The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has determined that the selected build alternative for the NM 41 Project located in Santa Fe County, New Mexico will result in no significant impact to the human or natural environment.

The proposed project includes the reconstruction of NM 41 from Milepost (MP) 46 to MP 62.1. The project includes the reconstruction of the existing highway, the addition of shoulders, the replacement of the bridges over San Cristobal Arroyo and Galisteo Creek, and the addition of various traffic calming measures through the Village of Galisteo. The project is needed to: (1) improve safety of motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists; (2) replace pavement that is in poor condition; and, (3) correct structural and geometric deficiencies with the Galisteo Creek Bridge and San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge.

The project will be constructed in three phases. Phase 1 includes the replacement of the two bridges. Phase 2 includes the reconstruction of NM 41 from MP 46 (Clark Hill) through the community of Galisteo. Phase 3 will reconstruct the roadway from Galisteo to the project terminus at US 285 (MP 62.1). Construction funding has been programmed in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (2012-2015) for the first two phases of the project.

This FONSI is based on the Environmental Assessment (EA), Project Input Synopsis, and FONSI Request prepared by the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT), which have been independently evaluated by the FHWA and determined to adequately and accurately discuss the need, environmental issues, and impacts of the proposed project, and the adequacy of identified mitigation measures. The FHWA takes full responsibility for the accuracy, scope, and content of the EA. The EA, Input Synopsis, and FONSI Request provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required. Issuance of this FONSI provides final environmental authorization for final design of the identified corridor location. The FONSI also authorizes right-of-way acquisition and construction of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the selected build alternative for the NM 41 Project (CN U500010).
Input Synopsis

NM 41
Clark Hill to US 285 (MP 46.1 to MP 62.1)
Santa Fe County, New Mexico

Project No. & CN U500010

Santa Fe County
New Mexico

Federal Highway Administration

July 2012
1.0 Introduction

This document provides a summary of the input received at a public hearing for proposed improvements to NM 41 in Santa Fe County, New Mexico. The information summarized in this document will be used along with the environmental assessment as the basis for the decision by the Federal Highway Administration and New Mexico Department of Transportation to either: (1) conclude the environmental assessment with a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and authorize the project to proceed to final design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction; or, (2) determine that the proposed project would have significant impacts that require the preparation of an environmental impact statement before a final decision is made with regard to project authorization.

The following information is included in this input synopsis:

- A brief description of the proposed project;
- A description of the methods used and process followed to circulate the environmental assessment to agency and public stakeholders for review and comment;
- A summary of comments on the environmental assessment received from agencies and the public, and the NMDOT’s responses to these comments;
- Any changes to the environmental assessment and/or project design features made in response to agency and public comments; and,
- The final list of commitments and mitigation measures that will be implemented as part of the proposed project.

2.0 Proposed Project

The proposed project includes the reconstruction of NM 41 from Milepost (MP) 46 to MP 62.1. The project area is generally rural except for the small community of Galisteo located between MP 56 and MP 57. The project is an undertaking of the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) as Project Number and Control Number U500010. Construction funding has been programmed for two initial phases of the overall project including $4,350,000 in FY 2013 for the replacement of the Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo bridges, and $6,325,000 programmed in FY 2014 and FY 2015 for the reconstruction of NM 41 from Clark Hill (MP 46) to the community of Galisteo. Due to their poor condition, the bridge replacements are considered a high priority action by the NMDOT.

The need for the project is based on identified safety and geometric deficiencies including, but not limited to:

- Structural and geometric deficiencies with the Galisteo Creek Bridge and San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge;
- An absence of safe shoulders for use by motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists;
- Limited stopping sight distance in several locations related to vertical curves; and,
- Poor pavement condition.

The major design features of the proposed improvements to NM 41 include:
Reconstruction of the roadway and the addition of shoulders throughout the project limits. Three typical sections are used including:

- 12-foot lanes and 6-foot shoulders throughout the project limits except for the segment of highway approaching and within the community of Galisteo (MP 55.5 to MP 57.8) and at Clark Hill where a climbing lane is needed (MP 46.3 to MP 46.7).

- The segment of NM 41 within Galisteo (MP 55.5 to MP 57.8) would be reconstructed to include two 11-foot lanes with 4-foot shoulders except for the southern transition point at MP 55.5 to the San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge which would be reconstructed to include 12-foot lanes and 4-foot shoulders. The 12-foot lanes at this location are the transition into the community.

- The highway segment at Clark Hill would also include a 12-foot wide southbound truck climbing lane where NM 41 ascends Clark Hill (MP 46.7 to MP 46.3).

Reconstruction of the San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge and Galisteo Creek Bridge. The bridges would include the removal of the existing bridge structures and the construction of new bridges on the existing alignment. The San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge typical section would include two 12-foot travel lanes, 4-foot shoulders, and a 4-foot walkway along the east side of the bridge. The Galisteo Creek Bridge typical section would include two 11-foot travel lanes, 4-foot shoulders, and a 4-foot walkway along the east side of the bridge. The aesthetic design of the bridge railings for both bridges would be developed to be historically consistent with the existing bridges.

3.0 EA Distribution and Public Notification Process

An environmental assessment (EA) for the proposed project was prepared and was authorized by FHWA for distribution to agencies and the general public on May 2, 2012. Distribution of the EA included the following actions:

1. A copy of the EA was mailed to federal, state, and local agencies with resource management responsibility. Copies were also delivered to other agencies, jurisdictions, and groups having a potential interest in the project. Transmittal of the EA included notice of the location, date, and time of a public hearing. Documents and notices were provided to the following agencies:

   - US Army Corps of Engineers
   - US Fish & Wildlife Service
   - New Mexico Environment Department
   - New Mexico Department of Game and Fish
   - New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs, Historic Preservation Division
   - Santa Fe County Commission (Chairman and District 3 Commissioner)
   - Santa Fe County Planning and Development Department

   Copies of the letters sent to federal, state, and local agencies are included in Attachment A.

2. In addition to the above agencies and jurisdictions, notice of EA availability and information about the public hearing was provided directly to area residents, land owners, and businesses within the corridor. Notices were sent using US Postal addresses and email addresses. The mailing list and
email list included 154 postal addresses and 126 email addresses for a total of 280 addresses. A copy of the notice sent to the public is included in Attachment B.

3. Flyers for the notice of availability and public hearing were posted at several businesses within the communities of Edgewood and Moriarty, New Mexico. These locations were selected to help notify users of NM 41 from these communities.

4. Notices/display advertisements stating availability of the EA and the public hearing were published in the *Santa Fe New Mexican* on May 18, 2012 and *The Independent* on May 16, 2012. Copies of the newspaper advertisements are included in Attachment B.

5. Copies of the EA were placed at four locations available for public review. These include the Galisteo Fire Station (in Galisteo), the NMDOT District 5 offices, NMDOT Environmental Bureau Office, and the FHWA New Mexico Division Office. In addition, two copies of the EA were provided to a board member of the Galisteo Community Association. The EA was also available for review in digital format at the NMDOT website under District 5 projects.

### 4.0 Public Hearing

A public hearing for the proposed project was held June 6, 2012 at the Galisteo Community Center. The community center is located centrally within the project area in the community of Galisteo. Approximately 30 people attended the hearing, excluding project team members.

The hearing started at 6:30 pm with a presentation followed by a public comment period. The presentation included a description of the proposed project, the project purpose and need, a discussion of project alternatives, and a summary of project impacts and mitigation measures. A handout that summarized the same general information as the presentation was provided to all meeting participants. A copy of the presentation and meeting handout are provided in Attachment C.

### 4.1 Summary of Comments Received and Responses to Comments

The comment period for the EA ended July 6, 2012. Thus, 50 days were provided from the date of the latest public notice to the close of the comment period. This included 20 days before the hearing and 30 days following the hearing.

Written comments on the EA were received from 3 agencies and 18 individuals and public groups, some of whom commented at the hearing and then followed up with written comments after the hearing. Comments received from agencies and the public and the NMDOT’s responses to these comments are summarized below. The summary is limited to the key points of the comments and do not include the names of public individuals (for privacy protection). The verbatim verbal comments and copies of the original written comments are provided in Attachment D.

### 4.2 Agency Comments on the EA

Written comments on the EA were received from 3 agencies. Copies of the letters received from these agencies are included in Attachment D. Comment excerpts from these agencies are summarized below.
Agency Comment #1 -- ...In response to your request, the Corps has reviewed those sections of the EA that are applicable to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act including Sections 3.8 to 3.10 (water quality, wetlands and floodplains) as well as 3.12 (Threatened and Endangered Species)...

We concur with the EA’s findings for Alternatives I and 2 regarding water quality (Section 3.8, pp. 25-26). Alternative I uses the existing roadway and bridge location and would not increase the quantity of fills within jurisdictional waters. Should Alternative 2 be used, however, the amount of fill at the Galisteo Bridge site would double since the existing bridge would not be removed and it has two piers within waters of the US. Therefore, the least environmentally damaging proposed alternative (LEDPA) would be Alternative I relative to water quality.

Regarding wetlands (Section 3.9, pp. 26 - 31), both alternatives have similar permanent impacts of less than 0.01 acre of fills. However, Alternative I has 0.013 acre of temporary fills and Alternative 2 will have "negligible temporary impacts". We concur that neither alternative has any significant difference over the other relative to permanent wetland impacts.

Regarding the floodplains (Section 3.10, 31-32), four drainages have Zone A, 100-year flood events. This includes both bridge sites at San Cristobal Arroyo and at Galisteo Creek. The other two drainages are the Arroyo de la Jara (intermittent) and Gaviso Arroyo (ephemeral). Neither Alternative requires that any existing structures be extended within Zone A floodplains. No floodplain impacts would occur because the new bridges at San Cristobal Arroyo and Galisteo Creek would allow passage of I DO-year and SOD-year flow events the same as the existing structures do. The Gaviso Arroyo structure is in good condition and will not be replaced. Neither Alternative I nor 2 require that the existing structures be extended within Zone A and so would have no effect on the floodplains. We concur that neither alternative would have a significant effect over the other regarding floodplains.

Regarding Threatened and Endangered Species (Section 3.12, pp. 36-37), the Southwestern willow flycatcher was observed in one instance at Galisteo Creek. The yellow-billed cuckoo (Candidate species) was not observed but the project area has suitable habitat at Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo bridges. Both alternatives have similar effects on the Southwestern willow flycatcher. According to the EA, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has concurred with the EA’s may affect not likely to adversely affect determination for the Southwestern willow flycatcher. They concurred that the proposed alternatives will be no effect on other protected species. The agency stipulated that the Galisteo Creek Bridge area disturbed during construction would be replanted to match the community type and composition that currently exists at the site.

We encourage the FHWA and NMDOT to continue coordination with the Corps during the planning process to discuss the jurisdictional areas potentially impacted by the NM 41 Alignment Study project.

Response – The comments from the Army Corps of Engineers concur with the findings of the EA and favor Build Alternative 1, which is the preferred alternative. The NMDOT will continue to coordinate with the Corps during the design process to fulfill the requirements of the Section 404 permitting process and to develop compensatory mitigation plans, as appropriate.
**New Mexico Environment Department**

**Agency Comment #2** -- We plan to participate in this project development through review of their 404 permit. Please note that implementation of the improvement project may involve the use of heavy equipment, thereby leading to a possibility of contaminant releases (e.g., fuel, hydraulic fluid, etc.) associated with equipment malfunctions. The GWQB advises all parties involved in the project to be aware of notification requirements for accidental discharges contained in 20.6.2.1203 NMAC. Compliance with the notification and response requirements will further ensure the protection of ground water quality in the vicinity of the project.

**Response** – The NMDOT will include the NMED in the Section 401/404 process during final design. The NMDOT will also notify the contractor of the requirement to comply with the notification requirements of 20.6.2.1203 NMAC. The NMDOT will include standard specifications in the construction bid documents that require contractor compliance with specific measures to protect ground water and surface water.

**Agency Comment #3** -- Construction activities identified in this proposal will create increases in pollutant emissions due to combustion-related construction equipment usage and the disruption of earth. It is important that all facilities, equipment and contractors utilized in the proposed project have the appropriate air quality permits. For more information on air quality permitting and potential modeling requirements, please refer to 20.2.72 NMAC.

For the duration of the project, dust associated with increased vehicular use will also impact local air quality. Dust control measures should be considered to minimize the release of particulates due to vehicular traffic and ground disturbances. Activities resulting in significant ground disturbance should be reclaimed to avoid long-term problems with soil erosion and fugitive dust.

Activities identified in this proposal will increase local emissions and will temporarily impact air quality in the area. It is important that all county and local ordinances are followed for the duration of this project. Negative impacts associated with construction activities identified in this proposal will be minimized if regulations and guidelines identified in this document are followed.

**Response** – The NMDOT will include standard specifications in the construction bid documents that require contractor compliance with the applicable air quality regulations and ordinances related to the minimization of construction-related emissions of dust and other air pollutants. Areas disturbed by construction will be revegetated to help avoid long-term erosion and fugitive dust.

**New Mexico Department of Game and Fish**

**Agency Comment #4** -- ...After conducting a field inspection of the bridges, we concur with the biological report findings that the historic bridges offer minimal to no important bat habitat. We also concur with the biological report finding that the solitary willow flycatcher observed at Galisteo Creek during the first of five protocol surveys in spring of 2010 was likely a migrant because no nesting has since been documented.

Significant riparian vegetation occurs at both bridge locations (Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo), which provides an important wildlife corridor for mule deer, migratory birds and other wildlife. The EA states the amount of riparian vegetation permanently lost at Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo would be minimal, and riparian vegetation would be replaced as part of a compensatory mitigation plan.
for the project. However, because of our observation during the site visit of multiple species of nesting migratory songbirds within the riparian areas immediately adjacent to both bridges, and an active black-chinned hummingbird nest directly beneath the Galisteo Creek bridge, we strongly encourage New Mexico Department of Transportation to conduct project activities (tree clearing and grubbing; bridge demolition and reconstruction activities) outside of the breeding season. We also encourage you to contact the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Migratory Bird Division office in Albuquerque at (505) 248-7882 for their mitigation recommendations.

Response – If practical, the NMDOT will conduct tree removal and other activities that disturb riparian habitat outside of the migratory nesting season. However, due to the length of time required for bridge demolition and construction, it may not be possible to conduct all of the bridge demolition and replacement activities outside of the migratory bird nesting season. If construction activities occur during the nesting season, field surveys for Southwestern willow flycatcher will be conducted weekly in the vicinity of the Galisteo Creek Bridge during the nesting season to identify the presence of nesting activity within the project right-of-way. If Southwestern willow flycatchers or other migratory bird nests are identified, the NMDOT will contact the US Fish & Wildlife Service to discuss needed actions.

4.3 Verbal Comments Received at the Public Hearing

Nine persons commented on the EA and/or asked questions about the proposed project at the public hearing. These comments and the responses from the NMDOT are summarized below. Copies of the comments received from the public are included in Attachment D. Note that some individuals offered several comments. When more than one comment was made by an individual, the comments are designated with letters.

Comment #1-A -- I am in favor of Alternative 1…but I do have a couple questions. First, where will the vertical curve flattening occur and what will the profile look like? Also, how will this affect the roadside area? Would you send me the profiles and the sections?

Response – The segment of the roadway profile with substantive changes to the vertical profile are limited to locations where the existing profile does not meet safe design criteria for a 55 mph posted speed. Major cut or fill locations are limited to the southern-most 6 miles of the project limits (MP 47 to MP 53), although the greatest number and magnitude of cut/fill locations occur south of MP 48.5. The general profile of the highway will retain its existing rolling character although the sharpness of crest and dip curves will be reduced. In locations with substantial cut or fill sections (> 2 feet), the area immediately adjacent to the roadway will be re-graded to maintain a safe roadside design. The grading changes will disturb existing vegetation but will not substantially alter the visual character of the highway. The disturbed areas will be reseeded using vegetation similar to the existing roadway right-of-way. (Note: To aid in the understanding of the above issue, a digital copy of the roadway plan and profile drawings was provided to this commenter on June 7 after the public hearing.)

Comment #1-B -- My second question has to do with the size of the lanes on the bridges and the sidewalk on the bridges. It seems to me to be quite excessive. And I would like to know what your reasons are for making it four-foot shoulder, 12-foot driving lane, plus another 12-foot driving lane, plus another four-foot shoulder, plus the four-foot sidewalk. I didn't quite understand that. You're saying that the shoulder minimum criteria that DOT and the Federal Highway Administration will accept on a bridge is four feet? Also, what is the speed on the bridge? Can exceptions be made through the federal highway authority for historic villages, historic sites, beautiful roadways, rural roadways? It's my impression or my
understanding that that is the case. I've seen it in other states. No one walks across that bridge. And putting that bridge in that condition is not going to invite people and encourage people to walk across it. Is this something we can negotiate with the NMDOT?

Response – The proposed typical section for the San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge includes two 12-foot lanes, 4-foot shoulders, and a 4-foot walkway on the east side of the bridge. The section for the Galisteo Creek Bridge is the same, except that lane widths are reduced to 11-foot. The shoulders are included to provide safe passage by bicycles. Comments in addition to yours have stated similar positions regarding low pedestrian usage. However, other public comments have stated the need for a pedestrian walkway across the bridges. Because bridges are long-term investments and the amount of pedestrian traffic could increase in the future, the NMDOT’s position is that it is prudent and safer to accommodate pedestrian travel with the bridge replacement. The width of the walkway was set to meet minimum requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The proposed bridge designs have included reasonable measures to maintain the scenic and historic context and create a driver perspective of a narrow bridge for traffic calming purposes. These include limiting the sidewalks to one side of the bridge, placing railing between the sidewalk shoulder, and using a bridge railing design that is historically consistent.

Comment #2 -- My comment is on the walkway that you are proposing on the bridges. I agree (with the previous comment) that they are unnecessary. And they're also an invitation to a few kids that we have in the village that like to ride their RVs wherever possible. And that's a really good invitation for them to use that to go down this main highway. That's it.

Response – Please see response to comment #B-1. To prevent the illegal use of the sidewalks by ATVs, the NMDOT will investigate the placement of bollards that prevent ATV entry while still complying with ADA requirements.

Comment #3-A -- Are the old piers under the Galisteo bridge removed? I back up what some of these people are saying. But I do walk over both of those bridges, and especially this one (Galisteo Creek). I live by it and walk by it and over it almost every day. But I do agree that they could be a lot narrower. And I would love to see the sidewalks still raised, because that makes a tremendous difference in how safe you feel. I walk across there with my dog. And being up above the traffic is a huge difference. I mean surely there could be a ramp or something for bikes and everybody.

Response – The existing piers supporting the Galisteo Creek Bridge extend 15 to 20 feet or more below the ground. Their removal will be limited to the first several feet below grade. This is proposed to minimize the amount of disturbance to the stream channel that would otherwise occur if they were completely removed. With regard to the bridge typical sections, please see response to comment #1-B.

Comment #3-B -- What is the schedule for bridge replacement? I live right next to it. Will you give us plenty of advance notification about this?

Response – The bridges are scheduled for start of construction in the fall of 2013 or early spring of 2014. The NMDOT will continue to involve the community during the final design process and will inform the community of the construction schedule when bridge design is complete and the construction bid process begins.
Comment #3-C -- I sort of dislike the suburban look of a median.

Response – Comment noted. Note that other public comments received support the medians.

Comment #4-A -- I am on the board of the community association. My comment is in the form of a suggestion. I understand that, as the design is underway, that you will come out and reach out to people. But I'd like to suggest that perhaps a couple of the established organizations that represent the town have one or two members be members more officially; not necessarily on voting or decision-making, but on a regular ongoing basis, somebody from the board, somebody from the fire department, something like that. That would be good. My concern is just that I think there's going to need to be some dialogue with the design. Going through the village, the four-foot shoulders currently exist in kind of an informal dirt side. But when you get to the edges up around La Tienda and that end of town and when you get to the edges up by some of the existing properties, because a lot of these are historical structures, they're not right angles to the road. And so some of them close in a little bit more. The four-foot shoulder is going to come very close to property. So I think we need to have a discussion and some representation as to how we deal with that. That will just be one issue that's going to come up.

Response – The NMDOT will continue to work with the community, as well as other stakeholders, as the study advances into final design and construction. The NMDOT is willing to include a working group (selected with input from the community association) in periodic design plan reviews to discuss design actions needed to prevent impacts beyond those discussed in the EA.

Comment #4-B -- The other comment would be I would echo what the previous person said. I think over the four years that I've been coming to meetings here, I see a very positive change in the proposals. And I see that a lot of what we've put in, particularly from the survey we did 18 months ago and then gave feedback to the DOT and to your organization, I see a lot of that incorporated here. And I just want to compliment that. So thank you.

Response – Comment noted.

Comment #5-A -- So I am here to represent the Bicycle Coalition of New Mexico…The Bicycle Coalition of New Mexico is very pleased with NMDOT’S commitment to the principles of complete streets in proposing to provide a uniform, smooth-paved surface across New Mexico 41 including shoulders, as well as the use of a relatively bike-friendly rumble strip design where rumble strips are deemed necessary...Number one, the rumble strips should be acceptable for bicycles on the cross-sections with six-foot shoulders but would be very problematic on four-foot shoulders, which does not appear to be planned on New Mexico 41.

Response – The use of rumble strips is limited to the highway segments with a posted speed > 40 mph. Thus, rumble strips will not be used in any of the areas with shoulders less than 6-feet.

Comment #5-B -- There seems to be a discrepancy in the EA between page 52, Commitment 17, "Rumble strips will be narrow, 12 inches," and the statement under Alternative 1, "Rumble strips will be narrow, seven inches." The current NMDOT standard is a 12-inch width and no wider. So presumably the commitment is for a seven-inch wide rumble strip.
Response – The width of the rumble strips will be determined during final design. They will not be wider than 12 inches. If a narrower strip is identified that meets safety and maintenance needs, the NMDOT will consider its use for the NM 41 project.

Comment #5-C -- The second concern and comment, given constraints and lower motor vehicle speeds within the Village of Galisteo, a four-foot shoulder is acceptable and certainly a desirable facility for bicyclists and pedestrians…However, where a cross-section of 12-foot lanes and four-foot shoulders is proposed between the rodeo grounds and the San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge, BCNM respectfully requests that proposed placement of the shoulder stripe be moved in one foot on each side of the road to create a proposed typical section of 11-foot lanes and five-foot shoulders. This request is based on the facts that the desirable minimum width of a shoulder as a bike facility is five feet. Narrow travel lanes, narrower than the AASHTO maximum of 12 feet, are associated with traffic calming, which is desired on approaches to Galisteo village.

Response – During final design, the NMDOT will consider changing the striping plan for the section of NM 41 from the Galisteo Rodeo Grounds to the San Cristobal Bridge from 12-foot lanes with 4-foot shoulders to 11-foot lanes with 5-foot shoulders. This change will be made provided that adverse safety issues are not identified with this change.

Comment #5-D -- The third concern, AASHTO guidelines provide for safe clearance from vertical obstructions call for a shy distance beyond the absolute minimum width of the bike facility. In order to meet these guidelines, please strive to approximate installation and surfacing details in DOT's Standard Drawing 606, which show face of guardrail located well outside of the usable paved shoulder space. The above proposal to move the shoulder stripe in one foot on part of the alignment would resolve this issue on the proposed San Cristobal Bridge cross-section, which currently shows 12-foot lanes with four-foot shoulders to face of concrete barrier. Elsewhere, where roadside barriers leave less than five feet clear space, please consider omitting or adjusting the rumble strip to maximize available clear space.

Response – Guardrail will be placed outside of the 4-foot shoulder where practical. There are some locations within or near the community of Galisteo where this may not be practical due to the effect this could have on slopes adjacent to the highway. Because the NMDOT desires to minimize substantial changes to the roadside, a relatively minor shift in guardrail placement could result in a substantial change in the amount of cut/fill in the existing roadside slopes. This issue will be investigated in greater detail during final design, and practical approaches will be investigated to balance roadside impacts with the safety of highway users.

Comment #6 -- I live in Eldorado and I'm on this road about three times a week all year-round. With the speeds that people drive on this road, which exceed 85 mph at times, having four feet as a safety barrier is the bare minimum. And if the four-foot is the minimum that we will have or the maximum we will have, will that surface be biker friendly as opposed to a rough surface, which is usually the case? The question is can we have the same road surface that is afforded to automobiles?

Response – When a friction course is applied to the highway, it will extend the full-width of the travel lanes and shoulders. This will eliminate the change in pavement surface between the travel lanes and shoulders used on some highways.
**Comment #7** -- I suggest that you restrict truck traffic during the construction phase, indicating alternate routes. Safety and construction costs and what have you, because it's going to be terrible if you have a truck and a bicyclist at the same time among other things.

**Response** – A traffic detouring plan will be developed during final design. Temporary truck restrictions during construction will be implemented by the NMDOT if potential safety conflicts are identified.

**Comment #8** -- I would like to look more at the stopping sight distance issues within the EA and those nine vertical curves, because the proposal to soften the curves may -- may be less soft than what I was hoping. I just want to take a look at that and get a better understanding of it, because I would be concerned to retain as much as possible of the rolling character of the road. And if the road is widened and there are shoulders added to the road, then perhaps some of the cut-and-fill could be minimized.

**Response** – Please see response to comment #1. (Note: To aid in the understanding of the above issue, a digital copy of the roadway plan and profile drawings was provided to this and one other commenter on June 7 after the public hearing.)

**Comment #9** -- There should be a coordinated effort with the County where New Mexico 41 comes into County Road 42, just because this is a pretty important intersection and County Road 42 is now entirely paved. It's now being used by a number of residents and other commuters in this portion of the county. This intersection should be evaluated to make sure that it's functioning properly, that there's no issues with surface treatments and that sort of thing.

**Response** – An analysis of traffic operations conducted during the study phase of the NM 41 project did not identify existing traffic operation issues or projected issues for the 20-year horizon for this intersection. Issues involving design of this intersection will be investigated as part of final design and changes will be made, as needed. This effort will be coordinated with Santa Fe County.

### 4.4 Written Comments from Individuals

Thirteen persons submitted written comments following the public hearing. Four of the 13 persons commenting also made verbal comments at the hearing. The written comments and the responses from the NMDOT are summarized below. As noted for the verbal comments and written comments from agencies, the comments below are summarized and include only the key points of the comment. A copy of the original letter/email is provided in Attachment D.

**Comment #10** -- Please widen this road with shoulders that are safe for cyclists and pedestrians.

**Response** – Comment noted.

**Comment #11** -- Note: Written comments received from the Bicycle Coalition of New Mexico were the same as those read into the record by an individual at the public hearing. Please see comments 5-A through 5-D, above.

**Response** – Responses to the comments from this group were provided in responses to comments 5-A through 5-D.

**Comment #12-A** -- As a cyclist who rides on NM 41 at least twice per week, all traffic includes vehicles that flagrantly disregard speed limits...My fear is that this would continue after the proposed improvements with the lower speed limits. What is needed are “photo vehicles”, unmarked sheriff's vehicles, and other speed impediments.
**Response** – Comments noted. The suggested speed enforcement methods will be forwarded to state and county law enforcement officials for their consideration.

**Comment #12-B** -- Four foot shoulders are a bare minimum for cyclists, considering there is not much option for avoidance of contact with vehicles.

**Response** – Comment noted. The 4-foot shoulder width proposed through the Galisteo community area was selected considering both the need to provide for the safety of highway users and the desire to maintain the historic and scenic character of the area.

**Comment #13-A** -- Note: The first written comment received from this individual are the same as those made verbally at the public hearing. Please see comment #1-A and 1-B, above.

**Response** – See response to comments #1-A and 1-B.

**Comment #13-B** -- Oil tankers, semi-trucks (40'), and other large trucks are using County Road 42.

**Response** – Your comment will be provided to Santa Fe County. County Road 42 is under the jurisdiction of Santa Fe County.

**Comment #14** -- Why is the NMDOT catering to the bicyclists who endanger themselves and the rest of us because they like NM 41?

**Response** – The proposed roadway section for NM 41 was developed considering all stakeholders. These stakeholders include, but are not limited to, motorists and bicyclists who use the highway for commuting and recreation, the landowners and residents within the corridor, school buses, and others. The proposed design does not favor anyone group. Rather, the NMDOT strived to balance the interests of all stakeholders and to provide a safe facility for all users.

**Comment #15** -- I am in favor of Alternative 1. I am pleased that bicyclists have been considered on this project for their safety as well as the motorists. I am in favor of the walkways on the bridges. I enjoy walking every day and will feel safer if this is included.

**Response** – Comments noted.

**Comment #16** -- I've been riding County Rd 41 for years. The current state of the road is poor and the shoulder inadequate. It can be downright scary at times. I hope the project is approved to widen the road to Clark Hill.

**Response** – Comment noted.

**Comment #17** -- I am a cyclist and use the road often. Like most Santa Fe cyclists, I find the meetings that you hold in the evenings in Galisteo terribly inconvenient. As a result, I think that the attendees from Galisteo are over-represented at the meetings. On behalf of the many cyclists who use the road, I ask that you make safety the prime consideration and make the road wide enough to safely accommodate both vehicles and cyclists.

**Response** – Comment noted.

**Comment #18** -- Love the medians at both ends of the Village, but could they be narrower than 20 feet? …How about 15 feet?

**Response** – The median width was set for a specific curvature consistent with the desired design speed for the village transition zones. A slight reduction in median width would not change the design speed excessively and could be offset by the overall traffic calming benefits of the median. The NMDOT will consider a narrower median width during the final design phase.
Comment #19-A -- I would have preferred severe speed and weight restrictions, with exceptions for emergency vehicles, to replacement of the two bridges. However, of the choices presented, I believe alternative 1 is the best, particularly if the width of the bridges could be confined to 11' driving lanes and 4' shoulders, eliminating the walkways. It seems to me that the wider the bridges appear, the faster an approaching driver is encouraged to go. Slimming the driving lanes on the San Cristobal bridge from 12' to 11' would be no more dangerous than the proposed 11' lanes on the Galisteo creek bridge, particularly if the shoulders approaching the bridge could be narrowed to 4' as a visual warning of the slimmer roadway to come. While the proposed 4' pedestrian walkway is a pleasant idea, I believe that the 4' shoulders are sufficient and that a slimmer bridge is more in keeping with the scale of the community.

Response – Please see response to comment #1-B for the comment about the sidewalk on the bridges. Because the San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge is beyond the community limits/historic district and is the transition zone where the 55 mph speed is reduced to 45 mph, wider lanes are proposed (as compared to the Galisteo Creek Bridge).

Comment #19-B -- It looks to me as if the cutting and filling proposed for some scenic and rolling sections of the road is excessive. There appear to be roughly twelve alterations between two and a half and five feet, four between five and ten feet and two of greater than ten feet. I think it has been demonstrated that widening and straightening of roadways in the hope of making them safer may actually have the opposite effect; drivers tend to fly along at the highest speed they consider comfortable, so wider and straighter roads may simply encourage higher speeds with no significant positive effect on safety. Please don't give us another, slightly thinner, version of the roughly parallel 84/285 cutting through the Galisteo basin. Addressing safety issues, the proposed 6' wide shoulders (I would prefer 5') will give drivers added room for evasive maneuvering and reduce the perceived need for drastic cutting and filling. Therefore, in order to preserve some of the rural and scenic nature of NM 41, which tourism and economic development interests as well as local residents consider important, I hope that the most invasive cuts and fills can be significantly reduced.

Response – The rolling character of NM 41 near Clark Hill will be preserved (see response to Comment #1-A). The designed proposed for NM 41 is significantly different than that used for US 285 between Lamy and Clines Corner. The typical section of that roadway includes 12 foot lanes with 8 foot shoulders and the profile was designed to safely accommodate 65 mph driving speeds. In contrast, the proposed section for NM 41 is 12 foot lanes with 6 foot shoulders and the profile is for a posted speed of 55 mph — a speed that allows substantially sharper vertical curvature.

Comment #19-C -- I find that Alternative 1 would be acceptable. I both drive and ride my bicycle through the NM 41 corridor. The lane widths for both bicycles and cars have been reduced somewhat from the standard. There should not be any further reductions in lane widths. Any reduction in bicycle lane widths or traffic lane widths will put walkers and bicyclists in danger. Do pave the entire roadway with a finish course for all the 4-foot bicycle lane/shoulder width to be useable.

Response – Your alternative preference is noted. The friction course is limited to the areas of NM 41 with a posted speed > 45 mph. Thus, the shoulder width will not be affected in areas where 4-foot shoulders are proposed, i.e., within the community where posted speeds are 35 mph or less.

Comment #20 -- I live cheek by jowl with the Galisteo bridge, and hope that care is taken not to remove any more trees than necessary (for obvious ecological reasons, and also because I depend on them to shield me from the highway) and that there will be minimal disturbances of wildlife. I walk across the bridge weekly and have advocated in meetings that the walkway be raised as it is now; it makes
pedestrians feel far safer than a railing on the same level, however hefty. I also hope that the idea of "medians" is not being seriously considered. Again, the urban/suburban look (not to mention huge widening of the roads) is incompatible with a rural village.

Response – While some loss and disturbance of roadside vegetation/trees is an unavoidable consequence of road and bridge construction, restrictions will be included in the construction plans to minimize disturbance to that required for construction and equipment operation. Disturbed areas will be reseeded after construction is completed and the mitigation plans for riparian areas will include tree and vegetation replanting. The use of a slightly elevated sidewalk will be considered during final design and discussed with the community.

5.0 Changes to the Proposed Action in Response to Comments

No comments were received during the EA review period that resulted in changes to the proposed project or the selection of Alternative 1 as the preferred alternative. Consequently, Alternative 1 is the selected alternative. Requests were made for the NMDOT to consider minor changes to the roadway typical section specific to the use of 11-foot lanes in place of 12-foot lanes between MP 55.5 and the San Cristobal Creek Bridge at MP 55.7 (including the bridge typical section). Alternatively, a request was made to consider striping the roadway so that 11-foot lanes with 5-foot shoulders are used in this segment rather than 12-foot lanes with 4-foot shoulders. After considering these requests, the NMDOT has decided to investigate the requested change to stripe the roadway using 11-foot lanes and 5-foot shoulders between MP 55.5 and MP 55.7. If this change is made, there would be no change in the impacts identified by the EA. Other suggested changes (raised sidewalk across the bridges and slightly narrower medians at the two proposed medians) are minor and would not affect the operation or impacts of the proposed project. These changes will be investigated during final design and the NMDOT Design Team will inform the community and New Mexico Bicycle Coalition of their findings and decisions.

6.0 Summary of Commitments

The following mitigation measures are commitments made by NMDOT and FHWA and will be implemented as stipulations and provisions included in contracts between NMDOT and the design and construction contractors.

6.1 Design Phase Commitments

1. The NMDOT will work with the Galisteo Community Association to identify a citizen working committee to represent the overall community. The NMDOT will hold meetings with this committee during final design and at design milestones.

2. The NMDOT will reconsider the roadway and bridge typical section for the segment of NM 41 between MP 55.5 and MP 55.7 (Rodeo Grounds to the San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge). During final design, the NMDOT will consider striping the roadway with 11-foot lanes and 5-foot shoulders in lieu of 12-foot lanes and 4-foot shoulders. The profile of the sidewalks will also be assessed to determine the feasibility of raising the sidewalk above the road level.

3. The NMDOT Environmental Geology Bureau (EGB) will complete an Initial Site Assessment for the selected alternative. Any recommendations for additional investigations will be completed and resolved in final design.
4. A traffic control plan to maintain traffic during construction will be developed during project final design.

5. A Preconstruction Notification for a Clean Water Act (CWA) Nationwide Permit 14 will be submitted to the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) during final design. An application will also be submitted to the New Mexico Environment Department Surface Water Quality Bureau for water quality certification under Section 401 of the CWA. During final design, NMDOT will determine temporary and permanent fill amounts and surface area within the ordinary high water mark, determine impacts to wetlands and riparian habitat, and develop a wetland mitigation plan and compensatory mitigation plan in consultation with the USACE.

6. Archaeological sites LA 150613, LA 167739, LA 168909, LA 168910, LA 168912, LA 168913, and LA 168914 will be protected from construction activities by the placement of temporary fencing between the sites and the construction zone.

7. The final assessment of impacts to Section 4(f) resources and need for a Section 4(f) evaluation will be determined by the FHWA.

8. If it is determined during final design that the Official Scenic Historic Marker at MP 56.4 will be impacted by the project, the marker will be temporarily removed during construction and replaced as close to the original location as the project design will allow. This activity will occur in consultation with the Cultural Properties Review Committee as per New Mexico Administrative Code 4.10.6.

9. The aesthetic design of the bridge railings will be developed to be historically consistent with the existing bridges.

10. Pedestrian crossings designated by colored or patterned concrete and/or pavement striping are to be included at two locations within Galisteo. The location of these pedestrian crossings will be determined during final design and in collaboration with the community.

6.2 Construction Phase Commitments

1. The NMDOT Standard Specifications for Highway and Bridge Construction (2007 Edition, Sections 104, 107, and 603) include mitigation requirements for the issues listed below. These specifications are commitments that will be implemented during project design and construction.
   a. The requirement to stop work in the event of an environmental or cultural resource discovery and notification of NMDOT personnel;
   b. The implementation of air quality and dust control abatement measures during construction;
   c. The implementation of noise abatement measures for construction equipment;
   d. The reporting and cleanup of any hazardous materials, such as contaminated soils or landfill waste, within the construction area; and
   e. Minimization of soil disturbance and erosion control and revegetation requirements.

2. The requirements of the most current U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Construction General Permit issued February 16, 2012, will be implemented during project design and construction. This includes the implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and best management practices (BMPs) in accordance with current NPDES regulations.
3. Acquisition of right-of-way will be in accordance with the policies of the NMDOT and the Uniform Relocation Assistance, the Real Property Acquisitions Act, and other applicable federal and state legislation.

4. Water quality protection features such as a combination of straw bale walls and filter fences will be placed around the portions of the Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo wetlands that are not within the proposed construction limits. This barrier will be installed prior to any other work undertaken at this site, and all subsequent construction activities will be within the work zone delineated by the fence.

5. Upon completion of construction, the areas disturbed, but not physically occupied, by the roadbed will be seeded with certified weed-free native plant species representative of species currently in the project area.

6. Areas with class A or B noxious weeds will be treated according to District 5 practices by staff trained and certified in the appropriate herbicide. Scotch thistle, a Class A noxious weed, is located at MP 46.1 and MP 59.5 on the west side on NM 41. Tree-of-heaven, a Class B noxious weed, is located on the east side of NM 41 at MP 56.45.

7. In order to prevent the spread of noxious weeds occurring within or near the project area, the contractor shall ensure that all equipment is cleaned prior to working in the project area, after every use in areas where noxious weeds are present, and again before leaving the project area.

8. Bat boxes will be installed at Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo.

9. The decorative mailboxes north of Via La Puente will be removed during construction and replaced after the completion of construction at the outside edge of the NMDOT right-of-way.

10. A pavement friction course (open-graded asphalt) and longitudinal rumble strips at the edge of the driving lanes are proposed for all highway segments with a posted speed of 55 mph. The friction course will extend the full width of the driving lanes and shoulders to avoid interference with bicycle travel on the shoulder. Rumble strips will be narrow (12” or less) and intermittent to maximize the area available for bicycle travel.

11. To the extent possible, mature trees with a trunk of 12” or more in diameter will be preserved.

12. Prior to commencement of construction, photos of the project area at Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo will be taken and provided to the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

13. Construction will be minimized in the riparian areas to the minimum needed to accomplish the project.

14. Clearing and grubbing will be minimized in riparian areas to the minimum needed to accomplish the project. If possible, all tree, shrub, and brush clearing within the project area will be accomplished outside of the nesting season for Southwestern willow flycatchers and other migratory birds.

15. A biological monitor will be on site once a week during construction during the Southwestern willow flycatcher migratory season to survey for the presence of Southwestern willow flycatchers and nests in the right-of-way. If Southwestern willow flycatchers or nests are located, the US Fish and Wildlife Service will be contacted immediately. If any nests will be monitored, nest monitoring will only be conducted by biologists permitted for that activity. This biological monitor will also be utilized to ensure that construction workers are aware of all sensitive area.
monitor may also assist in determining rehabilitation needs and standards to reduce impacts from the construction activities.

16. During Southwestern willow flycatcher surveys (preconstruction and during construction), any nests located within the right-of-way will be recorded. If nests are located, all construction activities should avoid Southwestern willow flycatcher nests to the extent possible.

17. Best management practices will be utilized to minimize disturbance to the Southwestern willow flycatcher during all construction activities. If Southwestern willow flycatchers are located within the project area these best management practices will include not starting construction activities within the vicinity of the Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo bridges until after 9 am each day during the Southwestern willow flycatcher nesting season since Southwestern willow flycatchers call earlier in the morning.

18. Following construction, an update will be provided to the US Fish and Wildlife Service that includes total acres of habitat affected and photographs of the project areas. If Southwestern willow flycatchers were found during surveys, this update will also include individual Southwestern willow flycatchers or nests impacted by construction activities.

19. Best management practices will be utilized to minimize impacts to water quality in Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo. These best management practices include use of erosion control measures (such as silt fence, compost socks, etc.) placed around the construction area; no equipment will be parked in the work area overnight; equipment will be cleaned and checked for leaks prior to accessing the floodplain area; and staging areas and fuel storage for equipment will not be located within 100 feet of Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo.

20. Post-construction restoration of impacted riparian and wetland vegetation within the project area will occur. A wetland and riparian mitigation plan will be developed and provided to the US Army Corps of Engineers with the Clean Water Act Section 404 Nationwide Permit pre-notification application.

7.0 Findings and Conclusion

Based on the analyses conducted for the environmental assessment and review and consideration of comments received from agencies and the public, the NMDOT finds that the proposed action:

- satisfies the identified needs for transportation improvements;
- was conducted with appropriate public input and agency involvement;
- includes measures to minimize social, economic, and environmental impacts; and,
- would not have significant impacts to the human or natural environment.

In addition, the analyses and comments by agencies and the public have not identified impacts that could be considered as significant. While impacts, both beneficial and adverse, were identified for the proposed action, adverse impacts are localized and do not outweigh the overall benefit that will result to the users, community, and state by the proposed action. Compelling information that would alter these findings was not received from the reviewing agencies or the public.

Based on the above findings, the NMDOT will request that the Federal Highway Administration conclude the environmental assessment with a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and that Alternative 1 be the selected Alternative.
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Attachment A:
Agency EA Notice of Availability
May 14, 2012

Wally Murphy, Field Supervisor
US Fish and Wildlife Service, New Mexico Ecological Services Field Office
2105 Osuna Road NE
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87113

Re: Notice of Availability of an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Improvements to NM 41, Milepost 46.1 to Milepost 62.1, From Clark Hill North of Stanley to the NM 41/US 285 South of Lamy, Santa Fe County, New Mexico (Project and Control No. U500010)

Mr. Murphy:

The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT), along with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), proposes to make improvements to NM Highway 41 from Clark Hill to the intersection with US Highway 285 through Galisteo, New Mexico (Mileposts 46.1 to 62.1). An environmental assessment (EA) for the proposed project has been prepared, and a copy is enclosed for the Fish and Wildlife Service's review and comment.

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide safety improvements to the roadway including the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo. The need for the project includes structurally deficient bridges, absence of shoulders, and limited visibility due to vertical curves.

Two build alternatives and the No Build Alternative are under consideration. Proposed roadway improvements are the same for both build alternatives and include adding shoulders, reducing vertical curves, and installing traffic calming measures within the community of Galisteo. The primary difference between the two build alternatives is replacing the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo, either on the same alignment or on a parallel alignment. The EA provides detailed information about the purpose and need for the proposed improvements, the major design features of each alternative under consideration, and the impacts to the human and natural environments and cultural resources that would result from each of the alternatives under consideration.

A public hearing for the proposed project will be held on Wednesday, June 6, 2012 from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM at the Galisteo Community Center (35 County Road 33A in Galisteo). Additional information about the public hearing is in the attached flyer. The public hearing will provide a summary of the EA and an opportunity for the public to comment on the EA and the proposed alternatives. Comments will also be received on bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian issues, as well as natural and cultural resources. Project displays, information, and project representatives will be available at the hearing starting at 6:00 PM. A presentation will start at
6:30 PM followed by a formal public comment period during the hearing. A court reporter will be present during the formal comment period to record public comments.

We welcome the Fish and Wildlife Service’s participation at the public hearing and comments on the EA. Please send comments on the EA to Parsons Brinckerhoff, 6100 Uptown Boulevard NE, Suite 700, Albuquerque, NM 87110, Attn: NM 41 Corridor Improvements. Alternatively, comments may be faxed to (505) 881-7602 or emailed to TibbettsD@pbworld.com. Comments on the EA are requested by July 6, 2012.

For questions or additional information, please contact me at (505) 476-4232 or our consultant, David Pennington with Parsons Brinckerhoff, at (505) 881-5357.

Sincerely,

Phillip Gallegos, P.E.
Assistant District Engineer for Engineering
NMDOT District 5

cc: David Pennington, Parsons Brinckerhoff
May 14, 2012

Allan Steinle, Chief, Regulatory Division, Albuquerque District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
4101 Jefferson Plaza NE
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87109-3435

Re: Notice of Availability of an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Improvements to NM 41, Milepost 46.1 to Milepost 62.1, From Clark Hill North of Stanley to the NM 41/US 285 South of Lamy, Santa Fe County, New Mexico (Project and Control No. U500010)

Chief Steinle:

The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT), along with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), proposes to make improvements to NM Highway 41 from Clark Hill to the intersection with US Highway 285 through Galisteo, New Mexico (Mileposts 46.1 to 62.1). An environmental assessment (EA) for the proposed project has been prepared, and a copy is enclosed for the Corps of Engineers’ review and comment.

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide safety improvements to the roadway including the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo. The need for the project includes structurally deficient bridges, absence of shoulders, and limited visibility due to vertical curves.

Two build alternatives and the No Build Alternative are under consideration. Proposed roadway improvements are the same for both build alternatives and include adding shoulders, reducing vertical curves, and installing traffic calming measures within the community of Galisteo. The primary difference between the two build alternatives is replacing the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo, either on the same alignment or on a parallel alignment. The EA provides detailed information about the purpose and need for the proposed improvements, the major design features of each alternative under consideration, and the impacts to the human and natural environments and cultural resources that would result from each of the alternatives under consideration.

A public hearing for the proposed project will be held on Wednesday, June 6, 2012 from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM at the Galisteo Community Center (35 County Road 33A in Galisteo). Additional information about the public hearing is in the attached flyer. The public hearing will provide a summary of the EA and an opportunity for the public to comment on the EA and the proposed alternatives. Comments will also be received on bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian issues, as well as natural and cultural resources. Project displays, information, and project representatives will be available at the hearing starting at 6:00 PM. A presentation will start at
6:30 PM followed by a formal public comment period during the hearing. A court reporter will be present during the formal comment period to record public comments.

We welcome the Corps of Engineers’ participation at the public hearing and comments on the EA. Please send comments on the EA to Parsons Brinckerhoff, 6100 Uptown Boulevard NE, Suite 700, Albuquerque, NM 87110, Attn: NM 41 Corridor Improvements. Alternatively, comments may be faxed to (505) 881-7602 or emailed to TibbettsD@pbworld.com. Comments on the EA are requested by July 6, 2012.

For questions or additional information, please contact me at (505) 476-4232 or our consultant, David Pennington with Parsons Brinckerhoff, at (505) 881-5357.

Sincerely,

Phillip Gallegos, P.E.
Assistant District Engineer for Engineering
NMDOT District 5

cc: David Pennington, Parsons Brinckerhoff
May 14, 2012

Liz Stefanics, Chair
Santa Fe Board of County Commissioners
102 Grant Avenue
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Re: Notice of Availability of an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Improvements to NM 41, Milepost 46.1 to Milepost 62.1, From Clark Hill North of Stanley to the NM 41/US 285 South of Lamy, Santa Fe County, New Mexico (Project and Control No. U500010)

Commissioner Stefanics:

The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT), along with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), proposes to make improvements to NM Highway 41 from Clark Hill to the intersection with US Highway 285 through Galisteo, New Mexico (Mileposts 46.1 to 62.1). An environmental assessment (EA) for the proposed project has been prepared, and a hardcopy of the report is enclosed for your review and comment. The EA can also be viewed at and downloaded from the project website at http://dot.state.nm.us/ProjectsD5.html, or a CD with the EA can be obtained upon request.

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide safety improvements to the roadway including the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo. The need for the project includes structurally deficient bridges, absence of shoulders, and limited visibility due to vertical curves.

Two build alternatives and the No Build Alternative are under consideration. Proposed roadway improvements are the same for both build alternatives and include adding shoulders, reducing vertical curves, and installing traffic calming measures within the community of Galisteo. The primary difference between the two build alternatives is replacing the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo, either on the same alignment or on a parallel alignment. The EA provides detailed information about the purpose and need for the proposed improvements, the major design features of each alternative under consideration, and the impacts to the human and natural environments and cultural resources that would result from each of the alternatives under consideration.

A public hearing for the proposed project will be held on Wednesday, June 6, 2012 from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM at the Galisteo Community Center (35 County Road 33A in Galisteo). Additional information about the public hearing is in the attached flyer. The public hearing will provide a summary of the EA and an opportunity for the public to comment on the EA and on proposed alternatives. Comments will also be received on bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian
issues, as well as natural and cultural resources. Project displays, information, and project representatives will be available at the hearing starting at 6:00 PM. A presentation will start at 6:30 PM followed by a formal public comment period during the hearing. A court reporter will be present during the formal comment period to record public comments.

We welcome your participation at the public hearing and comments on the EA. Please send comments on the EA to Parsons Brinkerhoff, 6100 Uptown Boulevard NE, Suite 700, Albuquerque, NM 87110, Attn: NM 41 Corridor Improvements. Alternatively, you may fax your comments to (505) 881-7602 or email them to TibbettsDr@pbworld.com. Comments on the EA are requested by July 6, 2012.

If you have questions or need additional information, please contact me at (505) 476-4232 or our consultant, David Pennington with Parsons Brinkerhoff, at (505) 881-5357.

Sincerely,

Phillip Gallegos, P.E.
Assistant District Engineer for Engineering
NMDOT District 5

cc: David Pennington, Parsons Brinkerhoff
May 14, 2012

Robert A. Anaya, Commissioner District 3
Santa Fe Board of County Commissioners
102 Grant Avenue
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Re: Notice of Availability of an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Improvements to NM 41, Milepost 46.1 to Milepost 62.1, From Clark Hill North of Stanley to the NM 41/US 285 South of Lamy, Santa Fe County, New Mexico (Project and Control No. U500010)

Commissioner Anaya:

The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT), along with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), proposes to make improvements to NM Highway 41 from Clark Hill to the intersection with US Highway 285 through Galisteo, New Mexico (Mileposts 46.1 to 62.1). An environmental assessment (EA) for the proposed project has been prepared, and a hardcopy of the report is enclosed for your review and comment. The EA can also be viewed at and downloaded from the project website at http://dot.state.nm.us/ProjectsD5.html, or a CD with the EA can be obtained upon request.

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide safety improvements to the roadway including the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo. The need for the project includes structurally deficient bridges, absence of shoulders, and limited visibility due to vertical curves.

Two build alternatives and the No Build Alternative are under consideration. Proposed roadway improvements are the same for both build alternatives and include adding shoulders, reducing vertical curves, and installing traffic calming measures within the community of Galisteo. The primary difference between the two build alternatives is replacing the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo, either on the same alignment or on a parallel alignment. The EA provides detailed information about the purpose and need for the proposed improvements, the major design features of each alternative under consideration, and the impacts to the human and natural environments and cultural resources that would result from each of the alternatives under consideration.

A public hearing for the proposed project will be held on Wednesday, June 6, 2012 from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM at the Galisteo Community Center (35 County Road 33A in Galisteo). Additional information about the public hearing is in the attached flyer. The public hearing will provide a summary of the EA and an opportunity for the public to comment on the EA and on proposed alternatives. Comments will also be received on bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian...
issues, as well as natural and cultural resources. Project displays, information, and project representatives will be available at the hearing starting at 6:00 PM. A presentation will start at 6:30 PM followed by a formal public comment period during the hearing. A court reporter will be present during the formal comment period to record public comments.

We welcome your participation at the public hearing and comments on the EA. Please send comments on the EA to Parsons Brinckerhoff, 6100 Uptown Boulevard NE, Suite 700, Albuquerque, NM 87110, Attn: NM 41 Corridor Improvements. Alternatively, you may fax your comments to (505) 881-7602 or email them to TibbettsD@pbworld.com. Comments on the EA are requested by July 6, 2012.

If you have questions or need additional information, please contact me at (505) 476-4232 or our consultant, David Pennington with Parsons Brinckerhoff, at (505) 881-5357.

Sincerely,

Phillip Gallegos
Assistant District Engineer for Engineering
NMDOT District 5

cc: David Pennington, Parsons Brinckerhoff
May 14, 2012

Jan Biella, State Historic Preservation Officer
New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs, Historic Preservation Division
407 Galisteo Street, Suite 236
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Re: Notice of Availability of an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Improvements to NM 41, Milepost 46.1 to Milepost 62.1, From Clark Hill North of Stanley to the NM 41/US 285 South of Lamy, Santa Fe County, New Mexico (Project and Control No. U500010)

Ms. Biella:

The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT), along with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), proposes to make improvements to NM Highway 41 from Clark Hill to the intersection with US Highway 285 through Galisteo, New Mexico (Mileposts 46.1 to 62.1). An environmental assessment (EA) for the proposed project has been prepared, and a copy is enclosed for the Historic Preservation Division's review and comment.

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide safety improvements to the roadway including the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo. The need for the project includes structurally deficient bridges, absence of shoulders, and limited visibility due to vertical curves.

Two build alternatives and the No Build Alternative are under consideration. Proposed roadway improvements are the same for both build alternatives and include adding shoulders, reducing vertical curves, and installing traffic calming measures within the community of Galisteo. The primary difference between the two build alternatives is replacing the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo, either on the same alignment or on a parallel alignment. The EA provides detailed information about the purpose and need for the proposed improvements, the major design features of each alternative under consideration, and the impacts to the human and natural environments and cultural resources that would result from each of the alternatives under consideration.

A public hearing for the proposed project will be held on Wednesday, June 6, 2012 from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM at the Galisteo Community Center (35 County Road 33A in Galisteo). Additional information about the public hearing is in the attached flyer. The public hearing will provide a summary of the EA and an opportunity for the public to comment on the EA and the proposed alternatives. Comments will also be received on bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian issues, as well as natural and cultural resources. Project displays, information, and project representatives will be available at the hearing starting at 6:00 PM. A presentation will start at
6:30 PM followed by a formal public comment period during the hearing. A court reporter will be present during the formal comment period to record public comments.

We welcome the Historic Preservation Division’s participation at the public hearing and comments on the EA. Please send comments on the EA to Parsons Brinckerhoff, 6100 Uptown Boulevard NE, Suite 700, Albuquerque, NM 87110, Attn: NM 41 Corridor Improvements. Alternatively, comments may be faxed to (505) 881-7602 or emailed to TibbettsD@pbworld.com. Comments on the EA are requested by July 6, 2012.

For questions or additional information, please contact me at (505) 476-4232 or our consultant, David Pennington with Parsons Brinckerhoff, at (505) 881-5357.

Sincerely,

[signature]

Phillip Gallegos, P.E.
Assistant District Engineer for Engineering
NMDOT District 5

cc: David Pennington, Parsons Brinckerhoff
May 14, 2012

Matt Wunder, Chief
New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Conservation Services Division
P.O. Box 25112
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

Re: Notice of Availability of an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Improvements to NM 41, Milepost 46.1 to Milepost 62.1, From Clark Hill North of Stanley to the NM 41/US 285 South of Lamy, Santa Fe County, New Mexico (Project and Control No. U500010)

Chief Wunder:

The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT), along with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), proposes to make improvements to NM Highway 41 from Clark Hill to the intersection with US Highway 285 through Galisteo, New Mexico (Mileposts 46.1 to 62.1). An environmental assessment (EA) for the proposed project has been prepared, and a copy is enclosed for the Department of Game and Fish's review and comment.

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide safety improvements to the roadway including the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo. The need for the project includes structurally deficient bridges, absence of shoulders, and limited visibility due to vertical curves.

Two build alternatives and the No Build Alternative are under consideration. Proposed roadway improvements are the same for both build alternatives and include adding shoulders, reducing vertical curves, and installing traffic calming measures within the community of Galisteo. The primary difference between the two build alternatives is replacing the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo, either on the same alignment or on a parallel alignment. The EA provides detailed information about the purpose and need for the proposed improvements, the major design features of each alternative under consideration, and the impacts to the human and natural environments and cultural resources that would result from each of the alternatives under consideration.

A public hearing for the proposed project will be held on Wednesday, June 6, 2012 from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM at the Galisteo Community Center (35 County Road 33A in Galisteo). Additional information about the public hearing is in the attached flyer. The public hearing will provide a summary of the EA and an opportunity for the public to comment on the EA and the proposed alternatives. Comments will also be received on bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian issues, as well as natural and cultural resources. Project displays, information, and project representatives will be available at the hearing starting at 6:00 PM. A presentation will start at
6:30 PM followed by a formal public comment period during the hearing. A court reporter will be present during the formal comment period to record public comments.

We welcome the Department of Game and Fish's participation at the public hearing and comments on the EA. Please send comments on the EA to Parsons Brinckerhoff, 6100 Uptown Boulevard NE, Suite 700, Albuquerque, NM 87110, Attn: NM 41 Corridor Improvements. Alternatively, comments may be faxed to (505) 881-7602 or emailed to TibbettsD@pbworld.com. Comments on the EA are requested by July 6, 2012.

For questions or additional information, please contact me at (505) 476-4232 or our consultant, David Pennington with Parsons Brinckerhoff, at (505) 881-5357.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Phillip Gallegos
Assistant District Engineer for Engineering
NMDOT District 5

cc: David Pennington, Parsons Brinckerhoff
May 14, 2012

Andrew Jandacek, Transportation Planner
Santa Fe County Planning and Development
102 Grant Avenue
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501-2061

Re: Notice of Availability of an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Improvements to NM 41, Milepost 46.1 to Milepost 62.1, From Clark Hill North of Stanley to the NM 41/US 285 South of Lamy, Santa Fe County, New Mexico (Project and Control No. U500010)

Mr. Jandacek:

The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT), along with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), proposes to make improvements to NM Highway 41 from Clark Hill to the intersection with US Highway 285 through Galisteo, New Mexico (Mileposts 46.1 to 62.1). An environmental assessment (EA) for the proposed project has been prepared, and a copy is enclosed for Santa Fe County’s review and comment.

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide safety improvements to the roadway including the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo. The need for the project includes structurally deficient bridges, absence of shoulders, and limited visibility due to vertical curves.

Two build alternatives and the No Build Alternative are under consideration. Proposed roadway improvements are the same for both build alternatives and include adding shoulders, reducing vertical curves, and installing traffic calming measures within the community of Galisteo. The primary difference between the two build alternatives is replacing the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo, either on the same alignment or on a parallel alignment. The EA provides detailed information about the purpose and need for the proposed improvements, the major design features of each alternative under consideration, and the impacts to the human and natural environments and cultural resources that would result from each of the alternatives under consideration.

A public hearing for the proposed project will be held on Wednesday, June 6, 2012 from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM at the Galisteo Community Center (35 County Road 33A in Galisteo). Additional information about the public hearing is in the attached flyer. The public hearing will provide a summary of the EA and an opportunity for the public to comment on the EA and the proposed alternatives. Comments will also be received on bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian issues, as well as natural and cultural resources. Project displays, information, and project representatives will be available at the hearing starting at 6:00 PM. A presentation will start at
6:30 PM followed by a formal public comment period during the hearing. A court reporter will be present during the formal comment period to record public comments.

We welcome Santa Fe County’s participation at the public hearing and comments on the EA. Please send comments on the EA to Parsons Brinckerhoff, 6100 Uptown Boulevard NE, Suite 700, Albuquerque, NM 87110, Attn: NM 41 Corridor Improvements. Alternatively, comments may be faxed to (505) 881-7602 or emailed to TibbettsD@pbcworld.com. Comments on the EA are requested by July 6, 2012.

For questions or additional information, please contact me at (505) 476-4232 or our consultant, David Pennington with Parsons Brinckerhoff, at (505) 881-5357.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Phillip Gallegos, P.E.
Assistant District Engineer for Engineering
NMDOT District 5

cc: David Pennington, Parsons Brinckerhoff
May 14, 2012

Julie Roybal, Environmental Impact Review Coordinator
New Mexico Environment Department, Office of the Secretary
Harold Runnels Building, 1190 St. Francis Drive, Room S2150
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

Re: Notice of Availability of an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Improvements to NM 41, Milepost 46.1 to Milepost 62.1, From Clark Hill North of Stanley to the NM 41/US 285 South of Lamy, Santa Fe County, New Mexico (Project and Control No. U500010)

Ms. Roybal:

The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT), along with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), proposes to make improvements to NM Highway 41 from Clark Hill to the intersection with US Highway 285 through Galisteo, New Mexico (Mileposts 46.1 to 62.1). An environmental assessment (EA) for the proposed project has been prepared, and a copy is enclosed for the New Mexico Environment Department's review and comment.

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide safety improvements to the roadway including the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo. The need for the project includes structurally deficient bridges, absence of shoulders, and limited visibility due to vertical curves.

Two build alternatives and the No Build Alternative are under consideration. Proposed roadway improvements are the same for both build alternatives and include adding shoulders, reducing vertical curves, and installing traffic calming measures within the community of Galisteo. The primary difference between the two build alternatives is replacing the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo, either on the same alignment or on a parallel alignment. The EA provides detailed information about the purpose and need for the proposed improvements, the major design features of each alternative under consideration, and the impacts to the human and natural environments and cultural resources that would result from each of the alternatives under consideration.

A public hearing for the proposed project will be held on Wednesday, June 6, 2012 from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM at the Galisteo Community Center (35 County Road 33A in Galisteo). Additional information about the public hearing is in the attached flyer. The public hearing will provide a summary of the EA and an opportunity for the public to comment on the EA and the proposed alternatives. Comments will also be received on bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian issues, as well as natural and cultural resources. Project displays, information, and project representatives will be available at the hearing starting at 6:00 PM. A presentation will start at
6:30 PM followed by a formal public comment period during the hearing. A court reporter will be present during the formal comment period to record public comments.

We welcome the New Mexico Environment Department's participation at the public hearing and comments on the EA. Please send comments on the EA to Parsons Brinckerhoff, 6100 Uptown Boulevard NE, Suite 700, Albuquerque, NM 87110, Attn: NM 41 Corridor Improvements. Alternatively, comments may be faxed to (505) 881-7602 or emailed to TibbettsD@pbworld.com. Comments on the EA are requested by July 6, 2012.

For questions or additional information, please contact me at (505) 476-4232 or our consultant, David Pennington with Parsons Brinckerhoff, at (505) 881-5357.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Phillip Gallegos, P.E.
Assistant District Engineer for Engineering
NMDOT District 5

cc: David Pennington, Parsons Brinckerhoff
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Moriarty-Edgewood’s athletic director Joe Butler resigns

By Jim Goodman

After five years as Moriarty-Edgewood district athletic director Joe is resigning. Butler instituted the spring track and field program which raised over $700,000 for the district’s athletic programs in 2012.

Butler, who turned 60 in March, said “My sole motivation was to spend more time with my family. I don’t want to work 60-70 hours a week anymore.”

He also lives in Santa Fe with his wife Chela who retired last year. “The grandkids I’ve been missing out on are the catalyst for my newfound freedom.”

But Butler said he would work 25-30 hours a week if the right opportunity came up. “I still have a passion for kids and academics. My best friends are coaches.”

He did not rule out the possibility of working for the New Mexico Activities Association; he ran the state’s tennis tournament this season.

Those interested in Butler’s job must submit a letter of interest and current resume to the school district by May 31. The qualified candidate will have previous coaching and program supervision experience.

An administrative license is preferred. This is a 12-month position requiring availability on evenings and weekends. Salary range is $47,000-$57,000. Please contact the human resource office with questions at 505-832-5809.

Mountaineer athletic programs looking for six new coaches

By Jim Goodman

Mountaineer athletic director Carol Zamora is looking for six new coaches, three of which are varsity. The basketball program is looking to fill three spots since varsity girls coach and principal Travis Dempsey is leaving to become a superintendent in Cloudcroft.

The girls basketball program is also looking for junior varsity and junior high coaches.

Former football coach Robert Zamora is now working nights at his railroad job so the district is also looking for a new varsity football coach as well as one for the junior high.

The head varsity volleyball coach position is also open with Sheldon Roberts taking on added responsibilities at his job with the electric co-op.

Call Carol Zamora at 847-2211 x 1011 for more information.
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**Western fires grow amid erratic wind**

Smoke from wildfires in New Mexico and Arizona is expected to be noticeable across both states for the next several days.

The Santa Fe Regional and Thatcher winds will yield climate conditions that will spread smoke from large wildfires burning in the region.

The winds will likely push smoke into Central and Northern New Mexico. The winds blew on Friday and continued on Saturday and on.

Meteorologist Brian Gray says the concentration of smoke will likely pass into the state on Sunday and within the Gila region of New Mexico.

Griego is the fifth teacher to get the award this year.

Griego is the fifth teacher to get the award this year.

Griego is the fifth teacher to get the award this year.

**Report: Species law shows results**

A new analysis of 35 endangered species shows that 90 percent, including many in the Southwest, are on track to meet recovery goals set by federal scientists.

Since 2008, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of Interior have listed more than 100 species under the Endangered Species Act.

The Center for Biological Diversity, headquartered in Tucson, Ariz., said the revised continental populations, trends of plants and animals protect the Endangered Species Act in all 50 states, including the Southwest.

**Abuse: Man told investigators he dropped 11-month-old boy**

Continued from Page C-1

Abney is the fifth officer to be charged with abuse since 2009.

**Advertised in the Santa Fe New Mexican**

The Associated Press

**Smoke to push across New Mexico**

Smoke from wildfires in New Mexico and Arizona is expected to be noticeable across both states for the next several days.

The Santa Fe Regional and Thatcher winds will yield climate conditions that will spread smoke from large wildfires burning in the region.

The winds will likely push smoke into Central and Northern New Mexico. The winds blew on Friday and continued on Saturday and on.

Meteorologist Brian Gray says the concentration of smoke will likely pass into the state on Sunday and within the Gila region of New Mexico.

**Spark: 2 more awards to be given**

Continued from Page C-1

newspaper, The Academy Times, was praised for working one-on-one with her students as she tutors them in writing, reading and communication skills.

"My favorite thing as a teacher is writing with students, sitting with individuals and being able to help them write," Gonzalez said during a brief interview after the ceremony.

"It's really great to be acknowledged. I've been teaching a long time. I work hard, everyone knows I do. And I have so much more to do," Gonzalez said.

Griego and his fiancé and took the boy to the changing room. …

the boy landed on a plastic bag and hitting his head on a parapet and testimony that made up the and testimony that made up the and testimony that made up the...
Public Hearing Announcement and Notice of Availability of an Environmental Assessment for NM 41 from Clark Hill (North of Stanley, Milepost 46.1) to the NM 41/US 285 Junction (South of Lamy, Milepost 62.1) Galisteo, NM – Project No. and Control No. U500010

The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have completed an environmental assessment (EA) for the proposed improvements to NM 41 from Clark Hill to the NM 41/US 285 intersection.

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide safety improvements to the roadway including the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo. Two build alternatives and the No Build Alternative are under consideration. Build Alternative 1 would replace the bridges on the current alignment. Build Alternative 2 would replace the bridges on an offset alignment. Additional proposed roadway improvements are the same for both build alternatives. The EA provides detailed information about the purpose and need for the proposed improvements and the major design features of each alternative, as well as impacts to the human and natural environments and to cultural resources.

The public hearing will provide a summary of the EA and an opportunity for the public to comment on the EA and proposed alternatives. Comments will also be received on bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian issues, as well as natural and cultural resources.

Project displays, information, and project representatives will be available at the hearing starting at 6:00 PM. A presentation will start at 6:30 PM followed by a formal public comment period. A court reporter will record public comments during the hearing's formal comment period. The hearing date, time, and location are:

**Hearing Date and Time:** Wednesday, June 6, 2012, 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM  
**Hearing Location:** Galisteo Community Center (35 County Road 33A in Galisteo)

The EA is available for review online at [http://dot.state.nm.us/ProjectsD5.html](http://dot.state.nm.us/ProjectsD5.html). Copies are also available at the following locations from May 14, 2012 through July 6, 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NMDOT District 5 Office</td>
<td>NMDOT Environmental Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7315 Cerrillos Road</td>
<td>604 W. San Mateo, 2nd Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe, NM 87502</td>
<td>(505) 827-1583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(505) 476-4200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galisteo Fire District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Avenida Vieja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galisteo, NM 87504</td>
<td>Tuesdays - 6:30PM to 9PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(505) 820-2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional information about the hearing and/or project, please contact Rosanne Rodriguez, NMDOT District 5 Public Information Officer, at (505) 475-4205 (Rosanne.Rodriguez@state.nm.us) or Phillip Gallegos, NMDOT District 5 Assistant District Engineer, at (505) 476-4232 (Phillip.Gallegos@state.nm.us).

Comments following the hearing are requested by July 6, 2012. Please send comments to Parsons Brinckerhoff, 6100 Uptown Boulevard NE, Suite 700, Albuquerque, NM 87110, Attn: NM 41, fax (505) 881-7602, email TibbettsD@pbworld.com.

To request Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) related accommodations, contact Dawn Tibbetts, Parsons Brinckerhoff, (505) 881-5357 or TibbettsD@pbworld.com at least three days in advance of the meeting.
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Public Hearing for the NM 41 Project

Clark Hill to NM 41/US 285 Junction – Milepost 46.1 to 62.1
NMDOT PN TPA-1502(20)46, CN U500010

June 6, 2012
The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have completed an environmental assessment (EA) for proposed changes to NM 41 from Clark Hill (milepost 46.1) to US 285 (milepost 62.1). The changes proposed and the environmental consequences of the changes are summarized below.

Why the NMDOT is Proposing Changes to NM 41
The primary factors behind the proposed changes to NM 41 involve structural and geometric problems with the Galisteo Creek Bridge and San Cristobal Arroyo and potential safety problems with other areas within the project limits. These include:

- The bridge decks, railings, girders, piers, and foundations are deteriorated and in need of replacement. Analysis of the existing bridges indicates that reconstruction of both bridges is necessary.
- A series of vertical curves in the first few miles north of Clark Hill do not meet criteria for safe stopping sight distance.
- The entire length of NM 41 within the project limits does not have shoulders. Because the highway is used by bicyclists, the lack of shoulders is unsafe for both bicyclists and motorists.
- The condition of pavement is poor in many locations along the route and is in need of replacement.
- Higher travel speeds through the Village are a safety concern for residents.

The Alternatives Under Consideration by the NMDOT
Various alternatives for the bridges and roadway were considered by the NMDOT. In all instances, the number of lanes remain the same as exists today, i.e. one driving lane in each direction except for the ascent up Clark Hill where there is also a climbing lane in the southbound direction. Three alternatives are evaluated in the EA including the No Build Alternative and two build alternatives.

- **No Build Alternative** – The No Build Alternative assumes NM 41 would remain in its existing condition and no major changes to the roadway or the bridges would be made. Improvements would be limited to routine maintenance and emergency repairs, as needed.

- **Build Alternative 1** – This build alternative would reconstruct NM 41 within the project limits and would maintain the existing roadway alignment. The major design features of this alternative include reconstruction of the roadway pavement and subgrade, the addition of shoulders, replacement of the San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge and Galisteo Creek Bridge, and replacement/upgrades of other features such as right-of-way fencing, signing, drainage structures, and traffic calming measures. This alternative would maintain the existing functional classification of NM 41 as a 2-lane rural collector highway, but would upgrade the roadway to a safe highway that is consistent with the rural and historic character of the Galisteo Basin. **This alternative is preferred by the NMDOT** due to its lesser impacts on the Galisteo Historic District and on the environment.

- **Build Alternative 2** – This alternative provides the same features as Alternative 1 except that new bridges across San Cristobal Arroyo and Galisteo Creek would be constructed parallel to the existing bridges. The new bridges would be offset by approximately 15 feet to the west. The segments of NM 41 approaching the bridges and between the bridges from MP 55.6 to 56.15 would also be offset to align with the new bridges.
Roadway Typical Sections (Both Build Alternatives)

The above roadway section would be used in all areas outside of Galisteo except for the climbing lane at Clark Hill. This section would include two 12-foot driving lanes with 6-foot shoulders. Narrow rumble strips will be included at the inside edge of shoulders. The rumble strips will include intermittent breaks to allow bicyclists to enter and exit the shoulder area.

The roadway section at Clark Hill includes a climbing lane. This section would include two 12-foot driving lanes, one southbound climbing lane, and 6-foot shoulders.

Within the community of Galisteo, the driving lanes are narrowed to 11 feet and the shoulders are reduced to 4 feet.
The cross section of the San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge (shown above) includes two 12-foot driving lanes with 4-foot shoulders and a 4-foot walkway along the east side of the bridge. The aesthetic design of the bridge railings will be consistent with the existing historic bridge.

The cross section of the Galisteo Creek Bridge (shown above) includes two 11-foot driving lanes with 4-foot shoulders and a 4-foot walkway along the east side of the bridge. The aesthetic design of the bridge railings will be consistent with the existing historic bridge.
Other Roadway Features (Both Build Alternatives)

Medians are proposed at two locations: (1) just south of the NM 41/Avenida Vieja intersection outside of the historic district, and (2) at or near the Vista Clara Ranch main driveway. The medians are intended to alert drivers that they are entering the community and to slow travel speeds at the community entrances.

In addition to the medians, two additional radar speed detectors are proposed: one near the Rodeo Grounds area and the second north of Vista Clara Ranch.

Other Important Design Features

- Pavement striping will be used at the outside edge of lanes throughout the corridor to create a visual appearance of narrow lanes.
- The proposed posted speed in the Community of Galisteo is 30 mph – 5 mph less than existing.
- The posted speed will be reduced to 35 mph beginning at Vista Clara Ranch (southbound) and at the Rodeo Grounds for northbound traffic. This is 10 mph less than the existing 45 mph.
- The posted speed in the outlying areas is proposed to be 55 mph – the same as existing.
- Where needed, metal barrier will be set back on the shoulders to preserve a full 4-foot usable shoulder area. Weathered steel barrier will be used to blend with the historic setting.
- Rumble strips will be intermittent and narrow to allow bicycles to move between the travel lanes and shoulders. Rumble strips will not be used within the community area to avoid a noise source that could disturb residents.
The Impacts of Project Alternatives

The environmental assessment identified impacts and benefits of all alternatives under consideration for the proposed changes to NM 41. Major findings are as follows:

- The 4-foot shoulders through Galisteo and the 6-foot shoulders in the outlying areas will improve safety for both bicyclists and motorists.

- The proposed improvements within the Galisteo community area are all within the existing roadway right-of-way. No walls, buildings, or trees would be removed within the community. However, some trees would be removed within Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo.

- The 4-foot walkways included on the east side of both bridges will improve safety for pedestrians.

- The medians and radar speed detectors will provide visual cues to motorists to slow their travel speed before entering Galisteo.

- The profile of the roadway will be modified in several spot locations in the 3-mile area north of Clark Hill. Locations with very sharp vertical curves, i.e. areas with sharp hills and dip sections, will be reduced to achieve safe sight distance as required by FHWA design criteria. The changes at these locations will be kept to the minimum needed and will not change the rolling character of the highway.

- With Alternative 2 (offset bridges), approximately 2 acres of new right-of-way will be acquired. The affected property is west of the highway between the Rodeo Grounds to a point just north of Galisteo Creek. No buildings or other structures are affected.

- Alternative 1 will not affect any archaeological sites. Alternative 2 will affect three archaeological sites. The treatment of archaeological sites impacted by Alternative 2 will be determined in consultation with the NM State Historic Preservation Officer.

- Both alternatives propose replacement of the historic bridge structures across Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo.

- Alternative 2 (offset bridges) will alter the visual appearance of the historic segment of NM 41 within the Galisteo Historic District.

- Both alternatives would impact wetland and riparian habitat. The quantity of wetland habitat lost would be minor (less than 0.025 acres). With both alternatives, impacts to riparian habitat would be temporary and the impacted habitat would be restored/replaced as part of construction. Wetland impacts will be mitigated following US Army Corps of Engineers requirements.

- Both alternatives would remove approximately 22 acres of roadside vegetation as a result of the shoulder additions.

- Small animals, such as mice and lizards, living next to the roadway would be lost by construction. This is an unavoidable impact of the Build Alternatives.

Both alternatives would remove a small amount of potential habitat used by the Southwestern willow flycatcher, a federally listed endangered species. Four years of field surveys for this species did not find any nesting flycatchers within the vicinity of the project. The US Fish and Wildlife Service has concurred with the finding that the project is not likely to adversely affect this species.
Public Comment Procedures

The public can comment on the proposed project and the environmental assessment. Comments received by July 6, 2012 will be part of the hearing record. The NMDOT will consider all comments and will provide a response to all comments received in an Input Synopsis. The Input Synopsis is the public record of the hearing process and the resolution of comments received. All comments and responses will be provided to the Federal Highway Administration for review and consideration in their decision on the EA. The Input Synopsis will be posted on the NMDOT webpage as soon as it is completed (anticipated sometime in early August 2012).

Comments on the EA and the proposed project can be made verbally at the public hearing or in writing. Written comments should be mailed or emailed to the following:

Parsons Brinckerhoff
Attn: NM 41 Project
6100 Uptown Boulevard NE, Suite 700
Albuquerque, NM 87110

TibbettsD@pbworld.com

For all comments, the NMDOT asks that you provide your name and address for the project record.

Additional information about this project and a copy of the EA and previous documents are available online at the NMDOT website: www.dot.state.nm.us/ProjectsD5.html#NM41

For your convenience, a comment sheet with a return address is attached. You may use this or other sheets, as desired.
Comment Form
Proposed NM 41 Corridor Study
Public Hearing - June 6, 2012
Galisteo Community Center, Galisteo, NM

Please provide your comments on the proposed NM 41 Corridor Study. You may use this comment form or your own letter. All comments received by July 6, 2012 will become part of the final record for the environmental assessment. You may leave your comments at the hearing registration table, mail them to the address on the back of the form, or email them to TibbettsD@pbworld.com. Remember, the deadline for submitting comments is July 6, 2012. Thank you for your input and interest in the proposed NM 41 Corridor Study.

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

For your comments to be included in the final record for the EA, your name and address must be provided.

Name  
__________________________________________________________________________________
Address  
__________________________________________________________________________________
City  ___________________________________________________________________________ State  _______________ Zip Code  ___________________________________________________________________________
Phone  ___________________________________________________________________________ Email  ___________________________________________________________________________
The information presented at this public hearing summarizes the findings of an environmental assessment (EA) prepared for the proposed project. The hearing also provides the public an opportunity to comment on the proposed project and the EA.

- Lead Agencies
  - Federal: Federal Highway Administration
  - State: New Mexico Department of Transportation
- Participating and Cooperating Agencies
  - US Army Corps of Engineers
  - US Fish & Wildlife Service
  - New Mexico Historic Preservation Division
  - New Mexico Environment Department
  - New Mexico Department of Game and Fish

Hearing Agenda
- Overview of Why Changes to NM 41 are Proposed (Purpose and Need)
- Description of Project Alternatives
  - Major Design Features
  - Project Impacts
- Right-of-way Acquisition Process
- Comment Procedures
- Public Comment Session

NM 41 Project Limits
- 16 mile length of NM 41
- Begins at milepost 46.1 (Clark Hill)
- Ends at milepost 62.1 (NM 41/US 285 junction)
- Includes two bridges at Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo
- Passes through Galisteo Historic District
Project Purpose and Need

Why changes to NM 41 are proposed
And Consistency with adopted plans

The need for the proposed changes to NM 41 include:
- Structural and geometric deficiencies at Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo bridges
- Safe stopping sight-distance limitations due to vertical curves
- Absence of shoulders that contributes to roll-over crashes and conflicts with bicycles
- Poor pavement condition

Structural and Geometric Deficiencies – Galisteo Creek Bridge
- No shoulders
- Sidewalks are not ADA compliant
- Railing in poor condition
- Deck has advanced deterioration
- Abutments, piers, and girders in poor condition

Representative photos of Galisteo Creek bridge deck, railing, and cross section taken in 2009 and 2010.

Condition of abutments and piers verified by field tests
- 11 concrete cores collected to assess concrete condition
- Key Findings
  - Limited evidence of active ASR (alkali-silica reactivity)
  - Significant problems with core samples fracting during collection process (7 of 11 cores sheared during sample collection)

Structural and Geometric Deficiencies – San Cristobal Arroyo
- No shoulders or sidewalks
- Railing in poor condition
- Deck has advanced deterioration
- Abutments, piers, and girders in poor condition
- Water scour extends below pile caps; deterioration of timber piles is likely advanced

Representative photos of San Cristobal Arroyo bridge taken in 2009 and 2010.

Stopping site distance issues
- Nine vertical curves with stopping sight distance limitations substantially below 55 mph
- All within the first few miles north of Clark Hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milepost</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Design Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Crest</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Crest</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Sag</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Crest</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Sag</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Crest</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Sag</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Crest</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vertical Curves with Design Speeds Less Than Posted Speed of 55 mph
Geometric/Safety Issues – Lack of shoulders
  • Contributes to roll-over crashes
    – 49% or all crashes between 2002 and 2010 resulted in roll-overs
  • Bicycle conflicts
  • Fire danger

Consistency with Galisteo Community Plan (GCP)
  • GCP includes future land use plan and Strategic Work Plan
    – Land use plan is not affected by NM 41 Improvements
    – Community Plans and Policies – Roads and Transportation Directive includes guidelines and recommended design approaches to guide improvements to NM 41
    – Proposed project is consistent with most but not all GCP Transportation Directive guidelines
      • Generally consistent with desired posted speeds and elements that alert drivers they are entering a community
      • Not consistent with Plan desired lane widths [10 ft.] and shoulder widths (1 ft. to 2 ft.)

Project Alternatives

• Several Alternatives/Strategies were Considered but Eliminated prior to the EA due to impacts, inconsistency with project need, practicality, and/or public comments
  – 8-foot shoulders
  – 2-foot shoulders (within the Village area)
  – Gravel/dirt shoulders (within the Village area)
  – Shoulders on one side only (within the Village area)
  – By-Pass Route around Village of Galisteo
  – Bridge Rehabilitation (Galisteo and San Cristobal)
  – Traffic calming strategies involving roundabout intersections and traffic chokers

• Further information about the above alternatives and the reason for their elimination are available in reports posted at:
  – [www.dot.state.nm.us/ProjectsD5.html#NM41](http://www.dot.state.nm.us/ProjectsD5.html#NM41)

Three Alternatives evaluated by the EA
  – No-Build Alternative
    • Leaves NM 41 (within the project limits) in its existing configuration
    • Routine maintenance and emergency repairs when needed
    • Two bridges will ultimately need replacement
    – Build Alternative 1 (NMDOT Preferred)
    – Build Alternative 2

Build Alternative 1 (existing alignment)
  – Reconstructs NM 41, Galisteo Creek Bridge, and San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge on the existing alignment
  – Provides additional traffic measures within Galisteo to help reduce travel speeds
  – Replaces and/or upgrades roadway related features including fencing, guardrail, drainage pipes/boxes
  – Adds livestock undercrossing at milepost 47.7
  – Is the preferred alternative by the NMDOT
**NM 41 Corridor Study**

**Three (3) Typical Sections Used in Alternative 1**

**Typical Section #1**
- All areas outside of Galisteo
- Two (2) 12-foot lanes with 6-foot shoulders
- Intermittent rumble strips at edge of shoulders

**Typical Section #2**
- Climbing lane at Clark Hill
- Two (2) 12-foot lanes with 6-foot shoulders plus 12-foot southbound climbing lane
- Intermittent rumble strips at edge of shoulders

**Typical Section #3**
- Two (2) 11-foot lanes with 4-foot shoulders (except south of San Cristobal Arroyo where 12-foot lanes are used)
- Milepost 55.5 (Rodeo Grounds) to MP 57.8 (Vista Clara Ranch Road)

---

**Traffic Calming Elements -- Medians**
- Two locations proposed
  - Just south of NM 41/Avenida Vieja intersection
  - Near Vista Clara Ranch driveway
- May include small shrubs and community-specific signing

**Traffic Calming Elements -- Radar Speed Boards**
- Two existing locations preserved
- Two additional locations
  - Rodeo Grounds (NB Direction)
  - North of Vista Clara Ranch Road (SB Direction)

---

**San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge**
- Typical Section
  - 12-foot lanes
  - 4-foot shoulders
  - 4-foot pedestrian pathway on east side
- Alignment
  - Reconstruction on existing alignment
- Aesthetic Design
  - Railings to be consistent with existing historic bridge

**Galisteo Creek Bridge**
- Typical Section
  - 11-foot lanes
  - 4-foot shoulders
  - 4-foot pedestrian pathway on east side
- Alignment
  - Reconstruction on existing alignment
- Aesthetic Design
  - Railings to be consistent with existing historic bridge
• Pier spacing would change from existing configuration 4-span to a 3-span bridge
• Changing pier spacing eliminates the need to excavate the existing piers and foundations
• Reduces disturbance in river channel, loss of vegetation, and impacts to wetland habitat

• Build Alternative 2 (bridge offset alignment)
  – Same design concept and features as Build Alternative 1 except:
    • Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo Bridges are constructed on a 15-foot (approximate) west off-set alignment
    – Galisteo Creek Bridge may be preserved in place if a funding source for maintenance is available or Santa Fe County agrees to accept maintenance responsibility
    – San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge is removed due to foundation problems

• Bicycle Accommodations
  – Bicycle use provided by the proposed 4- to 6-foot shoulders
  – Intermittent rumble strips provided in 55 mph sections with 6-foot shoulders
  – Friction course (top course of pavement for skid resistance) will extend full width of pavement in areas with a posted speed greater than 40 mph.

• Pedestrian Accommodations
  – 4-foot sidewalks on Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo Bridges
  – Pedestrian crossings near plaza area within Galisteo
  – Crossing location and design to be determined during final design (with community input)

• Estimated Construction Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Item</td>
<td>Amount $</td>
<td>Amount $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Construction Subtotal</td>
<td>$11,980,230</td>
<td>$11,980,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies (30%)</td>
<td>$3,594,068</td>
<td>$3,594,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Estimate Total</td>
<td>$15,574,299</td>
<td>$15,574,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge Construction Subtotal</td>
<td>$1,016,186</td>
<td>$1,016,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Contingencies</td>
<td>$351,715</td>
<td>$351,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>$172,040</td>
<td>$172,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Realignment</td>
<td>$1,310,536</td>
<td>$1,310,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge Total</td>
<td>$1,539,941</td>
<td>$1,539,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galisteo Creek Bridge Construction Subtotal</td>
<td>$1,498,811</td>
<td>$1,498,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Contingencies</td>
<td>$107,875</td>
<td>$107,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>$42,500</td>
<td>$42,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Realignment</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galisteo Creek Bridge Total</td>
<td>$1,920,071</td>
<td>$1,920,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Total</td>
<td>$18,356,394</td>
<td>$18,356,394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Higher costs of Alternative 1 are due to construction phasing required for traffic control

Factors Considered

- Local access
- Utilities
- Traffic operations
- Land Use
- Community resources
- Historic/Cultural resources
- Section 4(f) resources
- Water quality
- Wetlands
- Floodplains
- Vegetation and Wildlife
- Endangered Species
- Visual Resources
- Hazardous materials
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Construction detours
Impacts are generally the same for both Build Alternatives. Exceptions to this are noted. Substantive impacts were not identified for most of the issues considered. These include:

- Land use
- Utilities
- Traffic operations
- Environmental Justice
- Floodplains
- Air quality
- Noise

Access Changes
- Generally, no changes to access
- Realignment of Goose Downs access road considered
- Realigned to opposite Vista Clara Ranch access road

Community Resources
- No building acquisitions
- Existing walls are not affected
- Circulation within the community is not changed
- No disproportionate adverse impacts to special status populations (Federal Environmental Justice policy)
- Potential temporary relocation of community mail boxes and historic marker during construction

Community Resources (continued)
- Bridge and roadway offset with Alternative 2 will acquire approximately 2 acres of private property between MP 55.6 to 56.1
- Affected property is along the west side of the highway
- Does not affect any dwellings or other buildings

Community Resources (continued)
- Concerns with truck traffic and vehicle speeds addressed by:
  - Narrow roadway and bridge sections
  - Medians and added radar speed detectors
  - Reduced travel speeds within community and community approach sections

Historic/Archaeological/ Section 4(f) Resources
Project effects determined in consultation with SHPO, which is ongoing.

Alternative 1
- All archaeological sites within construction limits will be avoided.
- Proposed replacement of the historic bridge structures across Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Creek
- New bridges would be constructed to be historically consistent; thus no significant changes to the visual appearance of the District by bridge reconstruction.
Historic/Archaeological/ Section 4(f) Resources
• Alternative 2 (bridge offset alignment)
  – Three archaeological sites potentially impacted by roadway realignment between bridges.
  – Proposed replacement of the historic bridge structure across San Cristobal Creek
  – Realignment of historic NM 41 roadway and new Galisteo Creek Bridge will add a new visual element within the historic district and would affect the District.

Wetland Habitat
Project effects determined in consultation with US Army Corps of Engineers
• Alternative 1 (existing alignment)
  – Approximately 0.02 acres of wetland habitat permanently lost
  – Additional 1.1 acres of riparian habitat temporarily disturbed during construction of new bridges and due to the use of a temporary bridge
  – Wetland habitat will be replaced in accordance with US Army Corps requirements
  – Temporarily disturbed riparian habitat will be restored

Wetland Habitat (continued)
• Alternative 2 (bridge offset alignment)
  – Approximately 0.023 acres of wetland habitat permanently lost
  – Additional 0.84 acres of riparian habitat temporarily disturbed during construction of new bridges and demo of San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge
  – Wetland habitat will be replaced in accordance with US Army Corps requirements
  – Temporarily disturbed riparian habitat will be restored

Vegetation (Both Alternatives)
• Approximately 22 acres of roadside vegetation permanently lost as a result of shoulder addition.
• Slightly more with Alternative 2.
• All disturbance is within r/w fencing except for new alignment section with Alternative 2.
• Disturbed areas will be restored.
• No rare or unique plant species are affected.

Wildlife (Both Alternatives)
• Some small animals (e.g., mice, lizards) within the construction area will be lost.
• No impacts identified for larger animals.
• Existing movement patterns of large mammals would not be affected.
• New livestock under-crossing could be used by smaller animals.

Threatened and Endangered Species (Both Alternatives)
Project effects determined in consultation with US Fish & Wildlife Service
• Both alternatives would remove potential habitat used by Southwestern willow flycatcher (federal endangered species)
  o Field surveys conducted 2009 – 2011 have not identified the presence of nesting flycatchers. Some migrating birds found.
  o Field surveys will continue until construction
  o USFWS has concurred with the finding that the project is not likely to adversely affect this species
Construction-Phase Traffic

- Motorist delays during construction will occur with both alternatives
- Alternative 1 will require a detour at bridges. Options available include:
  - One lane traffic using phased bridge construction
  - Temporary bridges
- Traffic detouring method will be determined during design phase
- Alternative 2 will not require detours at bridges

Right-of-Way Acquisition Process

- No residences or other occupied buildings will be acquired
- Alternative 2 (offset alignment) will acquire approximately 2 acres of private property between MP 55.6 to 56.1
- If this alternative is advanced, property will be acquired following state and federal laws (Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970)
- This law provides for the fair, consistent, and equitable treatment of persons and businesses affected by federal actions requiring acquisition and relocations.

Hearing objective is to receive and record comments.

NMDOT responses will be limited to clarifications.

Comment Procedures

- Comments can be verbal or written
- All verbal comments are recorded and included in the hearing transcript
- Written comments can be sent via US postal mail or email
- All comments received by July 6, 2012 will be part of the hearing record
• Mail written comments to:
  Parsons Brinckerhoff
  6100 Uptown Boulevard NE, Suite 700
  Albuquerque, NM 87110
  Attn: NM 41 Project

• Email comments to:
  TibbettsD@pbworld.com

Verbal Comments
• Please provide name and address for the record

All comments will be reviewed by the FHWA/NMDOT Project team and responses will be prepared
All comments and responses will be published in an Input Synopsis that is part of the decision record by FHWA
Input Synopsis, NMDOT recommendations, and FHWA decision will be posted on the NMDOT webpage when available (anticipated in early August 2012)

Public Hearing for the NM 41 Project
Clark Hill to NM 41/US 285 Junction -- Milepost 46.1 to 62.1
NMDOT Project/Control No. U500010
June 6, 2012
Attachment D: 
Agency and Public Comments
Dear Ms. Tibbetts:

This is in response to a letter from Mr. Phillip Gallegos, New Mexico Department of Transportation, District 5 Office, dated May 14, 2012, requesting comments on the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Proposed Improvements to NM 41, Milepost 46.1 to Milepost 62.1, From Clark Hill North of Stanley to the NM41/US 285 South of Lamy, near Galisteo, Santa Fe County, New Mexico. We have assigned Action No. SPA-2010-00480-ABQ to this activity. Please include this number in all future correspondence concerning this project.

In response to your request, the Corps has reviewed those sections of the EA that are applicable to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act including Sections 3.8 to 3.10 (water quality, wetlands and floodplains) as well as 3.12 (Threatened and Endangered Species).

The No Build Alternative assumes the highway would remain in its existing condition with no major changes to the roadway or bridges. Improvements would be limited to routine maintenance and emergency repairs as needed. This would disregard the structural deficiencies of the two bridges and the absence of shoulders for use by motorists, pedestrians and cyclists.

Build Alternative 1 (Alternative 1) would reconstruct NM 41 within the project boundaries including the replacement of the Galisteo Creek Bridge and the San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge,
highway pavements, shoulders and other upgrades. This alternative would keep the highway as a 2-lane rural collector highway but would upgrade the roadway to a safer, more modern highway that would still be consistent with the rural and historic character of the project area.

Build Alternative 2 (Alternative 2) would construct new bridges in new locations parallel and adjacent (15 ft.) to the existing locations. The highway approaches would also be realigned to be consistent with the new bridge locations. Other aspects of the alternative would be the same as Alternative 1.

We concur with the EA’s findings for Alternatives 1 and 2 regarding water quality (Section 3.8, pp. 25-26). Alternative 1 uses the existing roadway and bridge location and would not increase the quantity of fills within jurisdictional waters. Should Alternative 2 be used, however, the amount of fill at the Galisteo Bridge site would double since the existing bridge would not be removed and it has two piers within waters of the US. Therefore, the least environmentally damaging proposed alternative (LEDPA) would be Alternative 1 relative to water quality.

Regarding wetlands (Section 3.9, pp. 26 – 31), both alternatives have similar permanent impacts of less than 0.01 acre of fills. However, Alternative 1 has 0.013 acre of temporary fills and Alternative 2 will have “negligible temporary impacts”. We concur that neither alternative has any significant difference over the other relative to permanent wetland impacts.

Regarding the floodplains (Section 3.10, 31-32), four drainages have Zone A, 100-year flood events. This includes both bridge sites at San Cristobal Arroyo and at Galisteo Creek. The other two drainages are the Arroyo de la Jara (intermittent) and Gaviso Arroyo (ephemeral). Neither Alternative requires that any existing structures be extended within Zone A floodplains. No floodplain impacts would occur because the new bridges at San Cristobal Arroyo and Galisteo Creek would allow passage of 100-year and 500-year flow events the same as the existing structures do. The Gaviso Arroyo structure is in good condition and will not be replaced. Neither Alternative 1 or 2 require that the existing structures be extended within Zone A and so would have no effect on the floodplains. We concur that neither alternative would have a significant effect over the other regarding floodplains.

Regarding Threatened and Endangered Species (Section 3.12, pp. 36-37), the Southwestern willow flycatcher was observed in one instance at Galisteo Creek. The yellow-billed cuckoo (Candidate species) was not observed but the project area has suitable habitat at Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo bridges. Both alternatives have similar effects on the Southwestern willow flycatcher. According to the EA, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has concurred with the EA’s may affect not likely to adversely affect determination for the Southwestern willow flycatcher. They concurred that the proposed alternatives will be no effect on other protected species. The agency stipulated that the Galisteo Creek Bridge area disturbed
during construction would be replanted to match the community type and composition that currently exists at the site.

The Corps agrees with the EA findings that both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would have the same indirect and cumulative impacts. Minor indirect effects would include changes in traffic flow and circulation as some drivers may search for alternate routes during construction. Cumulative impacts appear to be negligible because there are very few other projects, past or present, in the vicinity.

There seems to be little difference as to the extent of permanent effects between the two alternatives relative to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. However, in the Vegetation and Wildlife section (Section 3.11, pp. 32-36), the EA notes that Alternative 1 and 2 have the same permanent loss of upland habitat (22 acres). The EA also notes the permanent loss of riparian habitat under Alternative 1 is negligible and it has temporary disturbance of 0.69 acre. The EA noted that Alternative 2 would have 0.42 acre of permanent riparian loss and 0.22 acre of temporary riparian impacts. The permanent loss of riparian habitat for wildlife, migratory birds and endangered species would be a factor in the Corps’ determination of the LEDPA for the proposed project.

We encourage the FHWA and NMDOT to continue coordination with the Corps during the planning process to discuss the jurisdictional areas potentially impacted by the NM 41 Alignment Study project.

Our contact for this action is Mr. William Oberle at the Albuquerque District Office, 505-342-3284, e-mail: william.m.oberle@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

William M. Oberle
Project Manager
Copies furnished:

Ms. Christina Kelso  
Human and Natural Resources Bureau  
(sent electronically)

Mr. Neal Schaeffer  
New Mexico Environment Department  
(sent electronically)
June 18, 2012

Phillip Gallegos, P.E.
P.O. Box 1149
Santa Fe, NM 87505

RE: Request for information concerning the proposed improvements to NM 41 near Lamy, Santa Fe County. (NMED File Number: 3710 ER)

Dear Mr. Gallegos:

Your letter regarding the above named project was received in the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) and was sent to various Bureaus for review and comment. Comments were provided by the Surface Water Quality Bureau, Ground Water Quality Bureau and Air Quality Bureau and are as follows.

Surface Water Quality Bureau
We plan to participate in this project development through review of their 404 permit.

Ground Water Quality Bureau
New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) Ground Water Quality Bureau (GWQB) staff reviewed the above-referenced letter as requested, focusing specifically on the potential effect to ground water resources in the area of the proposed project.

The project consists of improvements to New Mexico Highway 41, from milepost 42.1 to milepost 62.1 and replacement of the bridges over Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo. The GWQB has determined that the project is unlikely to impact ground water quality in the area.

Please note that implementation of the improvement project may involve the use of heavy equipment, thereby leading to a possibility of contaminant releases (e.g., fuel, hydraulic fluid, etc.) associated with equipment malfunctions. The GWQB advises all parties involved in the project to be aware of notification requirements for accidental discharges contained in 20.6.2.1203 NMAC. Compliance with the notification and response requirements will further ensure the protection of ground water quality in the vicinity of the project.

Air Quality Bureau
The New Mexico Environment Department-Air Quality Bureau has evaluated the proposal you have submitted with respect to the proposed improvements to NM 41/US 285 south of Lamy,
Santa Fe County. Santa Fe County is currently considered to be in attainment with all New Mexico and National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

Construction activities identified in this proposal will create increases in pollutant emissions due to combustion-related construction equipment usage and the disruption of earth. It is important that all facilities, equipment and contractors utilized in the proposed project have the appropriate air quality permits. For more information on air quality permitting and potential modeling requirements, please refer to 20.2.72 NMAC.

For the duration of the project, dust associated with increased vehicular use will also impact local air quality. Dust control measures should be considered to minimize the release of particulates due to vehicular traffic and ground disturbances. Activities resulting in significant ground disturbance should be reclaimed to avoid long-term problems with soil erosion and fugitive dust.

Activities identified in this proposal will increase local emissions and will temporarily impact air quality in the area. It is important that all county and local ordinances are followed for the duration of this project. Negative impacts associated with construction activities identified in this proposal will be minimized if regulations and guidelines identified in this document are followed.

I hope this information is helpful to you.

Sincerely,

Julie Roybal
Environmental Impact Review Coordinator
NMED File #3710 ER
June 20, 2012

Parsons Brinkerhoff
6100 Uptown Blvd. NE, Suite 700
Albuquerque, NM 87110
Attn: NM 41 Corridor Improvements

*NM Highway 41 Corridor Improvements Draft Environmental Assessment NMDGF Doc. No. 15090*

Dear Sirs:

The Department of Game and Fish (Department) has reviewed the draft environmental assessment for the above-referenced project. The NM Highway 41 corridor improvement project near Galisteo, Santa Fe County will include demolition of two historic bridges.

After conducting a field inspection of these bridges, we concur with the biological report findings that the historic bridges offer minimal to no important bat habitat. We also concur with the biological report finding that the solitary willow flycatcher observed at Galisteo Creek during the first of five protocol surveys in spring of 2010 was likely a migrant because no nesting has since been documented.

Significant riparian vegetation occurs at both bridge locations (Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo), which provides an important wildlife corridor for mule deer, migratory birds and other wildlife. The EA states the amount of riparian vegetation permanently lost at Galisteo Creek and San Cristobal Arroyo would be minimal, and riparian vegetation would be replaced as part of a compensatory mitigation plan for the project.

However, because of our observation during the site visit of multiple species of nesting migratory songbirds within the riparian areas immediately adjacent to both bridges, and an active black-chinned hummingbird nest directly beneath the Galisteo Creek bridge, we strongly encourage New Mexico Department of Transportation to conduct project activities (tree clearing and grubbing; bridge demolition
and reconstruction activities) outside of the breeding season. We also encourage you to contact the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Migratory Bird Division office in Albuquerque at (505) 248-7882 for their mitigation recommendations.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this project. Should you have any questions regarding our comments please contact Mark Watson, Wildlife Habitat Specialist, at (505) 476-8115 or mark.watson@state.nm.us.

Sincerely,

Matt Wunder, Ph.D.
Chief, Conservation Services Division

MW/mlw

xc: USFWS NMES Field Office
   Brian Gleadle, NW Area Operations Chief, NMDGF
   Ellen Heilhecker, NW Area Habitat Specialist, NMDGF
   Jim Stuart, Non-game Mammalogist, NMDGF
   Hira Walker, Non-game Ornithologist, NMDGF
   Bill Howe, USFWS Migratory Bird Division, Albuquerque
From:
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2012 1:09 PM
To: Tibbetts, Dawn
Subject: Proposed widening of NM 41

Please widen this road with shoulders that are safe for cyclists and pedestrians.

Thank you,
The Bicycle Coalition of New Mexico (BCNM) is very pleased with NMDOT’s commitment to the principals of “complete streets” in proposing to provide a uniform smooth paved surface across NM41, including shoulders, as well as the use of a relatively bike-friendly rumble strip design where rumble strips are deemed necessary.

Thank you for giving BCNM the opportunity to express the following concerns which remain upon review of the Environmental Assessment:

(1) The rumble strips should be acceptable for bicycles on cross sections with six-foot shoulders but would be very problematic on four-foot shoulders, which does not appear to be planned on NM41. There seems to be a discrepancy between P. 52 Commitment 17: "Rumble strips will be narrow (12")" and statement under Alternative 1 "Rumble strips will be narrow (7") and intermittent to maximize the area available for bicycle travel." The current NMDOT standard is 12" width (and no wider), so presumably the commitment is for a 7" wide rumble strip.

(2) Given constraints and lower motor vehicle speeds within the Village of Galisteo, a four-foot shoulder is acceptable and certainly a desirable facility for bicyclists and pedestrians. As elsewhere on the corridor, the paved shoulder will also serve motor vehicle safety needs as well as contribute significantly to roadway preservation. However, where a cross section of 12-foot lanes and four-foot shoulders is proposed, "Between the Rodeo Grounds and the San Cristobal Arroyo Bridge," BCNM respectfully requests that proposed placement of the shoulder stripe be moved in one foot on each side of the road to create a proposed typical section of 11-foot lanes and 5-foot shoulders. This request is based on the facts that (1) the desirable minimum width of a shoulder as bike facility per AASHTO is five feet, (2) narrow travel lanes (narrower than the AASHTO maximum of 12 ft.) are associated with traffic calming, which is desired on approaches to Galisteo village, and (3) narrower travel lanes are more acceptable (that is, the drawbacks of narrower travel lanes are reduced) when there is a paved shoulder located immediately alongside such travel lanes.

(3) AASHTO guidelines to provide for safe clearance from vertical obstructions¹ (citation below) call for some shy distance beyond the absolute minimum width of the bike facility. In order to meet these guidelines, please strive to approximate "installation and surfacing" details in NMDOT Standard Drawing 606,² which shows face of guardrail located well outside of the usable paved shoulder space. The proposal above to move the shoulder stripe in one foot on part of the alignment would resolve this issue on the proposed San Cristobal Bridge cross section, which currently shows 12-ft. lanes with four-foot shoulders to face of concrete barrier. Elsewhere, where roadside barriers leave less than five feet clear space, please consider omitting or adjusting the rumble strip to maximize available clear space.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the EA and thank you for including the Bicycle Coalition of New Mexico in this excellent planning process for NM41 improvements.

---

¹ AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities (1999) p. 16:
Shoulder width of 1.5 m (5 feet) is recommended from the face of guardrail, curb or other roadside barriers. It is desirable to increase the width of shoulders where higher bicycle usage is expected. Additional shoulder width is also desirable if motor vehicle speeds exceed 80 km/h (50 mph), or the percentage of trucks, buses and recreational vehicles is high, or if static obstructions exist at the right side of the roadway.

² http://dot.state.nm.us/Plans_Specs_Estimates/Standard_Drawings/606.pdf
Comment Form
Proposed NM 41 Corridor Study
Public Hearing - June 6, 2012
Galisteo Community Center, Galisteo, NM

Please provide your comments on the proposed NM 41 Corridor Study. You may use this comment form or your own letter. All comments received by July 6, 2012 will become part of the final record for the environmental assessment. You may leave your comments at the hearing registration table, mail them to the address on the back of the form, or email them to TibbettsD@pbworld.com. Remember, the deadline for submitting comments is July 6, 2012. Thank you for your input and interest in the proposed NM 41 Corridor Study.

As a cyclist, riding on Hway 41 between 285 and...at least twice per week. All traffic - cars and trucks - includes vehicles that disregard speed limits, often as much as 20-30 mph beyond posted limits. My fear is that this would continue after the proposed improvements with lower speed limits. What is needed are "photo vehicle" unmarked sheriff vehicles and other speed enforcement.

Additionally, 4 foot shoulders is a bare minimum for cyclists, considering that there is not much option for avoidance of contact with vehicles.

For your comments to be included in the final record for the EA, your name and address must be provided.

Name
Address
City
Phone
Please provide your comments on the proposed NM 41 Corridor Study. You may use this comment form or your own letter. All comments received by July 6, 2012 will become part of the final record for the environmental assessment. You may leave your comments at the hearing registration table, mail them to the address on the back of the form, or email them to TibbettsD@pbworld.com. Remember, the deadline for submitting comments is July 6, 2012. Thank you for your input and interest in the proposed NM 41 Corridor Study.

4' sidewalk on bridges that are proposed are an invitation to our (Galisteo Valley) pre teen, teen, and young adults to ride their ATVs on. Galisteo already has a problem with them riding their bikes without Helmets, young kids about 9 to 10 yrs old are allowed to be passengers on these ATVs and we envision it predict that these kids are going to see these sidewalks as a new and challenging playground. County Sheriff have been notified in the past and continue to be notified to this day - Please reconsider on place barriers at each end.

@ intersection of Hwy 41 & Exit 42 - (Oil tankers, semis, etc) & other large trucks are using this road & I live on it & can swear to it.

For your comments to be included in the final record for the EA, your name and address must be provided.

Name
Address
City
Phone
Comment Form
Proposed NM 41 Corridor Study
Public Hearing - June 6, 2012
Galisteo Community Center, Galisteo, NM

Please provide your comments on the proposed NM 41 Corridor Study. You may use this comment form or your own letter. All comments received by July 6, 2012 will become part of the final record for the environmental assessment. You may leave your comments at the hearing registration table, mail them to the address on the back of the form, or email them to TibbettsD@pbworld.com. Remember, the deadline for submitting comments is July 6, 2012. Thank you for your input and interest in the proposed NM 41 Corridor Study.

Why is DOT catering to the bikers who endanger themselves and the rest of us because they like #41?

For your comments to be included in the final record for the EA, your name and address must be provided.

Name
Address
City
Phone
Thank you for your time and dedication on this project.

In favor of Alternative I

I am very pleased that bicyclists have been considered on this project for their safety as well as the motorists.

I am in favor of the walkways on the bridges. I enjoy walking everyday and will feel safer if these are included.

I am in total approval of the NM 41 Corridor improvement from a safety standpoint.

For your comments to be included in the final record for the EA, your name and address must be provided.

Name
Address
City
Phone
-----Original Message-----
From: 
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2012 4:29 PM 
To: Tibbetts, Dawn 
Subject: The proposed widening of 41

I've been riding Cnty Rd 41 for years. The current state of the road is poor and the shoulder inadequate. It can be downright scary at times. I hope the project is approved to widen the road to Clark Hill.
Hi
Thank you very much for your speedy response and also for your responsiveness to our concerns. I am away for two weeks and will contact you when I return.
Again, I appreciate working with you.

On Jun 7, 2012, at 12:28 PM, "Pennington, Dave (Albuquerque)" wrote:

Thank you for attending the NM 41 public hearing yesterday. Attached is the roadway plan and profile information you requested. I have only included the segment from Clark Hill north to Arroyo de la Jara, as this is the only section where notable changes are proposed to the vertical curves. Please note that the vertical to horizontal scale in the profile portion of each sheet is 10:1. The vertical exaggeration makes the vertical changes easier to see; however, it also makes the vertical change appear to be much greater than if they were viewed in a normal 1:1 layout. Nonetheless, the profile drawings will give you an idea of how the change will compare to the existing. The dashed line in the profile is existing and the solid line is the proposed. The dashed line on the plan view is the edge of slope. This will give you an idea of how the far the re-contouring of the terrain will extend away from the pavement. Feel free to contact me or any of the NMDOT folks if you need explanation or have questions.

Last night I mentioned that I can provide you with cross sections as an aid to help illustrate the extent of new slope/fill areas. After searching, I do not have the latest file. I have requested these from the designer and will send them to you when I receive them – should be in a day or two.

Thanks.

Dave

David L. Pennington
Area Manager
Parsons Brinckerhoff
6100 Uptown Boulevard NE, Suite 700
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87110
505-878-6536 (Office)
505-379-9058 (Mobile)

pennington@pbworld.com
www.pbworld.com
I am writing to comment on the above project. I am a cyclist and use the road often. Like most Santa Fe cyclists, I find the meetings that you hold in the evenings in Galisteo terribly inconvenient. As a result, I think that the attendees from Galisteo are over-represented at the meetings. On behalf of the many cyclists who use the road, I ask that you make safety the prime consideration and make the road wide enough to safely accommodate both vehicles and cyclists. Thank you.
Comment Form
Proposed NM 41 Corridor Study
Public Hearing - June 6, 2012
Galisteo Community Center, Galisteo, NM

Please provide your comments on the proposed NM 41 Corridor Study. You may use this comment form or your own letter. All comments received by July 6, 2012 will become part of the final record for the environmental assessment. You may leave your comments at the hearing registration table, mail them to the address on the back of the form, or email them to TibbettsD@pbworld.com. Remember, the deadline for submitting comments is July 6, 2012. Thank you for your input and interest in the proposed NM 41 Corridor Study.

Love the medians at both ends of the village.
But... could they be narrower?
Then why the dummy up 17' above road surface 5'?

Thanks for all your hard work & continuing communication with us all.

For your comments to be included in the final record for the EA, your name and address must be provided.

Name
Address
City
Phone
------Original Message------

From: Sloan, Victor
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2012 9:44 AM
To: Tibbetts, Dawn
Cc: Leslie Gallery
Subject: NM 41 Corridor Study/comments

Thank you for your detailed presentation at the Galisteo community center on Wednesday, June 6, and for sending the roadway plan and profile. Following are some brief comments that I would like to make.

Bridges:
I would have preferred severe speed and weight restrictions, with exceptions for emergency vehicles, to replacement of the two bridges. However, of the choices presented, I believe alternative 1 is the best, particularly if the width of the bridges could be confined to 11' driving lanes and 4' shoulders, eliminating the walkways. It seems to me that the wider the bridges appear, the faster an approaching driver is encouraged to go. Slimming the driving lanes on the San Cristobal bridge from 12' to 11' would be no more dangerous than the proposed 11' lanes on the Galisteo creek bridge, particularly if the shoulders approaching the bridge could be narrowed to 4' as a visual warning of the slimmer roadway to come. While the proposed 4' pedestrian walkway is a pleasant idea, I believe that the 4' shoulders are sufficient and that a slimmer bridge is more in keeping with the scale of the community.

Roadway:
It looks to me as if the cutting and filling proposed for some scenic and rolling sections of the road is excessive. There appear to be roughly twelve alterations between two and a half and five feet, four between five and ten feet and two of greater than ten feet. I think it has been demonstrated that widening and straightening of roadways in the hope of making them safer may actually have the opposite effect; drivers tend to fly along at the highest speed they consider comfortable, so wider and straighter roads may simply encourage higher speeds with no significant positive effect on safety. Please don't give us another, slightly thinner, version of the roughly parallel 84/285 cutting through the Galisteo basin. Addressing safety issues, the proposed 6' wide shoulders (I would prefer 5') will give drivers added room for evasive maneuvering and reduce the perceived need for drastic cutting and filling. Therefore, in order to preserve some of the rural and scenic nature of NM 41, which tourism and economic development interests as well as local residents consider important, I hope that the most invasive cuts and fills can be significantly reduced.

Sincerely,
-----Original Message-----
From:
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2012 10:05 PM
To:
Cc: Tibbetts, Dawn
Subject: Re: NM 41 Corridor Study/comments

I agree completely with you comments, sam. Thank you for bringing your /our concerns forward.

On Jun 13, 2012, at 11:43 AM, wrote:

> Thank you for your detailed presentation at the Galisteo community center on Wednesday, June 6, and for sending the roadway plan and profile. Following are some brief comments that I would like to make.
> Bridges:
> I would have preferred severe speed and weight restrictions, with exceptions for emergency vehicles, to replacement of the two bridges. However, of the choices presented, I believe alternative 1 is the best, particularly if the width of the bridges could be confined to 11' driving lanes and 4' shoulders, eliminating the walkways. It seems to me that the wider the bridges appear, the faster an approaching driver is encouraged to go. Slimming the driving lanes on the San Cristobal bridge from 12' to 11' would be no more dangerous than the proposed 11' lanes on the Galisteo creek bridge, particularly if the shoulders approaching the bridge could be narrowed to 4' as a visual warning of the slimmer roadway to come. While the proposed 4' pedestrian walkway is a pleasant idea, I believe that the 4' shoulders are sufficient and that a slimmer bridge is more in keeping with the scale of the community.
> Roadway:
> It looks to me as if the cutting and filling proposed for some scenic and rolling sections of the road is excessive. There appear to be roughly twelve alterations between two and a half and five feet, four between five and ten feet and two of greater than ten feet. I think it has been demonstrated that widening and straightening of roadways in the hope of making them safer may actually have the opposite effect; drivers tend to fly along at the highest speed they consider comfortable, so wider and straighter roads may simply encourage higher speeds with no significant positive effect on safety. Please don't give us another, slightly thinner, version of the roughly parallel 84/285 cutting through the Galisteo basin. Addressing safety issues, the proposed 6' wide shoulders (I would prefer 5') will give drivers added room for evasive maneuvering and reduce the perceived need for drastic cutting and filling. Therefore, in order to preserve some of the rural and scenic nature of NM 41, which tourism and economic development interests as well as local residents consider important, I hope that the most invasive cuts and fills can be significantly reduced.
> Sincerely,
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I attended the June 5th comment meeting in Galisteo. I find that Alternative A would be acceptable. I both drive and ride my bicycle through the Galisteo corridor.

The lane widths for both cars and bicycles has been reduced somewhat from the standard. There should not be any further reductions in lane width. If the village chooses to forgo the walkway, it is their decision to live with. Any reduction in bicycle lane width, or traffic lane will put walkers and bicyclists at risk.

Do pave the entire road width with a finish course for all the remaining 4 1/2 foot bicycle lanes to be fully usable.

Thank You.

For your comments to be included in the final record for the EA, your name and address must be provided.

Name
Address
City
Phone
-----Original Message-----
From: Lucy Lippard <flip14@wildblue.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2012 11:24 AM
To: Tibbetts, Dawn
Subject: NM 41

I must say that I feel like crying when I come into Galisteo from either direction and realize our lovely grassy shoulders will soon be gone, and with them the "rural" gateways to our village. But I realize bikers have rights too. (I am a daily walker here for 20 years, and perfectly happy with the status quo.)

I hope that care is taken not to remove any more trees than necessary (for obvious ecological reasons, and also because I depend on them to shield me from the highway) and that there will be minimal disturbances of wildlife. I walk across the bridge weekly and have advocated in meetings that the walkway be raised as it is now; it makes pedestrians feel far safer than a railing on the same level, however hefty.

I also hope that the idea of "medians" is not being seriously considered. Again, the urban/suburban look (not to mention huge widening of the roads) is incompatible with a rural village. Galisteo may have been gentrified, but so far it has not been too tarted up. Let's try to keep it that way.

Thank you for your sensitivity to the community, even though we dread the changes.