Headlines

• Continuing to evaluate options
• We have identified an option that avoids taking any church property on Young Street
• We still have work to do
Young Street Cross Section with D2

**PROPOSED TYPICAL SECTION - LOOKING EAST**
Stakeholder/Public Issues Review

• Review of public and stakeholder comments received to date
  – Comment Tracker
• Review of issues identified at previous stakeholder meetings
• Discussion of any additional issues
Top Comment Tracker Issues

- Alternative Preference: 272
- Historic, Archeological & Cultural Resources: 263
- Section 4(f): 227
- Traffic & Transportation: 207
- Access: 149
- Land Use & Zoning: 149
- Noise & Vibration: 103
- Safety, Security & Quality of Life: 96
- Economic Impacts: 69
- Demographics & Socioeconomics: 45
- Community Facilities & Resources: 22
- Construction Impacts: 11
- Design: 11
- Displacements & Relocations: 10
- Public Park Lands: 8
- Other: 8
- Visual & Aesthetic Conditions: 5
- Service Reliability: 1
- Issue Unrelated to Current Project: 1

Number of Issues
AGENDA

• Welcome
• Objectives of Meeting
• Process Review and Schedule
• Stakeholder/Public Issues Review
• Status of Preliminary Engineering
• Status of Environmental Studies
  – Cultural Resources Presentation
• Upcoming Activities
• Design Options Exercise
Meeting Objectives

• Review the process and overall schedule
• Provide an update on both the engineering and environmental efforts
• Provide an in-depth review of the process to identify and assess potential impacts to historic structures
• Conduct a group exercise on design options
Process and Schedule Review

- Authorized into PD on November 5, 2015
- Complete (30% design and Final EIS/ROD) by summer 2017

Core Capacity Project Submittal
- Updates to FTA:
  - September 2016 (Updated information)
  - September 2017 (To support request to enter Engineering)

Legend:
- FTA Approval
- FTA Evaluation, Rating & Approval

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

- Complete environmental review process including developing and reviewing alternatives, selecting locally preferred alternative (LPA), and adopting it into the fiscally constrained long-range transportation plan

ENGINEERING

- Gain commitments of all non-New Starts funding
- Complete sufficient engineering and design

FULL FUNDING GRANT AGREEMENT

Construction

UNDER MAP21
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PHASE
PUBLIC & AGENCY INVOLVEMENT
PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING
10-20% PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING
30% PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING
SUPPLEMENTAL DEIS
EXISTING CONDITIONS
IMPACT ASSESSMENT
MITIGATION OPTIONS
FULL CORRIDOR & DESIGN OPTIONS
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
FINAL EIS
FULL CORRIDOR & SELECTED DESIGN OPTION
MITIGATION COMMITMENTS
FTA RECORD OF DECISION
MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM*

ANTICIPATED KEY MILESTONE MEETINGS

1. PD KICKOFF MEETINGS
2. PUBLIC MEETING: EXISTING CONDITIONS/ISSUE IDENTIFICATION AT 10% PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING
3. IMPACT ASSESSMENT FINDING / MITIGATION OPTIONS AT 20% PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING
4. PUBLIC HEARING FOR SDEIS

*THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM WILL CONTINUE THROUGH PROJECT ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION.

We are here
# Top Comment Tracker Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Preference</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic, Archeological &amp; Cultural Resources</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f)</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise &amp; Vibration</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, Security &amp; Quality of Life</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impacts</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics &amp; Socioeconomics</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities &amp; Resources</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Impacts</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacements &amp; Relocations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Park Lands</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual &amp; Aesthetic Conditions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Reliability</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Unrelated to Current Project</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Unrelated to Current Project</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Number of Issues**
## Stakeholder Issues Review

### SWG Meeting #2a – March 9, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Comment Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Dallas</td>
<td>Potential impacts to Historic Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONCOR</td>
<td>Electric transformer vaults on Wood/Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marharger Development</td>
<td>Potential impacts to Meletio Electric Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwood Park</td>
<td>Wood option precludes park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| First Presbyterian Church  | Potential noise/vibration impacts to Chapel/Encore Park  
Potential demolition of parking garage  
Potential impacts to surface parking access  
Potential pedestrian access impacts |
| Statler Hilton             | Jackson Street access impacts |
| Lone Star Gas Lofts        | Jackson Street access impacts |
| Continental Building       | Jackson Street access impacts |
| Butler Brothers Building   | Potential right-of-way encroachment  
Support increased accessibility |
| Aloft Hotel / SoCo Lofts   | Several concerns noted: Noise/vibration, loss of access, revenue loss, pedestrian circulation, traffic, economic development, increased development costs, utilities, safety, quality of life, ADA, fire safety, code compliance, loss of property (land, structures), property values, etc. |
### Stakeholder/Public Issues Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Comment Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America/Metropolis Investment Holdings, Inc./Peloton</td>
<td>Potential impacts to below grade facilities/access along Lamar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Rite Temple (Freemasons)</td>
<td>Not directly impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would support integration of LRT on their site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Ellum Foundation</td>
<td>Potential impacts to parking lots, pedestrian access, traffic circulation, historic structures/signs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Discussion of any additional issues that have not been raised at meetings or in Comment Tracker
Status of Engineering

- Focus over last few months has been on data collection to support engineering:
  - Geotechnical
  - Survey
  - Utilities
  - Right-of-Way/Building Foundations
Status of Environmental Studies

• Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) updates have been initiated

• Existing Conditions field work/research – recent field investigations have included noise studies, historic structures surveys and traffic counts
Status of Environmental Studies

- Noise field investigations were conducted in April
- Approximately 540 noise measurements taken at 9 locations
Status of Environmental Studies

Cultural resources – the historic structures survey was conducted the first week in May.

- 93 potentially historic structures were identified and two NRHP Districts
Status of Environmental Studies

12 new traffic counts at key intersections
Status of Environmental Studies

Next Steps

• Impacts analysis (pending 10% design)
  o To be conducted for all environmental categories
  o Will review findings with this group as completed
HISTORIC STRUCTURES
Historic Structures

• Regulatory Background
• Process
• Study Area Resources
  - 2009 study – buildings
  - 2016 study – buildings
• Next Steps
  - Survey Report – Coordination with SHPO
  - Determination of Effects
Historic Structures

Regulatory Background

• National Historic Preservation Act, 1966
• Section 106 of the NHPA
• Section 4f of the Transportation Act
• Antiquities Code of Texas – Chapter 26
Historic Structures

Process

• Area of Potential Effects (APE)/Resource Age
  o 300 feet from alignment
  o 45 years from anticipated revenue date of 2021 (1976)

• Data Collection
  o Existing databases
  o Field work

• Coordination with THC/SHPO
  o Determination of Eligibility
  o Determination of Effects based on Impact Assessments
Historic Structures

Study Area Resources

• 2009 study – 24 structures along the B4 Lamar Young Alignment
• 2016 study – 93 structures and two NRHP Districts along the LPA and design options on the east end
Potential Historic Resources
Cultural Resources

Sample of Study Area Resources

Looking east along Jackson from Harwood

Higginbotham-Bailey Building #4

Deep Ellum area
Cultural Resources

Next Steps

• Determination of Eligibility
• Impact Assessments
• Determination of Effects
Upcoming Activities

• June 15 Public Meetings
  – Existing conditions and key issues along the project corridor
  – How impact assessments will be conducted
  – Design progress including alignment, station concepts and cross sections
  – Project schedule and next steps

• Continue development on 10% Preliminary Engineering

• Initiate Impact Assessments for SDEIS

• SWG Meetings in late June, August, September
Future SWG Meeting Topics

- Noise and Vibration
- Traffic Analysis
- Urban Design/Visual Aesthetics
- Station Concepts/Integration
- Community Facilities and Services
- Integration of West End Station/Bus Transfer Center (safety/security)
DESIGN OPTIONS EXERCISE
Eastern Segment
Design Options Exercise

• Materials
  – Alignment Map of east end options
  – Issues/constraints reference maps
  – Cross sections of the 3 corridors
  – Design criteria information

• Instructions
  – Group discussion and exercise
  – Review the existing cross section
  – Review the draft cross section with project
  – Refer to issues/constraints map
  – Objectively score the option relative to criteria/topic based on the potential for impact (1 worst, 4 best)
Design Options Exercise Packet Review

• Pages 1-2

1 Exercise Purpose

Stakeholders will review the alignment options using the provided criteria to evaluate the LPA and Design Options.

The three options are:
- Jackson St. Locally Preferred Alternative
- Wood St. Design Option #1 and
- Young St. Design Option #2

2 Exercise Guidelines

- Stakeholders will be divided into groups.
- Stakeholders will review information and resources provided on each alignment option.
- Stakeholders must recognize the Design Requirements below and cannot change any requirements for the different options.
- Stakeholders will use the Evaluation Criteria below to assess the impacts.
- The Evaluation Criteria will use a rating scale of 1 to 4 with 1 being the worst and 4 being the best for each area.

3 Evaluation Criteria

These criteria will assess the potential impacts to the adjacent properties relative to:
- Property/Vehicle Access – how does this option impact the access to the property?
- Pedestrian Movement – would existing or future pedestrian movements be impacted?
- Property Acquisition – does this option require full or partial acquisition of properties?
- Sensitive Noise Receptors – are there sensitive receptors as defined by NEPA (See requirements below)?
- Historic Properties – would properties that are 45 years or old today be impacted?

4 Design Requirements

Roadway Design Standards:
- Travel lane width: 10'-0" to 12'-0"
- Bicycle lane width minimum: 5'-0"
- Sidewalk width: Minimum 5'-0", Desirable 10'-0" for downtown areas

Transit/Rail Design Standards:
- Distance between track center lines: 15'-6"
- Clear space distance from centerline of track to sidewalk or travel lane: Minimum 7'-6"
- Minimum guideway width: 30'-6"
- Minimum curve radius: 250'-0"

Transit/Rail Station Standards:
- Length: 385'-0", ADA Ramps at each end: 27'-6"
- Center platform width: 23'-8"
- Side platform widths: 17'-4"
- Station platforms must be placed within a tangent straight track. Station platforms cannot be placed within a curve and require a minimum of 100' of tangent beyond the platform resulting in a minimum tangent length of 585'-0" for placement of a station.

5 Design/Environmental Considerations

Utility Considerations:
- ONCVR vaults and underground duct banks
- DWU Water and Sanitary Sewer Lines
- Gas Lines
- Communications: telephone, fiber optic

Fire Life Safety Considerations:
- Emergency Vehicle Access to Corridor
- Emergency Evacuation of Light Rail Vehicles

Existing Conditions/Environmental Considerations:
- Historic Structures
- Noise/Vibration – Sensitive receptors are defined by NEPA as hospitals, cemeteries, school, hotels, homes etc. where quiet is essential and necessary
- Visual/Aesthetics
- Traffic Impacts (LOS)
- Property Access (pedestrian)
- Property Access (auto)
  - Service/Deliveries
  - Property Acquisition

Stakeholder Work Group Meeting #3
Design Options Exercise Packet Review

• Page 3 – Cross Sections
Design Options Exercise Packet Review

- Page 4 – Driveways/Access Points
Design Options Exercise Packet Review

• Page 5 – Existing Sidewalks
Design Options Exercise Packet Review

- Page 6 – Potential Acquisition/Displacement
Design Options Exercise Packet Review

• Page 7 – Noise Sensitive Receiver Locations
Design Options Exercise Packet Review
• Page 8 – Potential Historic Resources
Design Options Exercise
Group Reports