Dallas CBD Second Light Rail Alignment (D2)

Subway Project Refinement

Stakeholder Committee Meeting
January 18, 2017
Meeting Objectives

• Review Alternative Ideas submitted by Stakeholders in December 2016
• Present Technical Committee Assessment Recommendations for Stakeholder Consideration
• Agree on set of reasonable subway alternatives to present DART Board and Dallas City Council to advance to screening evaluation
Agenda

• Review LPA Refinement Process and Schedule
• Review Key Project Objectives
• Review D2 Subway Alternatives
• Technical Committee Assessment
• Stakeholder Agreement on Set of Reasonable D2 Subway Alternatives
• Evaluation Criteria
• Next Steps
LPA Refinement Evaluation Process

Key Objectives

Range of Reasonable Subway Alternatives

Screening Evaluation

Short List of Subway Alternatives

Detailed Evaluation

Refined D2 LPA Recommendation

Dec-Jan

Jan-Feb

Mar-May

May-June
LPA Refinement Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPA REFINEMENT PHASE</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RANGE OF SUBWAY OPTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCREENING EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHORT LIST OF SUBWAY OPTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETAILED EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined LPA Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined LPA Approvals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Core Capacity Annual Submittal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Stakeholder Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Decision Milestone

WE ARE HERE
Role of Stakeholder Committee

- Provide the D2 Team with knowledge of opportunities and issues associated with their respective organization or property
- Coordinate and share information with their constituency
- Offer strategies to resolve issues between competing interests
- Review technical committee findings and make recommendations to DART Board
- Regularly attend meetings
Objectives to Identify Reasonable Set of Subway Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within $1.3 Billion Budget (YOE)</td>
<td>DART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructability/Favorable geology conditions</td>
<td>DART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway between Woodall Rodgers and IH 345</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to shift Green/Orange Line operations to D2</td>
<td>FTA (Core Capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of transfers (Proximity to Existing Bus/Rail)</td>
<td>City Council/DART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Jobs (Employment density)</td>
<td>City Council/DART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability between both downtown LRT lines</td>
<td>DART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize curves (travel time, O&amp;M, construction)</td>
<td>DART</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of Subway Idea Input
Range of Subway Ideas

**Corridors**
- Uptown
- Arts District
- Pacific
- Elm
- Commerce
- Wood
- Young
- Canton

**West/Victory Connection**
- Existing rail corridor
- DART-owned Victory ROW

**East/Deep Ellum Connection**
- Swiss
- Good Latimer
UPTOWN (ROUT) CORRIDOR

Portal in Museum Way

Complex Junction Configuration
May require LRT system out of service
ARTS DISTRICT CORRIDOR

DART Victory ROW Option

Complex Junction Configuration
May require LRT system out of service
Discussion of Subway Alternatives

Primary Corridors

PACIFIC CORRIDOR

- DART Victory ROW Option
- Swiss Option Portal west of IH 345
- Swiss Option Portal east of IH 345
- Rail Corridor Option
- Green Line track reconstruction (embedded track) and Deep Ellum Station removal/relocation
Discussion of Subway Alternatives

**Primary Corridors**

- **ELM CORRIDOR**
  - DART Victory ROW Option
  - Rail Corridor Option
  - Green Line track reconstruction (embedded track) and Deep Ellum Station removal/relocation
  - Swiss Option Portal east of IH 345
Proposed Elm Refinements

West adjustment to Elm RR Corridor option will be assessed

Monument Alley option will be assessed
Discussion of Subway Alternatives

Primary Corridors

- **COMMERCE CORRIDOR**
  - DART Victory ROW Option
  - Swiss Option
    - Portal west of IH 345
  - Good Latimer Option
    - Portal west of IH 345
  - Rail Corridor Option

- Green Line track reconstruction (embedded track) and Deep Ellum Station removal/relocation
CITY OF DALLAS D2 ALIGNMENT COMMENTS - PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

LEGEND

- Red Line
- Blue Line
- Green Line
- Orange Line

1. **Commerce St. A: Swiss Ave. Option**
   - Potential Station/Pedestrian Portal Location
   - Approx. 9,900' long (7,200' underground)

2. **Commerce St. B: Below-Grade Junction Option**
   - Potential Station/Pedestrian Portal Location
   - Approx. 11,600' long (9,300' underground)

3. **Ross Avenue**
   - Potential Station/Pedestrian Portal Location
   - Approx. 11,200' long (8,200' underground)

- Proposed Spur to High Speed Rail
- Non-Revenue Track
- Existing Streetcar/Trolley
- Potential Streetcar Route
- Train Portal
- Potential At-Grade Station for All Alignments
Discussion of Subway Alternatives

Primary Corridors

WOOD CORRIDOR

DART Victory ROW Option

Swiss Option
Portal west of IH 345

Good Latimer Option
Portal west of IH 345

Green Line track reconstruction (embedded track) and Deep Ellum Station removal/relocation
Discussion of Subway Alternatives

**Primary Corridors**

- **YOUNG CORRIDOR**
  - **Good Latimer Option**
    - Portal west of IH 345
  - **Swiss Option**
    - Portal west of IH 345
  - **DART Victory ROW Option**
  - **Green Line track reconstruction**
    - (embedded track) and Deep Ellum Station removal/relocation
Discussion of Subway Alternatives

Primary Corridors

CANTON CORRIDOR

DART Victory ROW Option

Good Latimer Option
Portal west of IH 345
Additional Stakeholder Suggestions
Ideas Not Developed
West Junction in Subway

- Beyond Core Capacity scope
- Exceeds available budget
- Constructability issues
- Existing rail service impacted during construction
Ideas Not Developed
East Junction in Subway

- Beyond Core Capacity scope
- Exceeds available budget
- Constructability issues
- Existing rail service impacted during construction
Summary of Technical Committee Discussion
Technical Committee Meeting

• The Technical Committee has met twice since the December 7 kick-off meeting with stakeholders
  • December 15
    – Discussed range of subway ideas submitted
  • January 12
    – Reviewed range of subway alternatives against project objectives
    – Agreed on set of reasonable options to recommend to stakeholders
Technical Committee Representation

• Local, state, federal resource agencies (i.e., TxDOT, NCTCOG)
• Local, state, federal permitting authorities (i.e., City of Dallas, FTA)
• Utility companies (i.e., Oncor, AT&T)
• Organizations with transportation interests (i.e., DDI, Deep Ellum Foundation, TREC, GDPC)
Key Technical Committee Findings

• Canton is too far south to meet Core Capacity objectives and serve existing ridership
• Uptown options would have significant real estate impacts and would not meet Core Capacity objectives
• Wood Street is too narrow and presents constructability issues
• Young meets objectives, but not as well as those to the north
• Pacific, Elm, Commerce best meet project objectives
Key Technical Committee Findings

• When considering the RR corridor versus the DART Victory right-of-way:
  – Victory provides benefit of station near Perot Museum that can serve that growing area of downtown
  – RR corridor presents cost/risk issues due to poor geology and no station opportunity
  – RR corridor requires use of pocket track to turn Red/Blue back south for emergency/special operations
  – Victory provides potential of full junction for operational flexibility
  – If using RR corridor:
    • Pacific is the only option that avoids Sixth Floor Depository/Dealey Plaza area
    • Elm presents risk but proposed realignment will be assessed
    • Commerce presents the most risk
Key Technical Committee Findings

• When considering Swiss versus Good Latimer:
  – Swiss is preferred due to Deep Ellum concerns with Good Latimer route:
    • A portal east of IH 345 is preferable
    • Avoid impacts to Carpenter Park
  – Good Latimer should only advance if a feasible below-ground option can be developed
Key Technical Committee Findings

• Other considerations as D2 Subway is developed:
  – Consider future service to High Speed Rail (HSR)
  – Upgrade the west end junction from 1-track to 2-track to allow for potential service direct from Victory to Union Station and HSR/Convention Center area
  – Streetcar presents opportunity to complement D2 Subway and serve other areas of downtown
### Summary of Technical Committee Findings for Stakeholder Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>TECHNICAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RR ROW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORY ROW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR ROW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td><em>Needs Refinement</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORY ROW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR ROW</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORY ROW</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD LATIMER</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td><em>Unless there is feasible below-grade</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWISS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD LATIMER</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWISS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD LATIMER</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td><em>Unless there is feasible below-grade</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWISS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD LATIMER</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWISS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPTOWN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEARL</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANTON</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS DISTRICT</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td><em>Work with city on East Junction options</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table contains recommendations for various alternatives with specific notes and conditions indicated.*
Stakeholder Discussion
Set of Reasonable Alternatives

• Do stakeholders agree with technical committee assessment?

• Are there any additional that should be dropped? Why?

• Are there any that should be retained? Why?

• Consensus list of alternatives
Screening Evaluation Criteria

• Proposed Screening Evaluation Criteria
  – Incorporate stakeholder input to date
  – Intended to support “short list” recommendations

• Detailed Evaluation Criteria will be developed to evaluate the short list of D2 subway options
  – Intended to support selection of a refined D2 Locally Preferred Alternative
Next Steps

• January
  – General public meetings (January 19)
  – Initiate screening evaluation

• February
  – Technical Committee Meeting
  – Stakeholder Committee Meeting
  – Screening Evaluation/Short List Recommendation

• March-May
  – Define Short Listed Options in more detail
  – Detailed Evaluation of Short List
  – Initiate Streetcar Alignment Discussion
How to Stay Involved

• Attend project meetings
• View materials and progress on www.DART.org/D2
• Comments? Email D2@DART.org
• Provide comments on key issues that DART should address in the process