Memorandum

DATE May 15, 2009

TO Trinity River Committee Members:
    David A. Neumann (Chair)
    Mayor Pro Tem Dr. Elba Garcia (Vice-Chair)
    Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Dwaine Caraway
    Carolyn R. Davis
    Linda Koop

SUBJECT Trinity Parkway Briefing

At the May 19, 2009 meeting of the Trinity River Corridor Project Committee, the attached briefing will be presented by Dan Chapman, P.E. with HNTB, Corp., representing the North Texas Tollway Authority. The briefing will provide an update on project status and a summary of the Public Hearing held on May 5, 2009. Staff will recommend that the Committee approve Alternative 3C – Combined (Further Modified) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Trinity Parkway alignment.

If you have additional questions, please let me know.

Jill A. Jordan, P.E.
Assistant City Manager

THE TRINITY
DALLAS

Attachment

c: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
    Mary K. Suham, City Manager
    Ryan S. Evans, First Assistant City Manager
    Ramon F. Miguez, P.E., Assistant City Manager
    A. C. Gonzalez, Assistant City Manager
    Forest E. Turner, Interim Assistant City Manager
    David K. Cook, Chief Financial Officer

Deborah A. Watkins, City Secretary
Thomas P. Perkins, Jr., City Attorney
Craig D. Kinton, City Auditor
Judge C. Victor Lander
Helena Stevens-Thompson, Asst. to the City Manager
Frank Librio, Director, Public Information Office

“Dallas, the City that works: diverse, vibrant, and progressive”
Agenda

• Corridor Overview
• Project Update
• Public Hearing Overview
• Public Comments
• Trinity River Corridor Projects Workshop
• Key Factors in Recommending Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)
• Next Steps
Corridor Overview
Project Update

- Initial Section 408 Submittal to USACE – May 1, 2009
- SDEIS Public Hearing – May 5, 2009
- Comment Period – March 20, 2009 to May 15, 2009
- Trinity River Corridor Projects Workshop – May 18, 2009
Public Hearing Overview

FHWA authorized release of the SDEIS on February 19, 2009

... The Feb 2009 SDEIS entirely replaces the Feb 2005 DEIS
Public Hearing Overview
Tuesday, May 5, 2009, Dallas Convention Center
Public Hearing Overview

Actual Timeline:

• Open House: 4:00 PM to 7:00 PM
• Public Hearing Presentation: 7:00 PM to 8:35 PM
• Recess: 8:35 PM to 9:00 PM
• Public Comments: 9:00 PM to 10:40 PM
• Hearing Adjourned: 10:40 PM
Public Hearing Overview

Attendance:

• Total attendees at the open house and public hearing – 405
• Elected officials – 6
• General public – 309
• Media representatives – 10
• Staff and consultants – 80
  (includes FHWA, TxDOT, NTTA, City of Dallas, Dallas County, HNTB, Halff Associates and others)
Public Hearing Overview
Public Outreach and Agency Coordination

- Formal public scoping meeting – July 1999
- Community Advisory Work Group
- 190+ public outreach meetings & presentations to local organizations, neighborhood groups, and elected officials (on-going)
- 100+ Interagency Executive Team meetings (on-going)
- Project-specific Internet Web page
- DEIS Public Hearing – March 2005
- Extensive consultation with USACE
- SDEIS Public Hearing – May 5, 2009
Public Hearing Overview

Project Alternatives

- No Build
- Alternatives 2A & 2B
- Alternatives 3A, 3B & 3C
- 4A & 4B
- 5
Public Hearing Overview
USACE Major Issues
(Would apply to all roadway alternatives within the Dallas Floodway)

1. No transfer of lands
2. Maintain federal project primacy
3. No impacts on Dallas Floodway O&M, flood fighting and surveillance
4. No impacts on the flood damage reduction capability of the Floodway (existing or planned)
5. No cuts or retaining walls in levees
6. Avoid / mitigate impacts of bridge crossings, ramps and interchanges on levees
## Public Hearing Overview

### Alternative Comparison Table

Note: All costs shown in 2007 dollars, rounded to millions (M). Project costs are expected to increase in future years due to inflation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trinity Parkway Alternative</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Estimated Right-of-Way (Ac)</th>
<th>Estimated Right-of-Way Cost ($)</th>
<th>Estimated Construction Cost ($)</th>
<th>Estimated Agency Cost ($)</th>
<th>Total Estimated Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (No Build)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>$ 392 M</td>
<td>$ 1,321 M</td>
<td>$ 364 M</td>
<td>$ 2,079 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>$ 353 M</td>
<td>$ 976 M</td>
<td>$ 276 M</td>
<td>$ 1,606 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>$ 94 M</td>
<td>$ 773 M</td>
<td>$ 211 M</td>
<td>$ 1,079 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>$ 111 M</td>
<td>$ 809 M</td>
<td>$ 221 M</td>
<td>$ 1,142 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>$ 111 M</td>
<td>$ 925 M</td>
<td>$ 252 M</td>
<td>$ 1,290 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>$ 101 M</td>
<td>$ 872 M</td>
<td>$ 241 M</td>
<td>$ 1,216 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$ 102 M</td>
<td>$ 1,005 M</td>
<td>$ 275 M</td>
<td>$ 1,384 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>$ 114 M</td>
<td>$ 1,068 M</td>
<td>$ 296 M</td>
<td>$ 1,479 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-7. SDEIS - Total Length, Right-of-way, And Estimated Costs
Public Hearing Overview
Inspection Report Major Findings

• Insufficient crest height rendering the East and West Levees incapable of successfully accommodating the Standard Project Flood without overtopping

• Significant encroachments and penetrations that impact the integrity and performance of the levees, as well as inhibit access for O&M, surveillance and flood fighting purposes

• Damaged gate closures

• Unstable structures
Public Hearing Overview

Inspection Report Major Findings (cont’d)

• Severe cracking of the levees
• Erosion; Vegetation
• Siltation; Channel instability
• Failure to meet USACE design criteria regarding relevant factors of safety for embankment stability and seepage gradients
Public Hearing Overview
Agency Position Regarding
Inspection Report New Information

• TxDOT, FHWA & NTTA will review the findings of the Inspection Report as they may relate to Trinity Parkway

• The agencies will identify and develop further studies needed with respect to the levee conditions and its impact on the Trinity Parkway Floodway alternatives

• The agencies will continue to coordinate with the City of Dallas and USACE to develop remedial actions if needed

• In the event a Floodway alternative is recommended for Trinity Parkway, further studies and initial results regarding the Parkway and the levees would be presented to the public in the future, but prior to the Final EIS
## Public Hearing Overview
### Summary of Environmental Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Factor</th>
<th>1 No-Build</th>
<th>2A Industrial Elevated</th>
<th>2B Industrial At-Grade</th>
<th>3A Combined Riverside Original</th>
<th>3B Combined Riverside Modified</th>
<th>3C Combined Riverside Further Modified</th>
<th>4A Split Riverside Original</th>
<th>4B Split Riverside Modified</th>
<th>5 Split Landside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential displacements</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial displacements</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ population affected</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in park land</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-1 Ac.</td>
<td>-5 Ac.</td>
<td>-174 Ac.</td>
<td>-154 Ac.</td>
<td>-177 Ac.</td>
<td>-214 Ac.</td>
<td>-270 Ac.</td>
<td>-84 Ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic properties affected</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise receivers impacted</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Factor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>3A Combined Riverside Original</td>
<td>3B Combined Riverside Modified</td>
<td>3C Combined Riverside Further Modified</td>
<td>4A Split Riverside Original</td>
<td>4B Split Riverside Modified</td>
<td>5 Split Landside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous sites impacted</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters of the U.S. incl’g wetlands</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-4 Ac.</td>
<td>-9 Ac.</td>
<td>-83 Ac.</td>
<td>-81 Ac.</td>
<td>-91 Ac.</td>
<td>-86 Ac.</td>
<td>-111 Ac.</td>
<td>-12 Ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-year floodplain area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>53 Ac.</td>
<td>76 Ac.</td>
<td>303 Ac.</td>
<td>290 Ac.</td>
<td>297 Ac.</td>
<td>384 Ac.</td>
<td>418 Ac.</td>
<td>267 Ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPF valley storage (% change)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPF max. increase in flood elev.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+0.05 ft.</td>
<td>+0.09 ft.</td>
<td>+0.03 ft.</td>
<td>+0.19 ft.</td>
<td>+0.71 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Hearing Overview
Right of Way Acquisition and Relocation

• Conducted in accordance with the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended
Public Comments
(as of May 12, 2009)

• Total comments received: 129
• Speakers at the public hearing: 32
• Written comments: 97
• General categories of comments included support or opposition for the project or a particular alternative, floodplain/levee impacts, park land impacts, business and residential relocations, costs, and environmental justice
Public Comments (Cont’d)
(as of May 12, 2009)

• 13 stated general support with no alternative specified
• 33 specifically supported Alternative 3C
• 15 specifically stated opposition for Alternatives 2A and 2B
• 13 specifically stated opposition to construction in floodway
• 17 comments suggesting alternative concepts (e.g., tunnel, mass transit, or route further removed from the CBD)
• 14 Opposed to the project (No-Build)
Trinity River Corridor Projects Workshop
May 18, 2009

• USACE Stated Objectives
  – To inform the City of Dallas/NTTA of the Federal Agencies’ processes, including required activities and standards to be met for the projects.
  – Develop common understanding for next steps.

• Highlights
Key Factors in Recommending a LPA

- Right-of-way considerations
- Displacements of businesses and homes
- Environmental issues (noise, wetlands, air quality, historic sites)
- Cost
- Public Input
- Access
- Economic impacts
- Compatibility with local plans
Next Steps

• TRCPC Recommendation of LPA

• Dallas City Council action on resolution for recommendation of LPA

• Preparation of Public Hearing documentation

• Preparation and review of recommended LPA schematic
Next Steps (cont.)

- Preparation and review of FEIS and Final Section 4(f) Evaluation
  - Complete Section 106 coordination and Section 4(f) requirements
  - Discussion of the preferred alternative
  - Only practicable alternative finding and supporting rationale per 23 CFR 650 and E.O. 11988
  - Cumulative H&H model
  - Traffic data from 2009 conforming travel model and new CO & MSATs analysis, noise modeling, EJ tolling O&D analysis, etc.
  - Discussion of USACE Periodic Inspection Report of the Dallas Floodway
  - Summary and analysis of public and agency comments on the SDEIS
  - Re-evaluate environmental impacts based on more detailed design of the preferred alternative
The mission of the North Texas Tollway Authority is to enhance mobility through responsible and innovative tolling solutions.