

Appendix A
FHWA PEL Questionnaire

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix A. Federal Highway Administration

Planning and Environmental Linkages Questionnaire

This questionnaire is intended to act as a summary of the planning process and ease the transition from planning to a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis. Often, there is no overlap in personnel between the planning and NEPA phases of a project, so consequently much (or all) of the history of decisions made in the planning phase is lost. Different planning processes take projects through analysis at different levels of detail. Without knowing how far, or in how much detail a planning study provided, NEPA project teams are not aware of and may often re-do work that has already been done. This questionnaire is consistent with the 23 CFR 450 (Planning regulations) and other FHWA policy on Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) process.

The Planning and Environmental Linkages Study (PEL Study) is used in this questionnaire as a generic term to mean any type of planning study conducted at the corridor or subarea level which is more focused than studies at the regional or system planning levels. Many states may use other terminology to define studies of this type and are considered to have the same meaning as a PEL study.

At the inception of the PEL Study, the study team must decide how the work will later be incorporated into subsequent NEPA efforts. A key consideration is whether the PEL Study will meet standards established by NEPA regulations and guidance. One example is the use of terminology consistent with NEPA vocabulary (e.g., purpose and need, alternatives, affected environment, environmental consequences).

Instructions: These questions should be used as a guide throughout the planning process, not just answered near completion of the process. When a PEL Study is started, this questionnaire will be given to the project team. Some of the basic questions to consider are: "What did you do?", "What didn't you do?" and "Why?". When the team submits a PEL study to FHWA for review, the completed questionnaire will be included with the submittal. FHWA will use this questionnaire to assist in determining if an effective PEL process has been applied before NEPA processes are authorized to begin. The questionnaire should be included in the planning document as an executive summary, chapter, or appendix.

1. Background

a. Who is the sponsor of the PEL study? (state DOT, local agency, other)

The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) is the sponsor of the PEL Study.



b. What is the name of the PEL study document and other identifying project information (e.g., sub-account or STIP numbers, long-range plan or transportation improvement program years)?

The scope of work from CDOT's solicitation for this project refers to it as the "Planning and Environmental Linkage Study for US 50 West Area." The study team adopted the name "US 50 West PEL Study: Swallows Rd. to Baltimore Ave." once logical termini were established. CDOT's project number is NH C020-027, and the Sub-account number is 16379.

The FY 2012–2017 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) identifies funding for improvements. The State Transportation Commission adopted the STIP on May 19, 2011, under STIP ID # SPB3726 and under STIP WBS ID # SR27002.019.

The Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG) 2035 *Long Range Transportation Plan* identifies congestion relief on US 50 between Purcell Blvd. and Pueblo Blvd. (SH 45) among its fiscally constrained elements. The *Long Range Transportation Plan* also includes grade-separated interchanges at Main McCulloch Blvd., Purcell Blvd., and Pueblo Blvd., in the list of Corridor Visions and Prioritized Projects.

c. Who was included on the study team (Name and title of agency representatives, consultants, etc.)?

Please see the **Acknowledgements** section immediately preceding the Executive Summary in the PEL Report for a detailed list of study team participants.

d. Provide a description of the existing transportation facility within the corridor, including project limits, modes, functional classification, number of lanes, shoulder width, access control and type of surrounding environment (urban vs. rural, residential vs. commercial, etc.)

The section of US 50 being studied extends about 11.8 miles from Swallows Rd. west of the Pueblo West Metropolitan District (at milepost 301.72) to Baltimore Ave. within the city of Pueblo (at milepost 313.52). This section of US 50 is classified as a freeway.

US 50 west of Pueblo between the intersections of Swallows Rd. and Baltimore Ave. is a four-lane divided east-west highway (two 12-foot lanes in each direction) with signalized intersections at Main McCulloch Blvd., Purcell Blvd., Pueblo Blvd. (State Highway 45), Wills Blvd., and Baltimore Ave. The intersections with Swallows Rd. and West McCulloch Blvd.

are unsignalized. There are also right-in, right-out accesses at Westroads Ave. (between Wills Blvd. and Baltimore Ave.) from both directions of US 50. Another right-in, right-out access is planned from US 50 eastbound to an extension of Tuxedo Blvd.

This portion of US 50 is divided by a depressed median from Swallows Rd. to the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad crossing, and by a raised median between the railroad crossing and Baltimore Ave. Acceleration and deceleration lanes are provided at the major intersections, as are left-turn lanes. US 50 travels through residential and agricultural areas from Swallows Rd. to Main McCulloch Blvd., then through parks and commercial areas between Main McCulloch Blvd. and Pueblo Blvd., and an urban area adjacent to the eastern study limits. The shoulder widths are about 10 feet on the outside and 4 feet on the inside between Swallows Rd. and the BNSF crossing, and 8 feet on the outside and 1 foot on the inside between the BNSF crossing and Baltimore Ave.

Sidewalks are provided along the south side of US 50 from Wills Blvd. to halfway between Westroads Ave. and Baltimore Ave. Pueblo Transit serves US 50 between Pueblo Blvd. (SH 45) and Club Manor Dr. to the east of the study area.

e. Provide a brief chronology of the planning activities (PEL study) including the year(s) the studies were completed.

- CDOT completed an Environmental Assessment (EA) for US 50 between Baltimore Ave. and I-25 in December 1997.
- CDOT completed the Eden Interchange/Pueblo Boulevard Feasibility Study in December 1999, which recommended a single-point urban interchange (SPUI) at the junction of US 50 and Pueblo Blvd. (SH 45).
- The Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG) Board adopted its 2035 *Long Range Transportation Plan* on January 24, 2008, and amended it on April 28, 2011.
- CDOT, FHWA, and other federal, state, and local agencies, along with the Colorado Front Range metropolitan planning organizations, including PACOG, entered into the Planning and Environmental Linkage Partnering Agreement on June 11, 2009, to foster proactive working relationships among all the participating agencies.
- CDOT and JFSA entered into an agreement to conduct the Planning and Environmental Linkages Study on US 50 West of Pueblo between the intersections of Swallows Rd. and Baltimore Ave. in July 2009.
- CDOT conducted an Origin-Destination Study within the project area from August 25 to September 30, 2009.
- CDOT and JFSA formed the Technical Advisory Team (TAT) on April 1, 2010, and conducted coordination meetings on April 1, May 6, June 15, July 13, August 5, August 17, September 14, October 7 and October 19, 2010; and on January 18, February 3, February 15, March 15, April 19, May 5, June 2, June 23, July 12, and August 4, 2011.
- CDOT formed the Policy Advisory Team (PAT) by inviting a representative of the Pueblo West Metropolitan District to ongoing bimonthly coordination meetings with Pueblo County and the City of Pueblo starting mid-2010.



- The TAT produced a first draft of a Purpose and Need Statement at the May 6, 2010, meeting. The TAT updated and revised the Purpose and Need Statement at the August 17, 2010, meeting and through subsequent email discussions.
- CDOT and JFSA completed the PEL Study in June 2012.

f. Are there recent, current or near future planning studies or projects in the vicinity? What is the relationship of this project to those studies/projects?

The project's analysis was consistent with the 2035 PACOG *Long Range Transportation Plan*.

The following projects are included in the Fiscally Constrained Plan:

- Construction of a split diamond interchange on I-25 at Dillon Dr. and Platteville Blvd.
- Congestion relief on US 50 between Purcell Blvd. and I-25, especially west of Pueblo Blvd. (SH 45)
- Completion of the Wildhorse Trail, in conjunction with development of the YMCA complex in the southeast quadrant of US 50 and Pueblo Blvd.

The following projects are included in the Corridor Visions and Prioritized Projects list:

- Grade-separated interchanges on US 50 at Main McCulloch Blvd., Purcell Blvd., and Pueblo Blvd.
- The Pueblo Blvd. Extension, ultimately north to the Pueblo and El Paso county line.
- The West Pueblo Connector from Purcell Blvd. to 4th St. (SH 96)
- The Platteville Blvd. Extension from States Ave., just west of the BNSF crossing, to I-25.

In addition, the following projects are included in the Preferred Plan:

- The West Pueblo Connector from 4th St. to Santa Fe Ave.
- Multiple components of the Spaulding Ave. Extension

The following studies are relevant to the US 50 West Corridor:

- The US 50 EA between Baltimore Ave. and I-25, completed in December 1997.
- The Eden Interchange/Pueblo Boulevard Feasibility Study, completed in December 1999.
- The Dillon-Eden Interchange EA, completed in January 2011.
- The ongoing I-25 New Pueblo Freeway EIS.

The study team also coordinated with the City of Pueblo, the County of Pueblo, Pueblo West Metropolitan District, and PACOG.



2. Methodology used:

a. What was the scope of the PEL study and the reason for completing it?

The scope of this PEL Study is to examine the need for improvements to US 50 between Swallows Rd. in Pueblo West and Baltimore Ave. in Pueblo. The PEL Study also examined the benefit that local improvement projects could provide to US 50, although the Preferred Alternative addresses only improvements to US 50. The reason for completing the PEL Study is to address the congestion and safety issues in the Corridor.

b. Did you use NEPA-like language? Why or why not?

Yes, using NEPA terms can lead to a better decision-making process that minimizes duplication of effort (future site-specific Categorical Exclusion or Environmental Assessment), promotes environmental stewardship, and reduces delays in project implementation.

c. What were the actual terms used and how did you define them? (Provide examples or list)

The terms used in this PEL are identical in meaning to those used in any NEPA document.

d. How do you see these terms being used in NEPA documents?

The terms used in this PEL are identical in their use in any NEPA document.

e. What were the key steps and coordination points in the PEL decision-making process? Who were the decision-makers and who else participated in those key steps? For example, for the corridor vision, the decision was made by state DOT and the local agency, with buy-in from FHWA, the USACE, and USFWS and other resource/regulatory agencies.

Key steps in the study process included:

- Identifying project purpose and need
- Identifying logical termini, critical issues, and constraints
- Determining the future design year (2035) and the travel demand model as a refinement to PACOG's regional model



- Developing alternatives and screening criteria
- Identifying the Preferred Alternative through various levels of evaluation processes

The primary decision-makers in the study process were the agency participants, including CDOT, FHWA, City of Pueblo, Pueblo County, Pueblo West Metropolitan District, and PACOG. All these participants were also involved in all the key steps, including:

- May 6, 2010, when the TAT drafted a Purpose and Need Statement
- August 17, 2010, when the TAT completed Level 1 Environmental Fatal Flaw Screening
- October 7, 2010, when the TAT completed Level 2 Purpose and Need Screening related to traffic levels of service
- June 2, 2011, when the TAT narrowed intersection options as part of Level 3 Evaluation
- July 12, 2011, when the TAT made its recommendation of the Preferred Alternative

Guidance and support for the decision-making process was gained through a series of TAT meetings and the presentations to elected officials of local agencies. The primary method for public outreach was two door-to-door visits with businesses, distribution of project information, news publicity, and meeting announcements in local newspapers, as well as formal public meetings, using an “open house” format, that were conducted during the alternative development and screening phase. The participating TAT agencies also promoted the study through their websites and other communication tools.

f. How should the PEL information be presented in NEPA?

The PEL Report was prepared consistent with NEPA language and allows the future NEPA study effort to readily extract pertinent data from the report.

3. Agency coordination:

a. Provide a synopsis of coordination with federal, tribal, state and local environmental, regulatory and resource agencies. Describe their level of participation and how you coordinated with them.

Please see **Chapter 4, Section 4.2** of the PEL Report, which describes the coordination with federal and state regulatory and resource agencies. No contacts were made with tribal governments. Contacts with local agencies focused on their transportation and public works departments, although community planning and zoning departments were also involved.

b. What transportation agencies (e.g. for adjacent jurisdictions) did you coordinate with or were involved during the PEL study?

Coordination occurred between:

- CDOT Region 2
- City of Pueblo – Departments of Planning & Community Development, Public Works and Transit
- Pueblo County – Department of Engineering & Public Works
- Pueblo West Metropolitan District – Public Works Department
- PACOG

Please see **Chapter 4, Section 4.1** of the PEL Report for more details on the coordination process involving the TAT and PAT.

c. What steps will need to be taken with each agency during NEPA scoping?

NEPA scoping requirements for site-specific projects in the US 50 Corridor will involve agency coordination to initiate the environmental review process. Agency coordination steps include:

- **Identifying any cooperating agency participation** – CDOT or FHWA may invite the participation of jurisdictional agencies to participate as cooperating agencies in environmental process.
- **Early agency coordination** – CDOT establishes an agency contact list and program to involve local, state, and federal agencies in the NEPA process through correspondence and meetings. The project purpose and need, issues, and regulatory requirements are typical topics in the early agency contact and coordination process.
- **Documentation** – Meeting and agency contact documentation include any issues, requirements, and recommendations identified during the early coordination process.

4. Public coordination:

a. Provide a synopsis of your coordination efforts with the public and stakeholders.

- CDOT and JFSA formed the Technical Advisory Team (TAT) on April 1, 2010, which met approximately monthly through the end of the study.
- CDOT formed the Policy Advisory Team (PAT) by inviting a representative of the Pueblo West Metropolitan District to ongoing bimonthly coordination meetings with Pueblo County and the City of Pueblo. CDOT conducted these coordination meetings periodically.



- Community Work Sessions (public meetings) were held on April 5, 2011, at the Pueblo West Public Library, and on April 7, 2011, at Centennial High School in Pueblo. Approximately 35 members of the public attended the first meeting, and about 6 members of the public attended the second.
- A press release was issued announcing both the start of the study, and, once it was concluded, informing citizens where they could review the final report. The report was posted on the CDOT website, with links on the PACOG, Pueblo County, City of Pueblo, and Pueblo West Metropolitan District websites.

5. Purpose and Need for the PEL study:

a. What was the scope of the PEL study and the reason for completing it?

The scope of the PEL Study is to consider environmental and community issues early in the planning process before a formal environment clearance begins. Data collected and analyzed for the PEL Study can be used in future environmental studies as funding for specific improvements becomes available.

A traffic safety assessment within the project area and a traffic forecast based on PACOG's socioeconomic forecast to estimate the future traffic volumes showed that US 50 within the project limit will experience congestion and safety deficiencies by the design year of 2035. This PEL Study is consistent with PACOG's *Long Range Transportation Plan* for 2035.

b. Provide the purpose and need statement, or the corridor vision and transportation goals and objectives to realize that vision.

Purpose and Need Statement

Please see **Chapter 1, Section 1.5** of this PEL Report, which includes a need statement in **Section 1.5.1** and a statement of project purposes in **Section 1.5.2**.

Corridor Vision

The PACOG *2035 Long Range Transportation Plan* adopted vision statements for two sections of US 50 that overlap with the study area: Cañon City to West McCulloch Blvd., and West McCulloch Blvd. to I-25.

The vision statement for the Cañon City to West McCulloch Blvd. segment is:

The Vision for the US 050A – Cañon City to West McCulloch Blvd. corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality. This corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility, provides commuter access, and makes east-west connections within the Pueblo to Cañon City area. Future travel modes include passenger vehicle, bus service, rail freight, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and Transportation Demand Management



(telecommuting and carpooling). The transportation system in the area primarily serves towns, cities, and destinations within the corridor. Based on historic and projected population and employment levels, passenger traffic volumes are expected to increase and Freight should increase to support the growing population along the US Hwy 50 Corridor west of Pueblo. The communities along the corridor value high levels of mobility, transportation choices, connections to other areas, and safety. They depend on tourism, agriculture, commercial activity, and employment at public prisons for economic activity in the area. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor while recognizing the environmental, economic and social needs of the surrounding area.

The vision statement for the West McCulloch Blvd. to I-25 segment is:

The Vision for the US 050A - West McCulloch Blvd. to I-25 corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality. This corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility, provides commuter access, and makes east-west connections within the Pueblo West to Pueblo Urbanized Area. Future travel modes include passenger vehicle, bus service, truck freight, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and Transportation Demand Management (telecommuting and carpooling). The transportation system in the area primarily serves towns, cities, and destinations within the corridor. Based on historic and projected population and employment levels, both passenger and freight traffic volumes are expected to increase. The communities along the corridor value high levels of mobility, transportation choices, connections to other areas, and safety. They depend on manufacturing and commercial activity for economic activity in the area. Users of this corridor want to preserve the urban character of the area while supporting the movement of commuters in and through the corridor while recognizing the environmental, economic and social needs of the surrounding area.

c. What steps will need to be taken during the NEPA process to make this a project-level purpose and need statement?

None, unless through further environmental data collection and analysis, any unforeseen conditions are found that will require the modification of the Purpose and Need statement in the PEL Study.



6. Range of alternatives: Planning teams need to be cautious during the alternative screen process; alternative screening should focus on purpose and need/corridor vision, fatal flaw analysis and possibly mode selection. This may help minimize problems during discussions with resource agencies. Alternatives that have fatal flaws or do not meet the purpose and need/corridor vision cannot be considered viable alternatives, even if they reduce impacts to a particular resource. Detail the range of alternatives considered, screening criteria and screening process, including:

a. What types of alternatives were looked at? (Provide a one or two sentence summary and reference document.)

A wide range of alternatives that address auto, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle modes were examined to assess their potential to alleviate the congestion and increase the mobility of the US 50 Corridor. Highway alternatives include intersection and mainline capacity improvements on US 50, as well as improvements in parallel corridors. Safety improvements and access control alternatives were also examined. A No Action Alternative was included in the evaluation. **Chapter 2** of this PEL Report describes all alternatives in general terms, with the specific alternatives in the final (Level 4) evaluation being described in **Section 2.15**.

b. How did you select the screening criteria?

The screening criteria were selected based on the established Purpose and Need of the project and to minimize the impact on the affected human and natural environments. The TAT and the PAT reviewed and agreed on the screening criteria.

The initial and detailed screening process and criteria were developed in cooperation with the public participation. The screening process and criteria were presented and discussed at public open house meetings.

c. For alternative(s) that were screened out, briefly summarize the reasons for eliminating the alternative(s).

In the final (Level 4) comparative analysis, those alternatives with relatively higher traffic delays, right-of-way acquisition, land use inconsistency, floodplain/stream/wetland and other environmental impacts were not recommended and screened out. Please see **Chapter 2, Section 2.14** of the PEL Report for a discussion of the tradeoffs among alternatives.



Chapter 2, Section 2.15 explains why Alternative E was preferred when compared to the other action alternatives and to the No Action Alternative.

All screening and comparative analysis processes were conducted in consultation with TAT members. **Chapter 2** has detailed information about each level of evaluation.

d. Which alternatives should be brought forward into NEPA and why?

At the minimum, the No Action Alternative and the Preferred Alternative should be brought forward into NEPA. **Chapter 2, Section 2.16** of the PEL Report describes the Preferred Alternative in detail.

e. Did the public, stakeholders, and agencies have an opportunity to comment during this process?

Yes. **Chapter 4** contains the details of agency and public involvement during the screening process.

f. Were there unresolved issues with the public, stakeholders and/or agencies?

There are no unresolved issues regarding the PEL Study, but some stakeholders were concerned about the timing of the implementation plan as the next step of the PEL Study.

7. Planning assumptions and analytical methods:

a. What is the forecast year used in the PEL study?

The PEL Study used 2035 as the forecast year.

b. What method was used for forecasting traffic volumes?

The PEL Study used the same method as PACOG to determine future traffic volumes. PACOG uses a four-step regional transportation planning model implemented in TransCAD and a custom trip generation application. **Appendix D** records refinements to the model made during the study, and **Appendix E** presents PACOG's letter concurring with those changes.

c. Are the planning assumptions and the corridor vision/purpose and need statement consistent with the long-range transportation plan?

Yes.

d. What were the future year policy and/or data assumptions used in the transportation planning process related to land use, economic development, transportation costs and network expansion?

The PEL Study used the same assumptions that PACOG established and checked with local agencies in regard to validity. Projects in the unconstrained *Long Range Transportation Plan* were included in the 2035 roadway network.

8. Environmental resources (wetlands, cultural, etc.) reviewed. For each resource or group of resources reviewed, provide the following:

a. In the PEL study, at what level of detail was the resource reviewed and what was the method of review?

Resource	Level of Detail and Method of Review
Land Use and Right-of-Way (ROW)	Obtained GIS parcel data from the City of Pueblo. Used GIS overlays to determine the acreage of property acquisition required for each intersection option. Also manually reviewed intersection footprints to determine whether property takes would be full or partial. Used PACOG's Future Land Use GIS Layer to qualitatively determine whether each intersection option would support that land use.
Local Vehicular, Pedestrian and Bicycle Access	Used qualitative site interpretation to determine how vehicular accesses to parcels might be modified in the future. Used a similar technique to evaluate changes to pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.
Air Quality	The Pueblo Metropolitan Area is in attainment for air quality. Recommended best management practices for construction.
Socioeconomics	Reviewed PACOG's GIS databases.
Environmental Justice	Performed GIS analysis on Census block groups to identify and map areas where the percentage of minority population or families living under the poverty line exceeds the Pueblo County average. The TAT thought the block groups were too large to make conclusions from the resulting maps and made a qualitative assessment based on local knowledge of development patterns.
Noise	For Level 3 Screening, qualitatively analyzed intersection options based on ramp configuration and which roadways passed above others. For Level 4 Analysis, used TNM 2.5 to analyze mainline and signalized intersection noise impacts, producing estimates of noise level at receptors within 500 feet of the US 50 centerline.
Visual	Qualitatively interpreted the number of levels of crossing roadway or pedestrian structures involved with each intersection option.

Resource	Level of Detail and Method of Review
Utilities	Collected GIS data from a number of sources. Overlaid and mapped intersection footprints. Qualitatively assessed potential impacts. Established cost estimates as a percentage of construction costs because no need for unusual relocation practices was identified.
Hazardous Materials	For Level 3 & 4 evaluation, used GIS overlays to identify hazmat sites that were potentially affected.
Water Quality	Sources identified water quality issues in the corridor that would be similar for any action alternative. Recommended best management practices for construction.
Surface Water & Floodplains	Obtained GIS and plan data from FEMA and the City of Pueblo. Used overlays to identify disturbance by alternative footprints.
TES Species Habitat	Level 3 evaluation addressed the species list from the USFWS. While these species are present in Pueblo County, no suitable habitat was found in the US 50 Corridor. Level 4 Analysis addressed the State DOW species list.
Wetlands	Completed field mapping and delineation studies to determine boundaries of wetlands. GIS overlays identified acres of impact by alternative.
Historic Properties, Recreational Properties and Wildlife Refuges	Database searches of the Colorado Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation did not identify any properties in the US 50 Corridor. A GIS layer of recreational properties from PACOG did not show any impacted properties. There are no wildlife refuges in the vicinity of the US 50 Corridor.

b. Is this resource present in the area and what is the existing environmental condition for this resource?

Chapter 3 of the PEL Report documents resources in the Corridor. Resources in and adjacent to the Corridor include hydrology and water quality, floodplains, vegetation and noxious weeds, fish and wildlife, threatened and endangered species, historic properties, paleontological resources, land use and recreation, social resources, economic resources, environmental justice, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, right-of-way, utility and railroad, noise, visual resources, hazardous materials, and cumulative impacts. **Table 3-1** provides a particularly useful summary of which resources are present in the Corridor and the level to which those resources present were examined.

c. What are the issues that need to be considered during NEPA, including potential resource impacts and potential mitigation requirements (if known)?

For issues that need to be considered during NEPA, please see the “**Next Steps**” sections for each resource examined in **Chapter 3**. Mitigation requirements are discussed in the “**Mitigation Strategies**” sections for each resource examined in **Chapter 3**.



d. How will the data provided need to be supplemented during NEPA?

Depending on the timing of future NEPA effort, certain resources in the Corridor may require an assessment due to new regulations, additional threatened and endangered species, historic time limits, etc. The environmental resource sections of **Chapter 3** identify any potential data collection activities in the “**Next Steps**” section. Also see **Table 3-1** for a convenient summary.

9. List environmental resources you are aware of that were not reviewed in the PEL study and why? Indicate whether or not they will need to be reviewed in NEPA and explain why.

There are no environmental resources commonly encountered in an urban arterial corridor that were purposely omitted from consideration in this PEL study. Consultation with and concurrence from resource agencies was not conducted as a part of this PEL Study and will need to be performed in a subsequent NEPA study.

10. Were cumulative impacts considered in the PEL study? If yes, provide the information or reference where it can be found.

Yes. Cumulative impacts were considered in this PEL Study. Please see **Chapter 3, Section 3.17.4**.

11. Describe any mitigation strategies discussed at the planning level that should be analyzed during NEPA.

Mitigation strategies were only schematically developed in this PEL level study, and are described in the “**Mitigation Strategies**” section within each resource considered in **Chapter 3**. The detailed mitigation strategy for each impacted resource will need to be further analyzed during the NEPA phase. Such mitigation strategies may include noise walls, wetland replacement, floodplains re-delineation, stream re-alignment, hazardous materials remediation, railroad crossing replacement, visual, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, water quality, and vegetation.



12. What needs to be done during NEPA to make information from the PEL study available to the agencies and the public? Are there PEL study products which can be used or provided to agencies or the public during the NEPA scoping process?

Relevant planning products that are readily available to a subsequent NEPA process include:

- This PEL Report, including the Alternative Screening Information in **Appendix B** and the Travel Modeling Methods in **Appendix D**
- The **Implementation Plan** developed and added as an addendum to the PEL Report

All documentation will be posted on the CDOT website and will also be readily available to the public through the offices of each TAT member agency.

13. Are there any other issues a future project team should be aware of?

a. Examples: Controversy, utility problems, access or ROW issues, encroachments into ROW, problematic landowners and/or groups, contact information for stakeholders, special or unique resources in the area, etc.

The exact definition and planned use of the Pueblo West Multi-Use Easement may need to be clarified. Please see **Chapter 3, Section 3.15.4** of the PEL Report for a discussion of this easement.

Future study teams should verify that FEMA does not intend to take further action on the city's request to remap floodplains downtown based on the assumption that US 50 delays flood waters at Pueblo Blvd.

This page intentionally left blank.