes, una compensación basada en el valor justo de mercado y asistencia para la reubicación, cuando corresponda. Este proceso incluirá una coordinación individual con cada propietario afectado una vez que comience el proceso de adquisición de los derechos de paso. No se anticipa que este proceso comience hasta que se apruebe el esquema y se finalice el proceso ambiental. La expropiación es la opción menos deseable para la ciudad, y se explorarán todas las posibilidades antes de que se implemente este proceso. Incluso en el caso de expropiación, se ofrecerá asistencia para la reubicación, cuando corresponda. Puede encontrar más información sobre este proceso aquí: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ Consulte las respuestas a los comentarios números 66 y 181, que también se refieren a esta propiedad.
264.	Raquel Martinez	6/4/2025	Voicemail	Soy Raquel Martínez mi número de teléfono es [REDACTED] mi correo electrónico es [REDACTED]. Les decía que estoy en contra de este proyecto soy una persona de bajos recursos y no estoy en una situación cómo cambiar a una vida diferente aquí va a crear contaminación va a crear accidentes y muchos problemas de privacidad también y va a ser un alto incremento de tráfico y nos va a causar muchos muchos problemas de tráfico y sobre todo también de salud mentalmente donde no vamos a poder tener privacidad. Gracias. Translation: I am Raquel Martinez my phone number is [REDACTED] my email is [REDACTED] I was telling you that I am against this project I am a low income person and I am not in a situation how to change to a different life here it is going to create pollution it is going to create accidents and many privacy problems also and it is going to be a high increase of traffic and it is going to cause us many many many traffic problems and above all also health problems mentally where we are not going to be able to have privacy. Thank you.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento. Las consideraciones de seguridad relacionadas con el proyecto para los usuarios del transporte público seguirán evaluándose e incorporándose a medida que avance el diseño del proyecto. El proyecto debe cumplir con los requisitos de la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA) y con las normas de seguridad vial. El proyecto incluiría un camino de uso compartido independiente para peatones y ciclistas. Además, el proyecto está diseñado para mejorar el tiempo de llegada de los servicios de emergencias debido a la construcción de un puente sobre la vía del tren. No solo reducirá los retrasos causados por el paso de los trenes, sino que eliminará la posibilidad de colisiones entre trenes y automóviles en ese lugar. En cuanto a un posible aumento de la delincuencia, este tema es responsabilidad del Departamento de Policía de la ciudad de Socorro.
265.	Rosa A. Ramirez de Pedrueza & Arturo Pedrueza	6/9/2025	Voicemail	Buenas tardes hablo de aquí de la señora Rosa Alma Ramírez de Pedrueza y pues también de mi esposo Arturo Pedrueza. Vivimos en la calle [REDACTED]. Casi enfrente tienen este proyecto que no estamos por supuesto que no de acuerdo en su construcción verdad por muchísimas cosas pero yo creo que las más importantes es nuestra vida nuestra forma de vida. Somos habitantes de este sector ya por 13 o 14 años y escogimos acá porque son tranquilas las comunidades nos gusta tener animales vegetales sembrar. Este aparte la contaminación ambiental que esto generará ruido el deterioro del medio ambiente el peligro a nuestra vida nuestra tranquilidad. La mayoría tenemos aquí caballos gallinas algunos tienen conejos. Somos una comunidad realmente rural por eso estamos viviendo en esta área no en El Paso Texas y de aparte que nos sorprende muchísimo que nunca recibimos un aviso de parte de la ciudad de Socorro nunca nunca recibimos nada ni formal ni informal. Yo me di cuenta por una persona que le va a pasar por ahí a enseguida de su casa entonces pues ojalá que consideren todo esto. Somos bastantes yo creo que toda la comunidad estamos en contra. Muchísimas gracias y si me quieren llamar este es mi teléfono mi correo electrónico mi teléfono es [REDACTED]. Muchísimas gracias. Translation: Good afternoon I am Mrs. Rosa Alma Ramirez de Pedrueza and my husband Arturo Pedrueza. We live at [REDACTED]. Almost across the street they have this project that we are of course not in agreement in its construction because of many things but I believe that the most important is our life our way of life. We are residents of this sector for 13 or 14 years and we chose here because the community is quiet and we like to have animals and vegetables we like to plant. Apart from the environmental pollution that this will generate noise the deterioration of the	Comments noted. Your property at [REDACTED] would be directly impacted by the proposed project. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. The proposed alignment will continue to be refined during the detailed design phase, and the engineering design team will attempt to avoid relocations where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ See responses to comment #s 72, 128, 259, and 277, which also pertain to this property. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				environment the danger to our life our peace of mind. Most of us have horses, chickens, some have rabbits. We are a really rural community that is why we are living in this area not in El Paso Texas and besides that we are very surprised that we never received a notice from the city of Socorro we never received anything formal or informal. I found out from a person that it is going to happen right next to her house, so I hope they will consider all of this. There are quite a few of us, I think the whole community is against it. Thank you very much and if you want to call me this is my phone number my e-mail address my phone number is [REDACTED]. Thank you very much.	was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Multiple public involvement opportunities have been provided throughout the alternative analysis phase of the project, including a virtual public meeting held in September 2021 and a public stakeholder meeting held in January 2022. Meetings with adjacent/affected property owners were also advertised and held in July 2024 and March 2025 and as requested throughout the project process. A second Public Meeting was held in May of 2025. Outreach methods were adapted for each event based on the purpose of the meeting and lessons learned from previous events.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Multiple types of notifications were used for each meeting. All property owners and renters adjacent to the Preferred Alternative (even if they would not be directly affected) were mailed a notice and a project newsletter providing the date, time, and location of the meeting in English and Spanish. The newsletter was also placed (by hand) on accessible front doors or property gates for all properties located adjacent to alternatives discussed in the various meetings. In addition, a public notice was published in two local newspapers (one in English and one in Spanish) and the notice and newsletter were emailed to all available email addresses. Public comments will also be accepted and reviewed at any time throughout the life of the project; but will only be formally documented in association with public meetings/hearings. Every feasible effort for project transparency and public awareness has been made by the project team, including both a broad distribution of public meeting notices (via newspaper and social media notifications) and a targeted distribution of notices and information to property owners directly affected by the project (via direct mailings of notices and hand-posted invitational newsletters). Information presented at each meeting was developed using the best available knowledge at the time of the meeting. Proposed alternatives and general information were updated between meetings as existing conditions changed (due to ongoing development) and as a result of public input. Note that a Public Hearing will be held after the environmental document is approved. This hearing will be advertised in the same manner as previously held public meetings. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Su propiedad, ubicada en el [REDACTED], se vería directamente afectada por el proyecto propuesto. La Alternativa Preferida se desarrolló para minimizar y evitar los desalojos donde fuera posible. El diseño propuesto seguirá perfeccionándose durante la fase de diseño detallado, y el equipo de diseño de ingeniería intentará evitar los desalojos donde sea posible. Durante la adquisición de los derechos de paso, la ciudad de Socorro seguirá el proceso de adquisición de derechos de paso de la Administración Federal de Carreteras, el cual incluye una evaluación de terceras partes, una compensación basada en el valor justo de mercado y asistencia para la reubicación, cuando corresponda. Este proceso incluirá una coordinación individual con cada propietario afectado una vez que comience el proceso de adquisición de los derechos de paso. No se anticipa que este proceso comience hasta que se apruebe el esquema y se finalice el proceso ambiental. La expropiación es la opción menos deseable para la ciudad, y se explorarán todas las posibilidades antes de que se implemente este proceso. Incluso en el caso de expropiación, se ofrecerá asistencia para la reubicación, cuando corresponda.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Puede encontrar más información sobre este proceso aquí: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ Consulte las respuestas a los comentarios números 72, 128, 259 y 277, que también se refieren a esta propiedad. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento. Las consideraciones de seguridad relacionadas con el proyecto para los usuarios del transporte público seguirán evaluándose e incorporándose a medida que avance el diseño del proyecto. El proyecto debe cumplir con los requisitos de la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA) y con las normas de seguridad vial. El proyecto incluiría un camino de uso compartido independiente para peatones y ciclistas. Además, el proyecto está diseñado para mejorar el tiempo de llegada de

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					los servicios de emergencias debido a la construcción de un puente sobre la vía del tren. No solo reducirá los retrasos causados por el paso de los trenes, sino que eliminará la posibilidad de colisiones entre trenes y automóviles en ese lugar. En cuanto a un posible aumento de la delincuencia, este tema es responsabilidad del Departamento de Policía de la ciudad de Socorro. Se han ofrecido varias oportunidades de participar al público a lo largo de la fase de análisis de alternativas del proyecto, incluyendo una reunión pública virtual llevada a cabo en septiembre de 2021 y una reunión pública con personas interesadas llevada a cabo en enero de 2022. También se anunciaron y llevaron a cabo reuniones con los propietarios/ inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes en julio de 2024 y marzo de 2025, y cuando se solicitaron a lo largo del proceso del proyecto. Se llevo a cabo una segunda reunión pública en mayo de 2025. Los métodos de comunicación se adaptaron para cada evento según el propósito de la reunión y las lecciones aprendidas de eventos anteriores. Se utilizaron varios tipos de notificaciones para cada reunión. A todos los propietarios y inquilinos adyacentes a la Alternativa Preferida (incluso si no se verían directamente afectados) se les envió por correo una notificación y un boletín informativo del proyecto con la fecha, la hora y el lugar de la reunión, tanto en inglés como en español. El boletín también se colocó (a mano) en las puertas de entrada o portones accesibles de todas las propiedades ubicadas junto a las alternativas discutidas en las diversas reuniones. Además, se publicó un aviso público en dos periódicos locales (uno en inglés y otro en español) y tanto el aviso como el boletín se enviaron por correo electrónico a todas las direcciones de correo electrónico disponibles. También se aceptarán y revisarán comentarios del público en cualquier momento a lo largo de la vida del proyecto; sin embargo, solo se documentarán formalmente aquellos relacionados con las reuniones o audiencias públicas. El equipo del proyecto ha hecho todo lo posible para garantizar la transparencia del proyecto y la concientización pública, lo que incluye tanto una amplia difusión de los avisos de reuniones públicas (a través de notificaciones en periódicos y redes sociales) como una distribución específica de avisos e información a los propietarios directamente afectados por el proyecto (mediante el envío directo de avisos por correo y boletines informativos de invitación entregados en mano). La información presentada en cada reunión se desarrolló utilizando los mejores datos disponibles al momento de la reunión. Las alternativas propuestas y la información general se fueron actualizando entre reuniones a raíz de los cambios en las condiciones existentes (debido al desarrollo) y como resultado de los comentarios del público.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Tenga en cuenta que se llevará a cabo una audiencia pública después de que se apruebe el documento ambiental. Esta audiencia se anunciará de la misma manera que las reuniones públicas previas.
266.	Unknown	6/10/2025	Voicemail	Sí, a quién corresponda buenos días. Estoy llamando nada más para decir que no estamos de acuerdo con la calle que quieren abrir en la calle Silver. Este porque se van a ver afectadas muchas personas. Este ahí vive mi hermano y él fue el primero que llegó ahí ahora cómo es posible que les van a quitar les van a quitar su su manera de vivir tranquila ellos ahí están tranquilos. Son personas grandes personas que viven por ahí y no está de acuerdo y lo que se está haciendo que no a otros lugares donde no se afecten tanta gente... Muchas gracias. Translation: Yes, good morning to whom it may concern. I am calling just to say that we do not agree with the street they want to open on Sylvia Street. This one because many people are going to be affected. My brother lives there and he was the first one who arrived there, now how is it possible that they are going to take away their way of living, they are going to take away their peaceful way of living, they are calm there. They are great people who live there and they do not agree with what is being done and not to other places where they will not affect so many people... Thank you very much.	Comments noted. Please note that after the public meeting, the project team revised the alignment along Sylvia Court to minimize impacts to residences. We sent a newsletter in April of 2026 to let all previously affected or adjacent property owners know that the alignment was moved to the north. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Tenga en cuenta que, después de la reunión pública, el equipo del proyecto revisó el diseño a lo largo de Sylvia Court para minimizar el impacto a las viviendas. En abril de 2026 enviamos un boletín informativo para informar a todos los propietarios/inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes que el diseño se había desplazado hacia el norte.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
267.	Luz M. Lopez	6/10/2025	Voicemail	Muy buenas tardes. Solo quiero apoyar la alternativa 3ª. Creo que es una de las alternativas más viables ya que afectaría menos a las familias y el tráfico también porque una de las alternativas está muy cerca de la avenida Horizon y eso es muy problemático. Últimamente hay accidentes casi todos los días. Entonces pienso que con una ruta así eso afectaría demasiado también el tráfico agradecería si siguen apoyando esa vía la 3ª. Gracias. Mi nombre es Luz María López. Translation: Good afternoon. I just want to support alternative 3. I think it is one of the most viable alternatives since it would affect less families and traffic also because one of the alternatives is very close to Horizon Avenue and that is very problematic. Lately there are accidents almost every day So I think with a route like that it would affect the traffic too much also I would appreciate if	Comment noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				you continue to support alternative 3a. Thank you. My name is Luz Maria Lopez.	
268.	Unknown	6/10/2025	Voicemail	Buenas tardes. Mire hablo desde Iowa la ciudad de Iowa solo para comentarles que estoy apoyando a mi hermana Magdalena Chávez que vive en la [REDACTED] en Socorro, El Paso, Texas y a mi cuñado, Luis Rey, a mi sobrino que todavía viven ahí, Héctor Reyes, solo para decirles que esa casa la construyeron cuando no había servicios no había nada no había ganado la luz no había nada. Incluso yo su hermano de Magdalena la que vive ahí en esa casa la dueña, yo ayudé a construir esa casa. Entonces es injusto que quieran desalojar nada más para hacer un Freeway una un Highway o no sé qué y eso va a traer mucho ruido mucho contaminación mucho todo eso no no está bien porque está en medio de la ciudad. Entonces solamente hablo para apoyarlos. Para apoyar a mi hermana a mi cuñado Luis Rey mi hermana Magdalena Rey Luis Rey y Héctor Reyes. Gracias. Hasta luego. Translation: Good afternoon. I am speaking from Iowa City, Iowa, just to tell you that I am supporting my sister Magdalena Chavez who lives at [REDACTED] in Socorro, El Paso, Texas and my brother-in-law, Luis Rey, my nephew who still lives there, Hector Reyes, just to tell you that that house was built when there were no services, there was nothing, there was no electricity, there was nothing. Even I, the brother of Magdalena who lives there, the owner of that house, I helped to build that house. So it is unfair that they want to evict just to build a Freeway, a Highway or I don't know what and that will bring a lot of noise, a lot of pollution, a lot of everything that is not right because it is in the middle of the city. So I only speak to support them. To support my sister, my brother-in-law Luis Rey, my sister Magdalena Rey, Luis Rey and Hector Reyes. Thank you. See you later.	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 158 feet from your home and 108 feet from your property fence. Please note that after the public meeting, the project team revised the alignment at this location to minimize impacts to residences. We sent a newsletter in April of 2026 to let all previously affected or adjacent property owners know that the alignment was moved to the north. Please see additional responses to Comment #s 178, 179, 269, and 270, which also pertain to this property. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Please note that although the proposed Arterial 1 roadway is a four-lane road, it would not be or function as a freeway. The proposed design, including speed limits and similar aspects, would be more similar to Horizon Boulevard. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. No se propone la adquisición de ningún derecho de paso dentro de su propiedad ubicada en [REDACTED]. El borde del pavimento de la vía quedaría a aproximadamente 158 pies de su casa y a 108 pies de la cerca de su propiedad. Tenga en cuenta que, después de la reunión pública, el equipo del proyecto revisó el diseño en esta ubicación para minimizar el impacto a las viviendas. En abril de 2026 enviamos un boletín informativo para informar a todos los propietarios de propietarios/inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes que el diseño se había desplazado hacia el norte. Consulte las respuestas adicionales a los comentarios números 178, 179, 269 y 270, que también se refieren a esta propiedad. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento. Tenga en cuenta que, aunque la vía arterial 1 propuesta es una carretera de cuatro carriles, no sería ni funcionaría como una autopista. El diseño propuesto, incluidos los límites de velocidad y aspectos similares, se asemejaría más al de Horizon Boulevard.
269.	Unknown	6/10/2025	Voicemail	Hola. Mi nombre es Marta Chavez. Este yo quiero apoyar a Magdalena y a Luis Rey porque ellos ya tienen años viviendo en en esta propiedad y ellos no quieren ser este desalojados. Ellos ya son unas personas mayores y y no se pueden mover. Gracias. Translation: Hello, my name is Marta Chavez. I want to support Magdalena and Luis Rey because they have been living in this property for years and they do not want to be evicted. They are already elderly and can't move. Thank you.	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 158 feet from your home and 108 feet from your property fence. Please note that after the public meeting, the project team revised the alignment at this location to minimize impacts to residences. We sent a newsletter in April of 2026 to let all previously affected or adjacent property owners know that the alignment was moved to the north. Please see additional responses to Comment #s 178, 179, 268, and 270, which also pertain to this property. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. No se propone la adquisición de ningún derecho de paso dentro de su propiedad ubicada en [REDACTED]. El borde del pavimento de la vía quedaría a aproximadamente 158 pies de su casa y a 108 pies de la cerca de su propiedad. Tenga en cuenta que, después de la reunión pública, el equipo del proyecto revisó el diseño en esta ubicación para minimizar el impacto a las viviendas. En abril de 2026 enviamos un boletín informativo para informar a todos los propietarios/inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes que el diseño se había desplazado hacia el norte. Consulte las respuestas adicionales a los comentarios números 178, 179, 268 y 270, que también se refieren a esta propiedad.
270.	Unknown	6/11/2025	Voicemail	I am calling in regards to the property on [REDACTED]. That is where my mother in law and my father in law live	Comments noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Based on your address at 551 Sylvia Court, no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 158 feet from your home and 108 feet from your property fence. Please note that after the public meeting, the project team revised the alignment at this location to minimize impacts to residences. We sent a newsletter in April of 2026 to let all previously affected or adjacent property owners know that the alignment was moved to the north. Please see additional responses to Comment #s 178, 179, 268, and 269, which also reference this property.
271.	Claudia Mendoza	6/11/2025	Voicemail	Hello, my name is Claudia Mendoza. I'm calling in regards of I just I have some questions I wanted to know if my address is one of the houses affected by the project. My address is [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] If you can please give me a call back my phone number is [REDACTED]. Thank you.	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 30 feet from your home and 18 feet from your property fence. See the response to Comment #137, which also pertains to this property. If you would like more information about the right-of- way acquisition process, even though your home would not be impacted, please see the link, below: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/
272.	Unknown	6/12/2025	Voicemail	I'm opposing Arterial 1 because I live near here.	Comment noted.
273.	Unknown	6/12/2025	Voicemail	I'm opposing Arterial 1 because I have a business, and it will be affected.	Comment noted.
274.	Annabelle Diaz	6/12/2025	Voicemail	My name is Annabelle Diaz and I'm calling for the Arterial.	Comment noted.
275.	Unknown	6/12/2025	Voicemail	Yes, I'm calling about the arterial project arterial 1 and I'm really against it for several reasons but the main reason is that before you do any other projects you should finish the other ones. So, I'm talking about north loop and Socorro those should take priority over anything else coming in because and in all reality nobody as far as citizens and constituents are going to benefit from this arterial coming in. The only one that will be benefit from it are the developers which includes the warehouses and owners of that but as far as the residents and institutions there's no benefit. Again, North Loop and Socorro need to be widened to four lanes. Both as it is when you have an accident it completely stops traffic which means no emergency vehicles can get through if they need to go to a fire from a house that because the traffic will be stopped anytime there's an accident. Police cannot get through in case of emergency that say somebody's getting attacked or you know that sort of	Comments noted. If approved, the proposed Arterial 1 project is not anticipated to begin construction until 2030; however, this is subject to change. A feasibility study to identify potential improvements to North Loop is in progress, and improvements in the Socorro Road area may be proposed as additional projects. These projects may improve north-south connectivity in the community, while Arterial 1 is intended to improve east-west connectivity. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				thing and as well as the an ambulance if there some medical emergency they can't get through. So, it doesn't make any sense that you all would want to do this arterial through which will only bring big trucks as well large trucks that will cost only more havoc on two already stress North Loop and Socorro road but I really believe you all need to rethink this very thoroughly before even trying to make a material and we definitely don't want it here on Anderson Road. It's a way of life that we have here at the farm. That's why we moved out here. I've been out here 20 years and I sure as heck do not want any more noise pollution and air pollution. Plus, you know we do have burrowing owls out here we have a barn owls as well and along with the fox. You know and a lot of more wild animals that will their habitat will be destroyed. Along with all the traffic and the other thing you all need to keep in mind as well is that it is a farm community and there's livestock, they can get loose which they do they do quite often. They can create an accident that would cause injury or worse worse death. You know so really really rethink this project. Plus, you also have the Clint cut off project coming through which is less than a mile away from Anderson. Does not make sense why you would want another...	between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. The City of Socorro follows Chapter 211 of the Texas Local Government Code (https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/GetStatute.aspx?Code=LG&Value=211), which grants municipalities the authority to regulate land use, building heights, and lot sizes to protect public health and safety. The City implements these state statutes locally through its Unified Development Code (UDC) and Chapter 46 of the Local Ordinances (https://costx.us/local-ordinances/). In compliance with state law, the city's Planning & Zoning Commission (https://costx.us/planning-zoning/) and City Council hold public hearings and issue notifications to property owners before any zoning changes or variances are approved. The City conducted a zoning assessment as part of the Socorro 2040 Comprehensive Master Plan, which included extensive public outreach. There is currently no planned City of Socorro M2 Heavy Industrial Zoning in the area as a result of the project. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Design considerations for farming and ranching operations will be incorporated during the detailed design phase (also known as PS&E phase). This may include the addition of median openings at strategic locations and enhanced safety signage and striping. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: air quality impacts

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					• traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation's (TxDOT's) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. In addition, the City of Socorro is currently conducting detailed design for phase 1 and alternative analysis for phase 2 of the extension of Nuevo Huevo Tanks. However, this alignment is also on the north side of Socorro, between Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard. To the south of Socorro, the following roads currently provide access to the city; however, the routes are not direct or they are too far south to meet the objectives of the proposed project: FM 1110, Clint-San Elizario Road, and Clint Cut-off Road. The proposed Preferred Alternative would connect to I-10 approximately 2.58 miles south (eastbound along I-10) of Horizon Boulevard. This is about halfway between the existing Horizon Boulevard and Clint-San Elizario Road intersections, which meets the objectives of the project.
276.	Berta Salas	6/12/2025	Voicemail	Buenas tardes. Mi nombre es Berta Salas y hablo para detener el proyecto que puede afectar a Socorro, San Eli y Clint. Yo vivo en el área de Socorro. Muchas gracias por tomar en cuenta mi opinión buen día. Translation: Good afternoon. My name is Berta Salas and I am speaking to stop the project that may affect Socorro, San Eli and Clint. I live in the Socorro area. Thank you very much for taking my opinion into consideration good day.	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
277.	Rosa Ramirez de Pedrueza	6/12/2025	Voicemail	Buenas tardes soy Rosa Ramirez de Pedrueza vivo en la calle [REDACTED] [REDACTED] en Socorro, Texas y hablo porque estoy en total desacuerdo del arterial 1 por bastantes puntos. Los principales es por la contaminación que va a generar contaminación ambiental el daño ecológico por el deterioro y la modificación del medio ambiente por un ruido constante por esta carretera por la forma de vida para nosotros los habitantes de este sector por un peligro en la vida y a la tranquilidad que tenemos la comunidad.	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED] no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 138 feet from your home and 100 feet from your property fence. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Somos una comunidad rural la mayoría tenemos ya sea gallinas, caballos, conejos etcétera. Translation: Good afternoon I am Rosa Ramirez de Pedrueza and I live at [REDACTED] in Socorro, Texas and I am speaking because I totally disagree with arterial 1 on several points. The main ones are the contamination that will generate environmental pollution, the ecological damage due to the deterioration and modification of the environment due to the constant noise caused by this highway, the way of life for us, the inhabitants of this sector, the danger to life and to the tranquility that we have in the community. We are a rural community, most of us have chickens, horses, rabbits, etcetera.	various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. See responses to comment #s 72, 128, 259, and 265, which also pertain to this property. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					No se propone la adquisición de ningún derecho de paso dentro de su propiedad ubicada en [REDACTED]. El borde del pavimento de la vía quedaría a aproximadamente 138 pies de su casa y a 100 pies de la cerca de su propiedad. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida. La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento. Las consideraciones de seguridad relacionadas con el proyecto para los usuarios del transporte público seguirán evaluándose e incorporándose a medida que avance el diseño del proyecto. El proyecto debe cumplir con los requisitos de la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA) y con las normas de seguridad vial. El proyecto incluiría un camino de uso compartido independiente para peatones y ciclistas. Además, el proyecto está diseñado para mejorar el tiempo de llegada de los servicios de emergencias debido a la construcción de un puente sobre la vía del tren. No solo reducirá los retrasos causados por el paso de los trenes, sino que eliminará la posibilidad de colisiones entre trenes y automóviles en ese lugar. En

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					cuanto a un posible aumento de la delincuencia, este tema es responsabilidad del Departamento de Policía de la ciudad de Socorro. Consulte las respuestas a los comentarios números 72, 128, 259 y 265, que también se refieren a esta propiedad.
278.	Alma Hemi	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hello, my name is Alma Hemi, and I am a resident of Socorro Texas I want to stay that I support option 3A revised for the arterial one project in Socorro Texas. I also want to voice my opposition to any other alternative routes or no build Alternative. Again, I want to support option 3A revised is the best option for our neighborhood thank you for your time and consideration thank you.	Comments noted.
279.	Surya Kalra	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hello this is Surya Kalra with EPISO and Border interface and I just wanted to support the plan for alternative 3A revised. I think it's a good plan and that there was a lot of listening to the community and working with the engineers to find more suitable route to build the arterial connection. Thank you, you can call me at [REDACTED].	Comments noted.
280.	Rose Zuniga	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hola, Mi nombre es Rose Martín Zúñiga vivo en la calle [REDACTED]. Estoy hablando para dejar mi comentario sobre esta carretera que quieren hacer enfrente de mi casa. Estoy en desacuerdo con esta carretera por la razón que destruiría mi casa apenas tengo 4 meses que la terminamos y haciendo esta carretera usted es la destruyeren la van a estar destruir. No pienso que es lo correcto por la razón de que con mucho esfuerzo hicimos este esta casa espero y escuches mi comentario. Se los agradecería. Muchas gracias. Translation: Hello, My name is Rose Martin Zuniga and I live at [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. I am calling to leave my comment about this road that you want to make in front of my house. I am in disagreement with this road for the reason that it would destroy my house I have just finished it 4 months ago and by making this road you are going to destroy it. I don't think it is the right thing to do because we made this house with a lot of effort and I hope you will listen to my comment. I would appreciate it. Thank you very much.	Comments noted. Please see responses to Comment #'s 60, 206, and 248, which also relate to this property. Your property at [REDACTED] would be directly impacted by the proposed project. The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize and avoid displacements where practicable. The proposed alignment will continue to be refined during the detailed design phase, and the engineering design team will attempt to avoid relocations where practicable. During right-of-way acquisition, the City of Socorro will follow the Federal Highway Administration's right-of-way acquisition process, which includes third-party appraisal, fair market value compensation, and relocation assistance, where applicable. This process will include one-on-one coordination with each affected property owner once the right-of-way acquisition process begins. This process is not anticipated to begin until the schematic is approved and the environmental process is complete. Eminent domain is the least desirable option for the City, and all possible avenues will be taken before this process is implemented. Even in the case of eminent domain, relocation assistance will be available, where applicable. More information regarding this process can be found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Consulte las respuestas a los comentarios números 60, 206 y 248, que también se refieren a esta propiedad. Su propiedad, ubicada en el [REDACTED], se vería directamente afectada por el proyecto propuesto. La alternativa preferida se desarrolló para minimizar y evitar los desalojos donde fuera posible. El diseño propuesto seguirá perfeccionándose durante la fase de diseño detallado, y el equipo de diseño de ingeniería intentará evitar los desalojos donde sea posible. Durante la adquisición de los derechos de paso, la ciudad de Socorro seguirá el proceso de adquisición de derechos de paso de la Administración Federal de Carreteras, el cual incluye una evaluación de terceras partes, una compensación basada en el valor justo de mercado y asistencia para la reubicación, cuando corresponda. Este proceso incluirá una coordinación individual con cada propietario afectado una vez que comience el proceso de adquisición de los derechos de paso. No se anticipa que este proceso comience hasta que se apruebe el esquema y se finalice el proceso ambiental. La expropiación es la opción menos deseable para la ciudad, y se explorarán todas las posibilidades antes de que se implemente este proceso. Incluso en el caso de expropiación, se ofrecerá asistencia para la reubicación, cuando corresponda. Puede encontrar más información sobre este proceso aquí: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/publications/ La ciudad de Socorro está pasando por un rápido crecimiento demográfico y cambios en el uso del suelo debido al desarrollo industrial, comercial y residencial. La ciudad ha registrado un aumento de población de aproximadamente el 13 por ciento entre 2020 y 2025; en comparación, el condado de El Paso ha crecido aproximadamente un 1.4 por ciento entre esos mismos años (datos de las estimaciones de la Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense de la Oficina del Censo de EE. UU.). El proyecto propuesto es necesario para abordar los problemas actuales y previstos de tráfico y la congestión que resultan de este crecimiento.
281.	Carlos Garay	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Yes, my name is Carlos Garay I am a Socorro City resident. I think the best option that the state has selected 3A is the best. I am not in favor of a no built vote. I feel that the Texas DOT has selected the best route to 3A if you have any questions my telephone number is [REDACTED] and my name is Carlos. Thank you for your attention.	Comments noted.
282.	Azulena Reina	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hello, Im a Azulena Reina I have a property at [REDACTED] in the Socorro Texas [REDACTED]. I'm calling to a post the arterial one three a revised because this will have a aggressively negative impact towards the human environment. We have birds we have a lot of nature out there. It will also impact the natural environment and and also the public the public will suffer a lot of great loss and their homes have sentimental value as well as	Comments noted. Your property at [REDACTED] is approximately 0.13 mile from the proposed Arterial 1 right-of-way and would not be affected by the proposed project. Please also see the response to Comment #176, which also references this property.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				the safety in our neighborhood. This will create a lot of pollution in that area we still have birds that migrate in that area and that will disappear if this goes through. This is one of many many reasons as to why I oppose arterial 3a revised. My phone number is [REDACTED].	As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative. The City of Socorro is currently under rapid population growth and land use changes due to industrial, commercial, and residential development. The City has undergone an approximately 13 percent population increase between 2020 and 2025 and by comparison, El Paso County has grown by approximately 1.4 percent between the same years (data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates). The proposed project is needed to address current and projected traffic and congestion as a result of this growth.
283.	Carmen Gonzales	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hola, mi nombre es Carmen González. Yo vivo en Socorro, Texas. Mi dirección es [REDACTED]. Quiero manifestar mi apoyo a la opción 3 a revisada para el proyecto de la arterial uno en Socorro, Texas también quiero expresar mi oposición a cualquier otra ruta alternativa o a una alternativa de no Construir. Reitero mi apoyo a la opción 3a revisada como la mejor opción para nuestro vecindario. Gracias por su tiempo y consideración. Translation: Hello, my name is Carmen Gonzalez. I live in Socorro, Texas. My address is [REDACTED]. I want to express my support for the revised option 3a for the arterial one project in Socorro, Texas I also want to express my opposition to any other alternative route or a No Build alternative. I reiterate my support for the revised Option 3a as the best option for our neighborhood. Thank you for your time and consideration.	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
284.	Mauricio Gonzales	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hello, my name is Mauricio Gonzalez, and I am a resident of Socorro, Texas. I want to state that I support option 3A revised for the arterial one project in Socorro, Texas. I also want to voice my opposition to any other alternative routes or a no build alternative. Again, I want to support option 3A revised as the best option for our neighborhood. Thank you for your time and consideration.	Comments noted.
285.	Henry Cordova	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hello, my name is Henry Cordova and I'm a resident of Socorro, Texas. I want to state that I support option 3A revised for the Arterial one project in Socorro, Texas. I also want to voice my opposition to any other alternative routes or a no build Alternative. Again, I want to support option 3A revised as the best option for our neighborhood. Thank you for your time and attention and consideration.	Comments noted.
286.	Maria E. Cordova	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hi, this is Maria Elena Cordova I live in Socorro, Texas. I want to state that I support option 3A revised for the arterial one project in Socorro, Texas. I also want to voice my opposition to any other alternative routes or a no build alternative. Again, I want to support option 3a revised as the best option for our neighborhood. Thank you for your time and consideration.	Comments noted.
287.	Irma Cordova	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hello, my name is Irma Cordova I'm a resident Socorro, Texas. I want to state that I support option 3A revised for the arterial one project in Socorro, Texas. I also want to voice my opposition to any other alternative routes to know or a no build alternative. Again, I want to support option 3A revised as the best option for our neighborhood. Thank you for your time and consideration.	Comments noted.
288.	Jose Arroyo	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Habla José Arroyo, buenas tardes. Este hablo para decir que yo no estoy de acuerdo con el proyecto Arterial 1 porque afecta el ecosistema en cierta parte iban todos los pájaros al canal de. Además, que tenemos mucha gente adulta y te sugiero que mejor busque la la calle de Clint la FM 110 algo así la amplían esa. Es mi comentario espero que lo atiendan o lo consideren. Muchas gracias. Translation: This is José Arroyo, good afternoon. I'm calling to say that I do not agree with the Arterial 1 project because it affects the ecosystem in certain part all the birds were going to the canal. Also, we have a lot of adult people and I suggest you better look for the street of Clint the FM 110 something like that widen that one. That's my comment I hope you will address it or consider it. Thank you very much.	Comments noted. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					Arterial 1 was identified as part of the Texas Department of Transportation’s (TxDOT’s) August 2015 Border Highway East Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study to provide an additional east/west connection from the City of Socorro to I-10. Currently, the only available east/west road connections in the area (between Socorro Road and I-10) are Loop 375 and Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, which are both on the north side of the City of Socorro. In addition, the City of Socorro is currently conducting detailed design for phase 1 and alternative analysis for phase 2 of the extension of Nuevo Hueco Tanks. However, this alignment is also on the north side of Socorro, between Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard. To the south of Socorro, the following roads currently provide access to the city; however, the routes are not direct or they are too far south to meet the objectives of the proposed project: FM 1110, Clint-San Elizario Road, and Clint Cut-off Road. The proposed Preferred Alternative would connect to I-10 approximately 2.58 miles south (eastbound along I-10) of Horizon Boulevard. This is about halfway between the existing Horizon Boulevard and Clint-San Elizario Road intersections, which meets the objectives of the project. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Como parte del proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el equipo evaluó y documentó los posibles impactos ambientales asociados con diversas alternativas preliminares y viables. Este análisis incluyó la prevención y minimización de los posibles impactos, siempre que fuera factible. El análisis dio como resultado la selección de una Alternativa Preferida que se presentó en la Reunión Pública #2, llevada a cabo el 21 de mayo de 2025. Tenga en cuenta que esta alternativa se ha revisado para minimizar aún más las reubicaciones. Ahora que se ha identificado una alternativa preferida, se llevarán a cabo estudios ambientales detallados para evaluar los posibles impactos en el entorno humano y natural. Estos estudios incluirán, entre otros: • impactos a la calidad del aire • análisis del ruido del tráfico • impactos a los patrones de movilidad de la comunidad (incluyendo la maquinaria agrícola) • impactos a la comunidad y los vecindarios • impactos a el hábitat de especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción • impactos a las aguas bajo jurisdicción de los Estados Unidos La alternativa de No Construir también se mantendrá a lo largo del proceso de la NEPA para compararla con la Alternativa Preferida.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					La Arterial 1 fue identificada como parte del Estudio de Planificación y Vínculos Ambientales (PEL) de la Autopista Fronteriza Este, realizado en agosto de 2015 por el Departamento de Transporte de Texas (TxDOT), con el fin de proporcionar una conexión adicional este-oeste desde la ciudad de Socorro hasta la I-10. Actualmente, las únicas conexiones viales este-oeste disponibles en la zona (entre Socorro Road y la I-10) son la Loop 375 y Buford Road/Horizon Boulevard, ambas ubicadas en el lado norte de la ciudad de Socorro. Además, la ciudad de Socorro está llevando a cabo el diseño detallado de la fase 1 y el análisis de alternativas para la fase 2 de la extensión de Nuevo Hueco Tanks. Sin embargo, este alineamiento también se encuentra en el lado norte de Socorro, entre Loop 375 y Horizon Boulevard. Al sur de Socorro, las siguientes carreteras actualmente permiten acceso a la ciudad; sin embargo, las rutas no son directas o se encuentran demasiado al sur para cumplir con los objetivos del proyecto propuesto: FM 1110, Clint-San Elizario Road y Clint Cut-off Road. La Alternativa Preferida propuesta se conectaría con la I-10 aproximadamente a 2.58 millas al sur (en dirección este por la I-10) de Horizon Boulevard. Esto se encuentra aproximadamente a mitad de camino entre las intersecciones existentes de Horizon Boulevard y Clint-San Elizario Road, lo que cumple con los objetivos del proyecto.
289.	Sophia Bustamante	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hello, my name is Sophia Bustamante I am a resident of Socorro, Texas. I want to express my support for revised option 3A for the arterial one project in Socorro, Texas. I also want to express my opposition to any other alternative routes or no build alternatives. I reiterate my support for revised option 3a as the best option for our neighborhood. Thank you for your time and consideration.	Comments noted.
290.	Karina Bustamante	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hello, my name is Karina Bustamante, and I am a resident to Socorro, Texas. I want to express my support for revision option 3A for the arterial one project in Socorro, Texas. I also want to express my opposition to any other alternative routes or no build alternatives. I reiterate my support for revision option 3A as the best option for our neighborhood. Thank you for your time and your consideration have a good day.	Comments noted.
291.	Linda Hemi	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hello, my name is Linda Hemi and I'm a resident of Socorro, Texas and I want to state that I support option 3A reminds for the arterial one project in Socorro, Texas. I also want to have voice my opposition to any other alternative routes or a no build alternative. Again, I want to support option 3A revised as the best option for a neighborhood. Thank you for your time and consideration bye bye.	Comments noted.
292.	Lucia Estrada	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Sí, buenos días mi nombre es Lucía Estrada, y vivo en el [REDACTED] y estoy hablando acerca del proyecto arterial 1. Para hacerles mi comentario que no estoy de acuerdo con el proyecto que tienen. Ya que como les hemos dicho	Comments noted.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				varias veces somos puras personas de la tercera edad y no estamos en edad para para empezar a reconstruir o a comprar no hay el dinero. Este aparte comentarles pues todo lo que hemos batallado nosotros para tener nuestro hogar pasamos años para que nos pusieran el agua luego muchos hay más para los otros servicios. No para nosotros no es justo no es justo lo que están planeando. Espero y nuestra voz se haga contar. Gracias y que tengan buen día. Translation: Yes, good morning, my name is Lucia Estrada, and I live in [REDACTED] and I am calling in regard to the arterial 1 project. As we have told you several times, we are all senior citizens and we are not old enough to start rebuilding or buying because we don't have the money. We have struggled for years to have our home, we spent years to get water and then there are many more for the other services. It is not fair to us, it is not fair what they are planning. I hope our voice will be heard. Thank you and have a nice day.	Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 160 feet from your home and 105 feet from your property fence. Please note that after the public meeting, the project team revised the alignment at this location to minimize impacts to residences. We sent a newsletter in April of 2026 to let all previously affected or adjacent property owners know that the alignment was moved to the north. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. No se propone la adquisición de ningún derecho de paso dentro de su propiedad ubicada en [REDACTED]. El borde del pavimento de la vía quedaría a aproximadamente 160 pies de su casa y a 105 pies de la cerca de su propiedad. Tenga en cuenta que, después de la reunión pública, el equipo del proyecto revisó el diseño en esta ubicación para minimizar el impacto a las viviendas. En abril de 2026 enviamos un boletín informativo para informar a todos los propietarios/inquilinos de propiedades adyacentes de que el diseño se había desplazado hacia el norte.
293.	Anne Hemi	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hello, my name is Anne Hemi, and I am a resident of Socorro, Texas. I want to say that I support option 3a revised for the arterial one project in Socorro, Texas. I also want to voice my opposition to any alternative routes or no build Alternatives. Again, I want to support option 3a revised as the best option for our neighborhood. Thank you for your time and consideration.	Comments noted.
294.	Francisca Zavala & Juan Zavala	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hola buenos días mi nombre es Francisca Zavala y Juan Zavala y somos residentes de Socorro, Texas. Quiero manifestar de apoyo a la opción 3 a revisada para el proyecto de la arteria 1 en Socorro, Texas. También quiero expresar mi oposición a cualquier otra ruta alternativa o una alternativa de no Construir. Reitero mi apoyo a la opción 3a revisada como la mejor opción para nuestro vecindario. Gracias por su tiempo y consideración. Translation: Hello good morning my name is Francisca Zavala and Juan Zavala and we are residents of Socorro, Texas. I want to express my support for the revised Option 3 for the arterial 1 project in Socorro, Texas. I also want to express my opposition to any alternative route or a No Build alternative. I reiterate my support for the revised Option 3a as the best option for our neighborhood. Thank you for your time and consideration.	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
295.	Luis Cejas	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Sí buenos días. Habla el señor Luis Cejas no es para dejarle mi número de teléfono. Mi número de teléfono de [REDACTED]. Translation:	Comments noted. Your contact information has been added to the list of interested parties.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Yes, good morning. This is Mr. Luis Cejas not to leave you my phone number. My phone number is [REDACTED] .	Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. Su información de contacto se ha agregado a la lista de interesados.
296.	Ernesta Gonzales	6/13/2025	Voicemail	Hello, I currently live in [REDACTED] and I am against that project that includes the area by Skov Road. I don't know what else I am supposed to leave in the message, but I really don't want that to happen. If its possible if somebody needs to contact me please call me back to [REDACTED] and my name is Ernesta Gonzalez. Thank you.	Comments noted.
COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER EXTENDED COMMENT PERIOD					
297.	Veronica Ramirez	6/15/2025	Email	No estamos de acuerdo con la construccion fe esta carretera ARTERIAL 1 Sra.Veronica Ramirez Translation: We do not agree with the construction of this highway ARTERIAL 1 Mrs. Veronica Ramirez	Comment noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
298.	Lorenza Diaz	6/17/2025	Voicemail	Sí buenas tardes Mire Mi nombre es Lorenza Díaz Somos la familia Díaz mi esposo Juan Manuel Díaz quiera manifestar mi apoyo a la opción 3 a previamente revisada para el proyecto de la arteria 1 de en Socorro también quiero expresar mi oposición a cualquier otra ruta o alternativa reitero mi apoyo a la opción 3a revisada como la mejor opción para nuestro vecindario Gracias por todo su atención y consideración mi nombre es lorenza Letizia Díaz a sus órdenes Somos la familia Díaz de aquí de Socorro Texas de la San Isidro Y bona gracias tengan Buena tarde Translation: Good afternoon my name is Lorenza Diaz we are the Diaz family my husband Juan Manuel Diaz would like to express our support for Option 3 previously revised for the arterial 1 project in Socorro. I also want to express my opposition to any route or alternative I emphasize that my support is for option 3a revised as the best option for our neighborhood. Thank you for your attention and consideration	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.
299.	Carlos Silva	6/17/2025	Voicemail	Muy buenas tardes mi nombre es Carlos Silva vivo aquí en [REDACTED] [unclear] Socorro Texas [REDACTED] aquí vivo por la por los años 47 años en mi casa ya soy una persona mayor y estaba viendo el proyecto que que están haciendo ahora en la tercera a Yo pienso que está muy bien por allá allá no va a afectar tanta gente ni y es la mejor opción que pueda haber gracias por todo y espero que que le sigan adelante con ese proyecto de la tercera Muchas gracias Bye Translation: Good afternoon my name is Carlos Silva I live here in [REDACTED] [unclear] Socorro Texas [REDACTED] been living here for 47 years, I am already an old person and I was looking at the project that you are doing now and the 3a I think it is very	Comments noted. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				good over there as it will not affect so many people and it is the best option there can be. Thanks for everything and I hope you go ahead with this project of the 3a. Thank you very much Bye	
300.	Alonzo Velasquez	6/17/2025	Email	My name is Alonzo Velasquez and I stand strong to NOT build this road due to privacy violations and to include it will be no more than a few feet from my house. Lastly this is a 4 way road which means BIG responsibility AND ACCIDENTS to those whom like to cause trouble, drug themselves and MOST IMPORTANT BEHOLD, like to hurt and NOT CARE for public safety. Therefore meaning my family will be affected and included in any accidents happening ARE going to affect us. Lastly, any noise WILL affect me and my neighbors meaning all will have panic, anxiety and maybe heart attacks. DO NOT BUILD Please!!!	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 78 feet from your home and 37 feet from your property fence. Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the team evaluated and documented potential environmental impacts associated with various preliminary and viable alternatives. This analysis included avoidance and minimization of potential impacts where practicable. The analysis resulted in the selection of a Preferred Alternative that was presented at Public Meeting #2, which was held May 21, 2025. Note that this alternative has been revised to further minimize relocations. Now that a Preferred Alternative has been identified, detailed environmental studies will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment. These studies will include, but are not limited to: • air quality impacts • traffic noise analysis • community travel pattern impacts (including farm equipment) • community and neighborhood impacts • threatened and endangered species habitat impacts • jurisdictional waters of the U.S. impacts The No-build Alternative will also be carried forward throughout the NEPA process for comparison against the Preferred Alternative.
301.	Joanna Hernandez	6/17/2025	Email	Mi nombre es Joanna Hdez y soy residente de Socorro. Estoy, aqui para expresor mi desacuerdo en la construccion de 4 carrides que TxDOT y la ciudad proponen. Cerea a nuestra propiedad. Seguin el diseño, esta carnera pasaro a solo unos cuantes pies de nuestra linea de propiedad...	Comments noted. Based on your address at [REDACTED], no right-of-way acquisition is proposed within your property. The edge of the roadway pavement would be approximately 78 feet from your home and 37 feet from your property fence.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
				Uno de los aspectos mas preocupantes es la curva pronunuada que se planea construir, locual representa ungrave peligro para los conductors y una amenana constante para las familias que uiuimos cerea. Mi casa es la mas proxima en la curva, tengo temer par mi familia mis hijos, y a no podremos estar afuera sin el miedo a que algo puede pasar. Como se llega mirar en casas en esquina en vecindarios con una velocidad minima residencial. Que se puede esperar de una carnertera de alta velocidad y tratico pesado y vehiculos de todo tipo. No estoy Deacuerdo. NO ala nueva construction Arterial 1. Translation: My name is Joanna Hernandez, and I'm a resident of Socorro. I'm here to express my dissatisfaction with the proposed construction of four lanes on our property. According to the design, this highway will be just a few feet from our property line... One of the most concerning aspects is the sharp curve that is planned, which represents a serious danger to drivers and a constant threat to the families who live nearby. My house is closest to the curve. I'm afraid for my family, my children, and we won't be able to be outside without the fear that something might hit us. How do you get to look at corner houses in neighborhoods with a minimum residential speed limit? What can you expect from a high-speed highway with heavy traffic and vehicles of all types? I disagree. NO to the new construction of Arterial 1.	Project-related safety considerations for the traveling public will continue to be evaluated and incorporated as the project design progresses. The project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and traffic safety standards. The project would include a separate shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the project is designed to improve emergency response times by bridging the railroad, which will not only reduce delays caused by crossing trains, but will eliminate the potential for train/auto collisions at that location. Regarding potential increases in crime, this issue falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Socorro Police Department. Regarding the curve adjacent to your property, the curve and curve radius meet applicable design standards (the 2024 TxDOT Roadway Design Manual and the AASHTO - A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 2018, 7th edition, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials). Please note that although the proposed Arterial 1 roadway is a four-lane road, it would not be or function as a freeway. The proposed design, including speed limits and similar aspects, would be more similar to Horizon Boulevard. The proposed speed limit of Arterial 1 will be evaluated in more detail as the project design progresses. Please also see the responses to Comment #91, which also pertains to this property. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. No se propone la adquisición de ningún derecho de paso dentro de su propiedad ubicada en [REDACTED]. El borde del pavimento de la calzada quedaría a aproximadamente 78 pies de su casa y a 37 pies de la cerca de su propiedad. Las consideraciones de seguridad relacionadas con el proyecto para los usuarios del transporte público seguirán evaluándose e incorporándose a medida que avance el diseño del proyecto. El proyecto debe cumplir con los requisitos de la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA) y con las normas de seguridad vial. El proyecto incluiría un camino de uso compartido independiente para peatones y ciclistas. Además, el proyecto está diseñado para mejorar el tiempo de llegada de los servicios de emergencias debido a la construcción de un puente sobre la vía del tren. No solo reducirá los retrasos causados por el paso de los trenes, sino que eliminará la posibilidad de colisiones entre trenes y automóviles en ese lugar. En cuanto a un posible aumento de la delincuencia, este tema es responsabilidad del Departamento de Policía de la ciudad de Socorro.

Arterial 1 (1682 Blvd) Public Meeting #2
May 21, 2025 Comment Response Matrix

Comment #	Commenter Name	Date Received	Source	Comment	Response
					En cuanto a la curva adyacente a su propiedad, tanto la curva como su radio cumplen con las normas de diseño aplicables (el Manual de Diseño de Carreteras de TxDOT de 2024 y la "Política sobre el Diseño Geométrico de Carreteras y Calles" de la AASHTO, 2018, 7.ª edición, Asociación Estadounidense de Funcionarios Estatales de Carreteras y Transporte). Tenga en cuenta que, aunque la propuesta vía Arterial 1 sería una carretera de cuatro carriles, no sería ni funcionaría como una autopista. El diseño propuesto, incluyendo los límites de velocidad y aspectos similares, se parecería más al de Horizon Boulevard. El límite de velocidad propuesto para la Arterial 1 se evaluará con mayor detalle en lo que avance el diseño del proyecto. Consulte también las respuestas al comentario número 91, que también se refiere a esta propiedad.
302.	Edith Pantoja	6/30/2025	Voicemail	Buenas tardes Soy Edith Pantoja dueña de la propiedad [REDACTED] este hablo para ver a ver qué es lo que está pasando de las propiedades que hubo unas juntas pero no pude ir porque no me enteré pero por favor márquenme a este mismo número gracias Translation: Good afternoon I'm Edith Pantoja owner of the [REDACTED]. I'm calling to see what's been going on the project. I know there were some meeting but I was not able to attend because I was not notified but please call me to this number.	Comments noted. The project team will follow up with Ms. Pantoja. Translation: Sus comentarios han sido anotados. El equipo del proyecto se pondrá en contacto con la Sra. Pantoja.
303.	Hector Rodriguez	7/2/2025	Email	Good Morning, My name is Hector Rodriguez, I reside at [REDACTED] in Socorro Texas. I am notifying you that I am in support of the NEPA study results to build the Arterial project on preferred alternative 3A. In reviewing the project since the beginning of discussion, it appears the 3A option is the most feasible one. Kindly accept my support of this option. Sincerely, Hector Rodriguez	Comments noted.