



# Appendix F

Comments Received on the D2 Subway Project  
Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS)



# **F-1**

## **Responses to Comments**



The Response to Comment Table contained in this appendix provides a response to all comments received within the 45-day comment period. All communications received were issued a unique comment number. The Response to Comment Table is divided into Elected Official Comments, Agency Comments and Public Comment Sections. The entry for each comment includes how the comment was received (mail, email, comment card, or oral testimony), the commenter name (and title where appropriate), the subject matter and the category of comment.

The Comment Categories are numbered 1 through 4:

- 1) Substantive comment requiring modification to FEIS or change to Project scope
- 2) General comment; response provided with no change to FEIS
- 3) Minor factual correction, grammatical correction or clarification to FEIS
- 4) Comment results in updated, new, or more detailed information included in FEIS but not a substantive change in the Project

In some cases, the comments have been abridged to eliminate redundancy or to reflect ongoing coordination. The complete text of the original comments is included in Appendix **F.1** through **F.5**.

**F.2:** Written Elected Official/Agency and Public Comments Received on SDEIS

**F.3:** Public Hearing Summary and Transcript – June 11, 2020, Virtual Hearing at 12:00 p.m.

**F.4:** Public Hearing Summary and Transcript – June 11, 2020, Virtual Hearing at 6:30 p.m.

**F.5:** Public Hearing Summary and Transcript – June 25, 2020, DART Headquarters at 12:00 p.m.

A majority of comments received are addressed by subject area as shown in **Table F-1**. Readers are encouraged to review **Section 2.2** before reviewing the individual responses.



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
A0001 Letter	Water Resources	USACE	2	The comment is to notify DART of an assigned project number and project manager to oversee the request from the USACE Fort Worth District Regulatory Division.	Comment Noted.
A0002 Letter	Floodplain	FEMA	2	WE WOULD REQUEST THAT THE COMMUNITY FLOODPLAIN ADMINISTRATOR BE CONTACTED FOR THE REVIEW AND POSSIBLE PERMIT REQUIREMENTS FOR THIS PROJECT. IF FEDERALLY FUNDED, WE WOULD REQUEST PROJECT TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH EO 11988 & EO 11990. You are required to coordinate with your local Floodplain Administrator for Jurisdiction in which proposed work is being completed for project. You can contact Colleen Sciano if you need assistance in providing Floodplain Administrator for a specific jurisdiction.	Comment Noted, According to the FEMA floodplain map, the Study Area lies entirely within Zone X, areas defined as having minimal flood hazard. None of the Study Area is within the 100-year floodplain. No direct impacts to the floodplain would occur as a result of the Build Alternative.
A0003 Letter	Natural Environment	TPWD	4	The TPWD recommends updating the SDEIS to reflect the current USFWS and TPWD threatened and endangered species lists and recommends practicing dark-sky friendly lighting to minimize the project's contribution towards skyglow.	<b>Section 4.14</b> has been modified to reflect comment. Technical Memorandum B.12 updated with current lists.
A0004 Letter	Traffic: I-345	TxDOT	4	The proposed D2 alignment crosses Interstate 345 (I-345) on the east side of the Central Business District of Dallas. TxDOT is currently conducting a feasibility study for the I-345 corridor that involves traffic modeling and public outreach. The result of the study will be a technically preferred alternative that TxDOT will recommend be progressed further into a full schematic and ultimately environmental clearance. The feasibility study team completed the first of three rounds of public meetings in the fall of 2019 and continues to meet with stakeholders in the corridor. The current schedule has the team presenting three to five alternatives to the public at a second round of public meetings in the fall of 2020. Once the public has been given the chance to provide input and comment on the alternatives, a decision matrix will narrow down the alternatives to a single alignment that will be presented to the public at the end of 2021.  The D2 proposed alignment shown in the SDEIS would limit the design options for I-345 and has the potential to substantially increase the construction cost of the I-345 reconstruction. TxDOT will continue to coordinate with DART, the City of Dallas and NCTCOG on options for I-345 and potential design changes that could benefit all parties. The feasibility study will have to be progressed to its technically preferred alternative before TxDOT could enter into any agreement with DART regarding the D2 crossing.	Comments Noted. <b>Section 3.3.3</b> modified to reflect comment and status of I-345 study.



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
A0005 letter	Environmental Justice	EPA	4	The Draft EIS states that no substantial impacts to any human or natural resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed D2 Subway line or its construction. As for mitigation measures, the project is not expected to cause disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and/or low-income populations. However, the Draft Supplemental EIS identified indirect impacts related to anticipated change in land use, transit-supportive development or redevelopment to the corridor, redevelopment intensification, etc. EPA therefore suggests the Final EIS expand discussion addressing indirect impact to the minority and low-income populations and effected populations within the redevelopment planning area. The Final Statement should consider and identify any related impacts which may include, but not limited to, displacement, relocation, noise, air quality and other, as applicable.	<p><b>Sections 4.11 and 4.16</b> have been modified to expand discussion on indirect impacts to minority populations. No low-income populations were identified within the Study Area.</p> <p>The Project will increase accessibility within a 0.5-mile radius around the project alignment with the addition of five stations and the ability to access LRT, bus service, and other DART routes. Accessibility and job opportunities will also improve for transit-dependent populations throughout the service area which could benefit minority and low-income populations.</p> <p>The Project is expected to have long-term benefits on the economy of the downtown area, including job growth, increased housing, and increased mobility as well as bring some benefits of TOD to areas along the alignment around station areas. Accessibility and job opportunities would also improve for transit-dependent populations throughout the service area which could benefit minority and low-income populations. The induced growth impacts from the Project would be considered a benefit for the area and surrounding communities and any negative impacts would be minimized through the continued monitoring of safety and access at proposed station locations.</p>
A0006 Letter	Cultural Resources	City of Dallas, Office of Historic Preservation (OHP)	1, 2, 3, 4	<p><b>A. B-4 Historic-Age Resource Reconnaissance Survey Report (AmaTerra Environmental, Inc., August 2019)</b></p> <p>Mapping</p> <p>The OHP recommends that a color-coded map, showing and identifying the 90 listed and eligible historic resources identified in the Survey Report be provided at a scale that is consistent with the Street Modification Plans, and that this be undertaken at this stage to inform a more complete understanding of the potential effects and any corresponding mitigation that may need to be considered.</p> <p>The OHP requests that all historic resources that were identified as not being eligible for listing in the National Register be clearly delineated on a map of historic resources so that the City be made aware of any potential adverse effects to historic resources that are important to the community.</p>	<p>DART has provided the City with KMZ files and a set of maps to show the relationship of resources to the project. Tables accompany the maps to summarize the listed and eligible resources based on THC concurrences and input. These maps and tables are included as an attachment to the Programmatic Agreement. As design proceeds, appropriate scaled maps will be developed to assist in design review process.</p> <p>See above. KMZ files include layer for 2018 historic resources determined not eligible to the NRHP by THC. On April 23, 2019 the FTA and DART provided the <i>Draft Historic-age Resource Reconnaissance Survey Report</i> (January 2019) and SHPO comments to the city for review and comment and did not receive any comments relative to resources important to the community.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>National Register Eligibility vs Local Significance</p> <p>In accordance with the provisions of Section 106, the OHP acknowledges that the identification of historic resources consists of those that are included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register. The OHP also acknowledges the importance of consulting with local governments in the identification and nomination of properties for inclusion in the National Register. In this regard, the OHP recommends where a resource has already been identified as a City of Dallas historic landmark or is eligible for such designation, that these resources not be identified as non-contributors to a National Register District except where the Certified Local Government has concurred with such an evaluation.</p>	<p>For a formally listed NRHP District, the THC is the agency who makes the determination as to what resource is a contributing resource during the Section 106 review processes. A private owner OR a municipality, or private interest group can work with the THC on having their resource reviewed to determination if it can be added to the NRHP listed District outside of a Section 106 process. The THC is the agency making the final determination of eligibility.</p>
				<p>Building, Structure, Object, Site and Districts</p> <p>In addition to structures, the OHP recommends that the survey include the identification and mapping of any decorative hardscapes, sidewalks and curbs that would be impacted by the proposed street improvements. Where any impacts are considered to be adverse, the OHP recommends that the City be made aware of any potential adverse effects to historic resources that are important to the community.</p>	<p>The <i>Historic-age Resource Reconnaissance Survey</i> identified tiled addresses on curbs near Pacific and Hawkins Street. These were determined not eligible by THC. During the review process in final design, DART will coordinate with the city related to any decorative elements, especially those associated with identified historic resources adjacent to street reconstruction areas.</p>
				<p>Evaluations</p> <p>For properties that were deemed not eligible for listing in the National Register, the OHP recommends that the evaluation of these properties be provided.</p>	<p>Evaluations are contained in the <i>Draft Historic-age Resource Reconnaissance Survey Report (January 2019)</i> and the revised <i>Historic-age Resource Reconnaissance Survey Report (August 2019)</i>. The draft report was provided to the City on April 23, 2019 along with SHPO comments on proposed determinations of eligibility.</p>
				<p><b>B. Determination of Effects Report (AmaTerra)</b></p> <p>The Magnolia Gas Station was deemed eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places in 2019 by the Texas Historical Commission. In 7.3, Section 4 (f) Evaluation, page 28 of the Report, mitigation measures are set out for impacts largely centered on the setting of St. James Temple, however, there does not appear to be a discussion on mitigation measures that would be commensurate with the magnitude of effects that would result from the complete loss of the Magnolia Gas Station.</p> <p>The Office of Historic Preservation is not supportive of the proposed demolition of the Magnolia Gas Station. Given the abundance of parking lots and non-contributing structures along the proposed route, the OHP does not concur that a historic site of such significance is the only practical location for construction staging.</p>	<p>Based on comments received during the SDEIS review process, DART will avoid use and demolition of the Magnolia Gasoline Station. This recommendation and associated mitigation to avoid adverse effects is included in the Programmatic Agreement.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p><b>C. Assessment of Effects</b></p> <p>There are a number of aspects, drawings, sections, contextual renderings that are needed at this stage in order to inform a robust assessment of effects. OHP believes that considerable information already exists that could be extracted and represented in a way that facilitates a more thorough assessment of effects. OHP does not concur with the indication that 90% completion drawings are necessary in order to undertake a more complete assessment of effects.</p>	<p>DART concurs with your comment that waiting until 90% design is not appropriate. The Programmatic Agreement outlines a design review at several earlier design intervals to assess potential effects and allow the historic context to be considered during final design.</p>
				<p><b>D. Alternatives</b></p> <p>The OHP requests the plans that depict the alternatives considered that avoided the proposed demolition of the Magnolia Gas Station with the analysis of pros and cons along with a statement confirming the number of parking lots and non-historic structures that have a land area equal to or greater than the land area occupied by the Magnolia Gas Station, that are proposed to be acquired along the route.</p>	<p>See above. Based on comments received during the SDEIS review process, DART will avoid use and demolition of the Magnolia Gasoline Station. This recommendation and associated mitigation to avoid adverse effects is included in the Programmatic Agreement.</p>
				<p><b>E. Section 106 vs Section 4 (f)</b></p> <p>Please clarify why Section 4 (f), which is concerned with “use” effects versus Section 106, which is concerned with “adverse effects” was sought for the “protection” of a National Register-eligible historic resource given that the likely effects that would result from its proposed demolition are significant, adverse, permanent and citywide.</p> <p><u>Question 1</u></p> <p>Would it not be beneficial to eliminate any historic property from consideration as a Section 4 (f) use for tunnels under Commercial Street, by making available sufficient documentation to facilitate such a determination now?</p> <p><u>Question 2</u></p> <p>Wouldn't this also reduce the likelihood of Late Discovery or Late Designation?</p> <p>The effort to identify potential Section 4 (f) properties requires thorough documentation of communication with the likely Federal, State and Local officials with jurisdiction. The absence of such documentation and coordination may result in a Section 4 (f) use. Every precaution should be taken to avoid this type of use. Please provide documentation that confirms how and when the City of Dallas historic preservation section (now the Office of Historic Preservation) was consulted, the feedback received and how the feedback is reflected in the proposed design.</p>	<p>A Section 4(f) evaluation was necessary for identified uses at Magnolia Gasoline Station and St. James AME Temple and does not address “protection” but focuses on other prudent and feasible alternatives. As noted above, based on comments, DART will avoid use or demolition of the Magnolia Gasoline Station. Mitigation for both resources is included in the Programmatic Agreement and FEIS/ROD.</p> <p>DART does not anticipate any Section 106 adverse effects or Section 4(f) use due to the tunnel. As outlined in the Programmatic Agreement, design review and construction plan review will be key to ensuring no adverse effects. Final design and more information on the construction approach is needed to fully understand potential effects.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p><b>F. Drawings</b></p> <p>The OHP recommends that all renderings and elevations of above-ground structures be shown in context as they would be experienced from the public right-of-way.</p> <p>OHP recommends that the relationship between Commerce Station and Magnolia Hotel be depicted in plan, elevation and rendering.</p>	<p>The scope of the 30% drawings has limited sections and elevations, not all areas are captured. Additional sections and elevations will be completed during final design. All elevations and sections where necessary will include context to help orientation. All renderings and visualizations included in the 30% design package have downtown Dallas context. Plans of Commerce Station include the outer limits of the Magnolia Hotel.</p>
				<p><b>DALLAS CBD SECOND LIGHT RAIL ALIGNMENT (D2 SUBWAY) Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement</b></p> <p><b>G. Metro Center Station</b></p> <p>OHP recommends that the Potential Secondary Access proposed for the intersection of Lamar and San Jacinto be depicted in its context and that a design statement address its consistency with the West End Historic District Ordinance.</p>	<p>The access point at Lamar/Pacific near San Jacinto has been removed from the 30% design due to public comments that indicate an at-grade pedestrian connection across Lamar is more appropriate and can be better integrated with the proposed West End Commons plaza. The preliminary concept for the plaza is referenced in the design drawings.</p>
				<p><b>H. Commerce Station</b></p> <p>In relation to settings, OHP recommends that the proposed Emergency Maintenance Access Point, Commerce Station Headhouse and the "reimagined" Pegasus Plaza be depicted in context and that design statements for these new builds address their consistency with the Adolphus Hotel Ordinance, the Busch/Kirby Building and Annex Ordinance, the Magnolia Building Ordinance and Standard 9 of the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i>, as appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Section 4.6.4</b> has been updated to include reference to consistency with these ordinances and Standard 9 for new facilities associated with the Commerce Station. These will also be considered as part of the design review process outlined in the Programmatic Agreement.</p>
				<p><b>I. Commerce Street</b></p> <p>Along Commerce St, the tunnel appears to exit within the boundary of the Harwood Street Historic District and is above grade thereafter, northwards. The proximity of the above-grade line to the Western Union Building may have impacts on setting that should be considered at the early stage.</p> <p>The OHP recommends that any above-grade construction including required headhouses, pedestrian portals and vent shafts (i.e. near the Dallas Power &amp; Light Building) be depicted in their intended context as experienced from the public right-of-way.</p>	<p>There will be cut and cover construction east of Harwood Street, but the tunnel does not return to at-grade until it passes under I-345. Surface conditions will be returned to existing or better conditions post-construction with the tunnel below-grade and will not affect the setting the Western Union Building. There will be access points east of Pearl Street that will be subject to design review. The ventilation shaft facility near the Dallas Power &amp; Light Building will also be reviewed in terms of its context from the public right-of-way.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p><b>J. CBD East Subway Station</b></p> <p>In relation to settings, OHP recommends that the proposed streetscape improvements and the proximity of the subway line to the Western Union Building at 2028-2034 Main St. be depicted in context and that a design statement that addresses its consistency with Standard 9 of the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> be confirmed, as appropriate.</p> <p>In relation to settings, OHP recommends that the proposed streetscape improvements and the proximity of the subway line to the Old City Hall at 106 S Harwood St be depicted in context and that a design statement that addresses its consistency with the Harwood Street Historic District Ordinance and Standard 9 of the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> be confirmed, as appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Section 4.6.4</b> has been updated to include reference to consistency with these ordinances and Standard 9 for new facilities and any adjacent street modifications. The Programmatic Agreement references the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to ensure consistency with standards as the design progresses. In most cases, streets will be returned to existing or better conditions and should not affect the setting.</p>
				<p><b>K. Metro Center Station</b></p> <p>In relation to vertical relationships, the OHP recommends that the cross-sectional relationship between the tunnel excavation that depicts the east end of the Metro Center Station and the locally-designated Westin located at the corner of Griffin and Main Streets be provided.</p> <p>In relation to vertical relationships, the OHP recommends that the cross-sectional relationship between the tunnel excavations that heads northeast along Commerce St show the locally-designated Santa Fe Building, the Dallas Power &amp; Light Building, the Mercantile Bank Building, and the Allen Building in context.</p> <p>Recommend a similar detail to that as depicted in the Cut-and-Cover Metro Center Station on page 18 of the DART D2 Subway Project 20% Preliminary Engineering City of Dallas Review Workshop (May 12, 2020).</p> <p>In relation to vertical relationships, the OHP recommends that the Adolphus Hotel and the Magnolia Building be depicted in the Cut-and-Cover Structures Commerce Station.</p> <p>This should be undertaken at the early stage of design because it can inform a robust assessment of effects and importantly, whether there might be a need for alternatives or mitigation. If such information is not made available until the latter stages of design, it risks being "design for information" rather "for informing design". It would appear that some of this information could be drawn from existing documentation in A.2 Vol B, Station Architecture Plans (March 6, 2020) however, it does not appear to have been developed in a way that would facilitate a better</p>	<p>Comments Noted.</p> <p>The scope of the 30% drawings has limited sections and elevations, not all areas are captured. Additional sections and elevations will be completed during final design. All elevations and sections where necessary will include context to help orientation. All renderings and visualizations included in the 30% design package have downtown Dallas context.</p> <p>The Programmatic Agreement outlines a design review process at several design intervals to assess potential effects and inform the design. This review process will start earlier than initially proposed in the SDEIS, and the FEIS has been modified to be consistent with the Programmatic Agreement. The City of Dallas staff from many departments including the OHP will be involved in continued design review and many improvements outside of the DART project limits may be implemented by the City of Dallas separate from the D2 Subway project to ensure design continuity.</p> <p>No ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise impacts are projected with the Project in operation.</p> <p>Once construction methods are known, DART will reassess the potential for vibration impacts and specific vibration</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>understanding of potential vibration effects. This information is also important to understand at this stage so that it might inform the need for mitigation and the early setting out of Temporary Protection Plans where appropriate.</p>	<p>mitigation measures will be developed as appropriate. This is also included in the Programmatic Agreement.</p>
				<p><b>L. Live Oak Station</b> The OHP recommends that drawings or renderings be employed to better illustrate how the proposed relocation of the Live Oak Station to the front of the St. James AME Temple would be seen from the public right-of-way. OHP further recommends that a design statement that addresses its consistency with the St. James AME Temple Ordinance and Standard 9 of the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> be confirmed, as appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Section 4.6.4</b> references this ordinance #24396. Language has been updated to include reference to consistency with this ordinance and Standard 9 as station design is advanced. The Programmatic Agreement references the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to ensure consistency with standards as the design progresses. Live Oak Station is currently shown as a typical prototype station. The historic context will inform the art and design program and may influence the ultimate design of the station and canopies to minimize visual effects.</p>
				<p><b>M. Lizard Lounge</b> It would be helpful to receive the evaluation of the Lizard Lounge at 2424 Swiss Ave that led to the determination that it was not eligible for listing.  In relation to the line heading south along Good Latimer Expressway between Pacific Ave and the curvature that terminates at the existing Green Line, please clarify the relationship to and within the setting of the Knights of Pythias Temple.</p>	<p>Evaluation of the Lizard Lounge is contained in the <i>Draft Historic-age Resource Reconnaissance Survey Report (January 2019)</i> and the revised <i>Historic-age Resource Reconnaissance Survey Report (August 2019)</i>. The draft report was provided to the City on April 23, 2019 along with SHPO comments on proposed determinations of eligibility.  Relationship to and within the setting of the Knights of Pythias Temple will not change. Minor reconstruction of the tracks and northbound Good Latimer Expressway is proposed.</p>
			4	<p><b>N. D2 Subway Urban Design Process &amp; Focus Area Subway Report (March 2020)</b> <u>Historic Context</u> The above report states that "the D2 Subway offers a rare opportunity to establish a new urban architectural vernacular for subway stations and pedestrian portals in downtown. Good urban design has the potential to encourage ridership, maximize the project purpose, enhance the livability of downtown and create long term value. For this reason, DART is conducting a comprehensive urban design approach to consider feedback from stakeholders, riders, agencies and the City of Dallas before implementing design decisions."</p>	<p>Comments Noted  The Urban Design report has been updated for the 30% design and FEIS/ROD. DART has expanded language to recognize the importance of historic context in design. A reference to the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement has been incorporated. The City of Dallas staff from many departments including the OHP will be involved in continued design review and many improvements outside of the DART project limits may be implemented by the City</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>A comprehensive urban design approach involving an exceptionally important infrastructure project, one that winds its way through, across, adjacent and under the City's historic core delivers a clear picture to the reader as to how the historic environment has informed the development of the urban design approach.</p> <p><u>Question 3</u></p> <p>In relation to urban design, how will the historic context inform design decisions? (See observation P – The Role of Character Appraisals below)</p> <p><u>Question 4</u></p> <p>Can the assessment of the historic environment play a role in the D2 Subway Urban Design Process &amp; Focus Area Subway Report (March 2020) that is commensurate with the proximity proposed DART D2 Subway Project to the physical historic environment of Downtown Dallas?</p> <p><u>Question 5</u></p> <p>If the answer to Question 4 is no, where would the assessment be best positioned going forward, so that the reader understands how this critical aspect will inform urban design decisions?</p>	<p>of Dallas separate from the D2 Subway project to ensure design continuity.</p> <p>The Programmatic Agreement outlines a design review process at several design intervals and will start early in final design so historic context can help to inform design.</p>
			2	<p><b>Old Dallas Burial Ground</b></p> <p>Under D2 Subway LPA – Commerce via Victory/Swiss, the D2 Subway Urban Design Process &amp; Focus Area Subway Report (March 2020) the report states “after leaving the station [Museum Way] the alignment crosses under Woodall Rogers Freeway at street level and then begins its transition underground into a tunnel portal just south of McKinney Avenue. As it descends, the alignment runs toward Griffin Street and turns under Griffin Street for several blocks where it remains”</p> <p>It would appear that the Old Dallas Burial Ground may be within the project area.</p> <p>Please identify the location within existing documents that have been prepared, where we might locate an assessment of the scope and nature of investigations that confirmed that the excavations required for the tunneling would not further disturb Dallas’ first known cemetery.</p> <p><u>Question 6</u></p> <p>Are there detailed plans and sections that depict any potential physical relationship between proposed excavations or tunneling and the cemetery?</p>	<p>There are no known recorded boundaries of the Old Dallas Burial Ground. Based on available researched information, it appears that the Old Dallas Burial Ground is west of the APE which is 300 feet from the proposed alignment and 600 feet from any proposed station location. Street and parking lot reconfiguration and/or improvements under Woodall Rodgers Freeway may extend closer to Lamar Street but no significant subsurface construction is anticipated. The subsurface construction begins south of McKinney and east of Old Griffin. DART conducted a series of geotechnical borings along the corridor to support preliminary engineering and a cultural resources assessment of those bores was conducted and documented in 2018. Examination of the core materials from the borings did not contain any materials of concern. The Programmatic Agreement includes stipulations related to Post-Review Discoveries focusing on construction activities.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p><b>O. The Role of Character Appraisals</b></p> <p>Prior to designing within a historic context, it is important that an appraisal of existing conditions that make up the character and appearance of the place be undertaken. In relation to assessing the effects of change, new work should be considered in relation to the baseline conditions of the setting with a clear delineation as to those aspects of the setting that are valued for their historic character and appearance.</p>	<p>Comment Noted.</p> <p>See the Urban Design Process and Focus Area Report for project design guidance in a historic environment.</p>
			2	<p><u>Character Appraisals</u></p> <p>A character appraisal should be undertaken early so that any assessments of visual effects can inform the need for design adjustments or mitigation. In this regard, the OHP does not recommend that assessments of visual effects be determined at the 90% design stage because their usefulness in shaping the most appropriate design response will likely be reduced to confirming effects rather than shaping or informing the design as it evolves.</p> <p>The OHP recommends that each proposed above-grade new construction element be informed by a character appraisal of the historic context. A character appraisal should identify, describe and depict the existing conditions that make up the context, including but not limited to the public realm, setting, scale, orientation, siting and character of physical form and features, materials, views and vistas, circulation systems, patterns, and furnishing and fixtures.</p>	<p>Comment Noted.</p> <p>See the Urban Design Process and Focus Area Report for project design guidance in a historic environment.</p> <p>In addition, DART concurs with your comment that waiting until 90% design is not appropriate. The Programmatic Agreement outlines a design review at several earlier design intervals to assess potential effects and allow the historic context to be considered during final design.</p>
			2	<p><u>Context Matters</u></p> <p>There is no formula or prescription for designing compatible new construction within a historic context, nor is there generally only one possible design approach that will meet preservation standards.</p> <p>Nonetheless, new construction shall encompass both the quality of the building itself and its quality as a contribution to the urban room in which it is situated. It will require certain questions to be addressed including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the proposal relate to its wider setting?</li> <li>• Are the street pattern and grain of the surroundings respected?</li> <li>• Are there changes in height between the existing and new development and if so how are they managed?</li> <li>• Will the result enhance or damage the quality of the streetscape?</li> <li>• Has the potential impact of the proposed new construction been assessed as it would be experienced in close range?</li> <li>• Is it either weak or overpowering?</li> </ul>	<p>Comment Noted.</p> <p>See the Urban Design Process and Focus Area Report for project design guidance in a historic environment.</p> <p>The City of Dallas staff from many departments including the OHP will be involved in continued design review and many improvements outside of the DART project limits may be implemented by the City of Dallas separate from the D2 Subway project to ensure design continuity.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it respect the scale and rhythm of its neighbors?</li> <li>• What materials are used and how do they relate to those of the surrounding buildings? (Note: Sensitivity to context and the use of traditional materials are not incompatible with contemporary architecture).</li> <li>• Is the quality as high?</li> <li>• Does the detailing of the materials show signs of careful thought or originality in the way the proposed new construction is put together?</li> <li>• How will the colors work together?</li> <li>• How does the architecture present itself to the viewer?</li> <li>• Is there a strong composition in the pattern of solid to void in the façades that are experienced from the public right-of-way?</li> <li>• What contribution, if any, does the proposal make to the public realm?</li> <li>• In the wider setting, has the impact of the building in views and vistas been considered?</li> <li>• Does it make a positive or negative impact?</li> <li>• Does it form a harmonious group or composition with existing buildings or features in the streetscape?</li> <li>• Does it distract the eye from the focus of the view and if so does it provide something better to look at?</li> </ul>	
			2	<p><b>P. Design Considerations</b></p> <p>1. <u>Preservation Principles</u> In each case, regard will need to be had for City of Dallas historic property ordinances and Standards 9 and 10 (Rehabilitation) of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the treatment of Historic Properties.</p> <p>2. <u>Compatible and Distinguishable</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carefully consider the historic context of the block and surrounding district when designing a new structure. New construction should be distinguishable from historic structures in the district without detracting from them. In relation to historic properties, new construction needs to be distinguishable and compatible.</li> <li>Compatibility of new structures may be accomplished through the use of a similar scale and mass as the nearby historic structure(s) and the use of similar proportion of windows to wall area.</li> <li>New construction that is either identical to historic buildings or in extreme contrast are not compatible.</li> </ol>	<p>Comments Noted.</p> <p>DART will comply with city ordinances and Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.</p> <p>See the Urban Design Process and Focus Area Report for project design guidance in a historic environment. The historic context outlines many the design considerations raised in your comment related to being compatible and distinguishable.</p> <p>The City of Dallas staff from many departments including the OHP will be involved in continued design review and many improvements outside of the DART project limits may be implemented by the City of Dallas separate from the D2 Subway project to ensure design continuity.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. Design new buildings to reflect their time while respecting the historic context. While new construction should not attempt to replicate historic features, new work should not be so dissimilar as to distract from or diminish the historic character and appearance of the district.</li> <li>e. Contemporary interpretations of traditional designs and details for new construction may be appropriate when they also satisfy the preservation principles that ensure distinguishability and compatibility.</li> </ul> <p>3. <u>Entrances</u>                      While existing building forms along the DART D2 Subway route vary, consistent building and entrance orientation along urban block faces create a pedestrian-friendly character within historic commercial districts.</p> <p>4. <u>Alignment</u>                      Typically, storefronts are aligned with the back of the sidewalk and their entrances are clearly visible along the street frontage.</p> <p>5. <u>Adjacency</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Consider any aspects of adjacency where a historic structure is involved and ensure that any aspects of prominence associated with the historic structure are not diminished.</li> <li>b. Utilize transitions in building height, wall-plane offsets, and other variations in building massing to provide a visual transition between new construction and that of adjacent historic buildings.</li> <li>c. Incorporating a simple, recessed, small-scale hyphen, or connection, to physically and visually separate adjacent new work from the historic building.</li> <li>d. New construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of their urban footprint.</li> <li>e. Protect buildings and landscape features when undertaking work in the setting. Temporary Protection Plans may need to be considered in a way that informs design evolution.</li> </ul> <p>6. <u>Height and Scale</u>                      Design new construction so that its height and overall scale are consistent with nearby historic buildings. In commercial districts, building height shall conform to the established pattern.</p> <p>7. <u>Public Realm</u></p>	



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>Retain the historic relationship between buildings and the public realm in the setting.</p> <p>8. <u>Roofs</u> Incorporate roof forms that are consistent with those predominantly found on the block.</p> <p>9. <u>Fenestration Pattern</u> Incorporate window and door openings with a similar proportion of solid to void as typical with nearby historic facades.</p> <p>10. <u>Façade Composition</u> a. The primary façade of new commercial buildings should be in keeping with established patterns. b. Maintaining horizontal elements within adjacent cap, middle, and base precedents will establish a consistent street wall through the alignment of horizontal parts. Avoid blank walls, particularly on elevations visible from the public right-of-way.</p> <p>11. <u>Materials</u> a. Materials that are dramatically different in scale, texture, and proportion as those historically used in the district can result in new construction that appears out of context and incompatible with the predominant character and appearance of the historic district. b. The primary façade of new commercial buildings should be in keeping with established patterns. Maintaining horizontal elements within adjacent cap, middle, and base precedents will establish a consistent street wall through the alignment of horizontal parts. Avoid blank walls, particularly on elevations visible from the public right-of-way.</p> <p>12. <u>Details</u> Incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the predominant character and appearance along the block face or within the district. Details should be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of adjacent historic structures or other historic structures within the district. Architectural details that are more ornate or elaborate than those found within the district are inappropriate.</p> <p>13. <u>On-Site Features</u> a. Designing new onsite features (such as parking areas, access ramps, or lighting), when required by a new use, so that they are as unobtrusive as possible, retain the historic relationship between the</p>	



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>building or buildings and the landscape, and are compatible with the historic character of the property.</p> <p>b. Complying with barrier-free access requirements in such a manner that the historic building's character-defining exterior features, interior spaces, features, and finishes, and features of the site and setting are preserved or impacted as little as possible.</p> <p>14. <u>Non-Contributors</u> Consider removing non-significant buildings, additions, or site features along the proposed DART D2 Subway route that detract from the historic character and appearance of the district.</p> <p>15. <u>Screening of Appurtenances</u> Design the siting and screening of mechanical equipment and roof appurtenances in such a way that it does not detract from the character and appearance of the historic context.</p>	
			2	<p><b>Q. Design Review – Office of Historic Preservation/Landmarks Commission</b></p> <p><u>Review Process</u> Any exterior change to a locally-designated landmark or historic district within the City of Dallas will require a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Landmarks Commission will have original jurisdiction for certain scopes of work.</p>	Comment noted. DART will coordinate with the City of Dallas OHP on any required Certificates of Appropriateness.
			2	<p><b>R. Costs</b></p> <p><u>Question 7</u> What is the cost of acquisition of the Magnolia Gas Station? Please provide a cost estimate for its proposed demolition and the cost to dispose. Please provide a calculation of the embodied energy for the historic structure.</p>	Based on comments received during the SDEIS review process, DART will avoid use and demolition of the Magnolia Gasoline Station. This recommendation and associated mitigation to avoid adverse effects is included in the Programmatic Agreement.
			2	<p><b>S. Demolition vs Deconstruction</b></p> <p><u>Question 8</u> In relation to the Magnolia Gas Station, if demolition were the only feasible alternative, what method of demolition would be undertaken?</p> <p><u>Question 9</u> How would the method satisfy environmental sustainability objectives?</p>	Based on comments received during the SDEIS review process, DART will avoid use and demolition of the Magnolia Gasoline Station. This recommendation and associated mitigation to avoid adverse effects is included in the Programmatic Agreement.



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p><u>Question 10</u> What consideration has been given to deconstruction? Please explain.</p>	
			2	<p><b>T. Public Comment Timeline</b> In the absence of items A-T, the OHP considers that the public would not have had a sufficiently complete understanding of the potential impacts on the City's historic resources in order to provide informed feedback by the June 29th deadline posted on DART's web site.</p>	<p>DART has conducted an extensive public, agency and stakeholder involvement process that included information on historic resources. Based on comments to date, project changes have been made such as avoiding the Magnolia Gasoline Station and removing the station access portal at Lamar/Pacific. The Programmatic Agreement includes a stipulation for a public involvement plan to ensure opportunities for review relative to Section 106 historic resources.</p>
A006a		City of Dallas, Urban Design Peer Review Panel (UDPRP)	2	<p><b>Process and Scope</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Panel stresses the need for clarity within the design-build contract to ensure the securing of the level of design and contextual sensitivity exhibited in the alignment analysis presented during the three reviews and recommends specific provisions to achieve the presented and expressed level of design for portals and stations. Furthermore, the Panel hopes to ensure that all Urban Design Peer Review Panel comments are incorporated into the design as well as the potential design-build contract and the subsequent urban design comments at the 20% design milestone.</li> <li>2. The Panel urges City staff and DART to develop a clear mechanism for staff review of key project design milestones during the design-build process in order to provide opportunities for critical design input to secure conformance with the Urban Design Transit Guidelines and Panel recommendations throughout the project design and development.</li> <li>3. The Panel is encouraged by the current approach to project development assuring that technical considerations are evaluated alongside the resulting urban design conditions as a direct component of the D2 design decision making process and encourages this approach to continue as the project develops further.</li> <li>4. The Panel recommends that the City be proactive on this project to work with appropriate parties and stakeholders to organize meetings and work sessions as necessary to better understand the urban</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment noted.</li> <li>2. Comment noted. The Urban Transit Design Guidelines adopted by the Dallas City Council outline this process and key milestones. DART and the City will coordinate to ensure opportunities for design input.</li> <li>3. Comment noted.</li> <li>4. Comment noted. DART agrees that proactive City participation is important.</li> </ol>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>design implications of the proposed eastern alignment, specifically related to the design of the street fabric.</p> <p>5. The panel discussed that when designing within a historic context, it is important that an appraisal of existing conditions (including historic resources) that make up the character and appearance of the place be undertaken. In accessing the effects of a change, new work should be considered in relation to the baseline conditions of the setting, including their historic character and appearance. These appraisals should be completed as part of the early design phase. The Panel requests the opportunity to provide input and recommendations regarding historic preservation and context issues related to current alignments, construction, and staging operations and their direct impact on any adjacent existing and potential historic building or district.</p> <p>6. The Panel recommends expanding the scope of the project to include enhancement of pedestrian access to the East Transfer Center and Carpenter Park while also exploring developing the East Transfer Center as a future transit oriented development site.</p>	<p>5. The Programmatic Agreement between FTA, THC, and DART, with the City of Dallas Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and Preservation Dallas as concurring parties, outlines the process for design review to ensure new elements consider Section 106 historic resources including the historic context.</p> <p>6. The scope of the D2 Subway project is limited to those elements directed related to the project. However, DART and the City of Dallas were awarded a \$1 million FTA TOD Planning grant, of which a key element will be multi-modal connectivity to surrounding areas such as Carpenter Park and exploration of properties such as the East Transfer Center as TOD sites.</p>
			1, 2, and 3	<p><b>Project Design and Urban Fabric</b></p> <p>1. The Dallas DART D2 should implement best management practices from the City of Dallas Integrated Stormwater Management guidance for all above ground facilities within the scope of the project. Based on the project's nature, integrate design solutions to reduce the amount of pollutant runoff, reduce the volume of runoff and create strategies for water conservation for each individual station area.</p> <p>2. The proposed demolition of historic structures solely for use of the site during construction seems is not acceptable as such is consistent with modern preservation or sustainable practices. Specifically, the Magnolia Gas Stations is a representative remnant of a building type that derives from the early influence of the automobile and is thus representative of major urban design forces that have most substantially shaped our city over the past 100 years.</p> <p>3. The Panel recommends DART establish a strong design language for maintaining a unified design identity for the entire alignment while also encouraging unique individual characteristics of each station/station area.</p>	<p>1. <b>Section 4.13.8</b> of the SDEIS outlined that the project will follow best management practices (BMP) related to water quality. A reference has been added in this section to the City guidance. DART plans to incorporate sustainable design goals into the project.</p> <p>2. DART has determined that the project will avoid the Magnolia Gasoline Station based on SDEIS comments received on this resource. <b>Section 4.5</b> and <b>4.17</b> of the FEIS reflect this change.</p> <p>3. Comment noted. The Design Report Section 7.2.2 Architectural Design Vision is consistent with this recommendation.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>4. The Panel encourages further refinement of the design of all stations to improve integration into their existing surroundings, enhancing street hospitality and vitality through landscaping and activity generators such as concessions and vendors.</p> <p>5. In order to improve general access and functionality of the Commerce Street Station, the Panel recommends reducing escalator runs and shortening the length of access to the platform if at all possible. The design team should enhance the experience of the transit user by carefully choreographing placement and movement of escalators to create a strong sense of arrival at Pegasus Plaza above and at the platform below.</p> <p>6. Design considerations within a historic context are important. The Panel notes that the corner of Main and Akard is the historic and current center of downtown Dallas, and, along with Pegasus Plaza, is of high historic significance to Dallas. This historic context must be considered and form the basis for design of DART's station structure/s in this area – which should be respectful of this historic location, and be of the highest level of both architectural and urban design possible. More specifically, the Panel recommends that the design team explore alternative designs, with the design approach of the headhouse for the Commerce Street Station in Pegasus Plaza be informed by and be compatible with the very significant surrounding historic context, presenting the most minimal physical intrusion possible. The architectural impacts on the park should be integral with the park's plan and landscape, while considering pedestrian traffic and access as a part of the design. Other design considerations while designing within historic contexts addressed by the Panel include Preservation Principles (per Dallas's historic ordinances and the <i>Secretary of the Interiors Standards</i>) relative to compatible and distinguishable design relative to context and design of specific features including entrances, alignment, adjacency, height and scale, relationship between new work and the public realm, roofs, fenestrations, façade composition, materials and details.</p> <p>7. The Panel expresses concerns for the potential detrimental effects created by locating bus transfer below-grade at the West End Transfer Center, specifically the need for necessary ramping and ingress/egress.</p> <p>8. The panel expresses concern regarding the resulting pedestrian experience from transit to the east portal area generated by moving</p>	<p>4. Comment noted. The 30% PE urban design report incorporates some of these refinements; these refinements will be a focus during early final design efforts.</p> <p>5. Comment noted. Vertical circulation has been refined where feasible at the Commerce Station, including turning one escalator to run north-south under Akard Street.</p> <p>6. Historic context considerations are addressed in the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, including a design review process for elements such as the Pegasus Plaza headhouse. The D2 Subway Pegasus Plaza Vision Summary report is included as an appendix to the Urban Design Process and Focus Area Report (<b>Appendix A.4</b> of the FEIS) and further documents similar feedback received during a January 2020 stakeholder workshop that will also help to guide park redesign efforts.</p> <p>7. A below-grade bus transfer center is not part of the D2 Subway project scope. Should such a concept be advanced in the future, any potential impacts would be addressed at that time.</p> <p>8. Comment noted. The urban design plans identify pedestrian connections along the north side of tunnel portal and Swiss Avenue towards Carpenter Park. The</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>the existing Deep Ellum Station, and strongly recommends great care be given toward introducing a safe and convenient pedestrian connection from the station, through the station portal area, to Carpenter Park.</p> <p>9. As project development advances, the panel recommends continued effort be made to shorten distances between pedestrian access points to below-grade station platforms wherever possible.</p> <p>10. Make specific effort to design the Swiss Avenue junction to allow for development to occur on either side of the “Y” to minimize the disruption caused by the surface infrastructure within the surrounding urban fabric. Additionally, the Panel advises enhancing the design of the space between and around the eastern “Y” at Swiss/Good Latimer with landscaping and public art in order to beautify it and prevent it from becoming a purely utilitarian space.</p> <p>11. The panel expresses significant concern around the amount of disruption being proposed at the east portal location, and suggests great care be taken to minimize or limit such disruption through the following means:</p> <p>a. Continued exploration of alternatives within the east portal area that more closely align track and portal infrastructure with the existing street grid and fabric minimizing disruption to valuable land within the potential future urban neighborhood.</p> <p>b. Additional study of the east portal area and alignment should be explored through the engagement of local urban design expertise, area stakeholders, DART and the City to work toward envisioning and securing the best possible urban design outcome for the eastern end of the project.</p> <p>12. The panel recommends a careful approach in regard to property acquisition particularly along the Swiss avenue alignment, focusing on staying within the right of way wherever possible. Where property acquisition cannot be avoided, ensure that track and station infrastructure are designed to allow for desirable future development scenarios.</p> <p>13. In all instances, avoid splitting existing blocks wherever possible, particularly in regard to surface alignments.</p>	<p>pedestrian crossing at Cesar Chavez and Pacific Avenue will be enhanced including a City of Dallas suggestion to remove the free right turn from Pacific to northbound Cesar Chavez.</p> <p>9. Comment noted. Pedestrian access points have been located and optimized based on feasibility, space, multi-modal/transit connectivity, and proximity to the platform. Additional opportunities may be identified during final design based on TOD or joint development opportunities.</p> <p>10. Comment noted. The urban design plan currently identifies this area as a green space with opportunity for landscaping. As part of the TOD Planning grant effort to be conducted by DART and the City of Dallas, opportunities for development over and around track infrastructure will be explored.</p> <p>11. Several alternatives have been explored for this area as part of project development as documented in <b>Section 2.4</b> of the FEIS. The current alignment has been optimized to allow for retaining a station in Good Latimer Expressway corridor and providing a median running option that maximizes property access. DART also conducted a Feasibility Study with Westdale to document how the tunnel portal can be integrated within their future phase 3 development. DART is also proposing to modify the existing tracks to be embedded track and realigning Hawkins Street to align with Jett Way and create a better grid network for the neighborhood.</p> <p>12. Comment noted. DART identified several parcels in this area for potential acquisition for the project or construction staging. Those parcels only needed for construction can be part of a development scenario. These opportunities will be explored in the TOD Planning grant effort.</p> <p>13. Comment noted. Splitting blocks in some cases was required due to geometric requirements and existing development or infrastructure.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>14. The panel urges that attention be given to the alignment and location of the western portal, potentially adjusting the alignment to westwards, to ensure the resulting parcellation will allow for seamless integration of future developable blocks and street connections. Additionally, the panel expresses concern with the loss of east to west connectivity at the west portal area, recommending great care be given toward maintaining pedestrian and vehicular connectivity at Horde Street, and at minimum a pedestrian connection at Corbin Street.</p> <p>15. The panel recommends DART's design team consider contextual integration of the east and west portals into their immediate surroundings. Air right development partnership opportunities and public space integration should be explored and used to enhance the character of each portal.</p> <p>16. The Panel recommends DART further explore partnering with private developers to develop air rights above all proposed stations while also ensuring station design can accommodate future development.</p>	<p>14. The horizontal alignment has been set to account for the Museum Way Station, support columns under Woodall Rodgers Freeway, future development and to avoid impacts to existing buildings such as the Dallas World Aquarium. Opportunities to adjust the alignment are limited. In addition, DART is conducting a Feasibility Study with the developer of the west portal property to allow for integration of development of pedestrian connections over and around the portal. Hord Street is proposed to remain open and paths along or parallel to Corbin may be included in developer plans for pedestrian access.</p> <p>15. Comment noted. Feasibility studies are underway with property owners at each portal regarding these opportunities.</p> <p>16. The TOD Planning grant effort to be conducted with the City of Dallas and DART will focus on TOD opportunities at all stations along the corridor.</p>
A0007 Letter	Ridership	NCTCOG	3	In Executive Summary ES-5 Table ES-1, clarify how D2 will not change ridership but still reduce VMT-- often are antithetical, so small description in exec summary would be helpful.	Explanation added in <b>Chapter 3</b> and summarized in <b>Table ES-1</b> .
	Mobility		3	In Section 1.4.2 1-12 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph, Mobility 2045 recommends a high-speed not a higher-speed connection between Dallas and Fort Worth. It should be noted that in June 2020, NCTCOG, in coordination with FRA and FTA, began an alternative analysis for a high-speed passenger service between downtown Dallas and downtown Fort Worth.	Clarification added to <b>Section 1.4.2</b> .
	LPA		2	In Section 2.1 2-2 LPA Refinement, include reference to Appendices B.20, B.22, B.23.	The LPA Refinement phase was focused on developing a subway LPA and is not related to subsequent refinements and other alternatives considered after the September 2017 action to adopt a refined LPA. No change was made in the FEIS.
	Mobility		3	In Section 2.2.1 2-3 Figure 2-1, Silver Line Rail is shown in dashed gray line but not labeled on map or included in the legend.	The Silver Line has been labeled on <b>Figure 2-1</b> .
	TxDOT		3	In Section 2.2.2 2-4 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, IH 345 coordination needed from TxDOT	This paragraph has been updated to reflect the latest information received from TxDOT as part of their SDEIS review.



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
	Mobility		3	In Section 2.2.2 2-4 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph, improvements to I-345 are programmatically included in Mobility 2045. Specific improvements to I-345 were not included in the MTP to avoid the perception that the type of improvements had been pre-determined. NCTCOG is awaiting the outcome of the TxDOT feasibility study before listing project specifics.	This paragraph has been updated to reflect that improvements are programmatically included in Mobility 2045.
	Mobility		2	In Section 2.3.1 2-7 Figure 2-3, replace Fig. 2-3 with Fig. 3.3 Transportation Network in Study Area; Fig. 3.3 would be more helpful to follow the narrative.	<b>Figure 2-3</b> is intended to illustrate the D2 Subway Project in the context of an aerial downtown map. <b>Figure 3-5</b> in <b>Section 3.3</b> is more appropriate for a discussion of the roadway network. No change as made in the FEIS.
	Alternative		3	In Section 2.4 2-24 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, include Alternative Comparison Summaries for Pacific, Elm and Commerce Street options. Reference DART Public Meeting 6/21/2017.	Clarified the reference to <b>Section 2.1</b> to note that it includes a range of alternatives considered during the LPA Refinement Phase during 2016-2017, including Pacific and Elm. <b>Section 2.1</b> includes a link to the D2 webpage including the referenced public meeting. No changes were made to <b>Section 2.4</b> . (Kris)
	Visual		3	In Section 3.2.2 3-13 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, maintain visibility and integrity of water wall and statue at Rosa Parks Plaza	Added text in <b>Section 3.2.2</b> to note relocation of the water wall and statue that maintains visibility and integrity.
	Air Quality		3	In Section 3.3.3 3-27 Table 3-11 and 3-12, Tables 3-11 and 3-12 seem to indicate a high level of precision; data shown to the single-digit. Suggest rounding to the nearest hundredth.	Numbers are direct from NCTCOG model PERF reports and have been rounded to be more indicative that they are forecast estimates.
	Resource		3	In Section 4.9.4 4-74 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph, qualifying that renewable energy sources will increase over time needs some backup source. Is there a DART policy dedicated to this?	DART actively seeks to expand renewable energy sources in accordance with the DART Clean Fleet Vehicle Policy. A reference to this policy was added to <b>Section 4.9.4</b> .
	Air Quality		3	In Section 4.9.4 4-74 Table 4-12, Table 4-12 seem to indicate a high level of precision; data shown to the single-digit. Suggest rounding to the nearest hundredth.	Numbers are direct from NCTCOG model PERF reports and have been rounded to be more indicative that they are forecast estimates.
	Security		3	In Section 4.10.5 4-77 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph, provide safety guarantees of DART security app reliability/mobile service in underground locations.	Information on wifi access has been added to <b>Section 4.10.5</b> in the "Access and Emergency Services" section.
	Ecosystems		3	In Section 4.14.3 4-94 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, the interior least tern has been known to nest on gravel rooftops in the urbanized area of the City of Dallas. More investigations will need to be conducted for this habitat and presence of the tern.	Project impacts to building structures with gravel rooftops is limited. Prior to any building demolition of structures with gravel rooftops, a migratory bird treaty act (MBTA) survey will be done.
	Cumulative		3	In Section 4.16.3 4-111 Table 4-17, redevelopable land is only listed as vacant or parking. But other buildings, offices, etc. can be redeveloped. Define what you consider redevelopment and address how current business and sites could change due to redevelopment of those sites.	Text and table in <b>Section 4.16.3</b> were modified to clarify that developed land can be redeveloped.
	Cumulative		4	In Section 4.16.3 4-113 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraphs, the cumulative impacts sections seems incomplete. It is mentioned how cumulative impacts are	Cumulative impacts analysis in <b>Section 4.16.3</b> was expanded to document resources evaluated.



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				done, but it doesn't list the resources evaluated (if any), any parameters temporal, etc.) for the resources and any potential cumulative impacts, if any. If there were no impacts or investigations, no negative statements were included and the section reads as incomplete.	
	Construction		2	In Section 5.3.1 5-19 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, DARTzoom Network redesign recommendations are needed to evaluate redesign of Rosa Parks Plaza. Reference items needed in Appendix.	The redesign of Rosa Parks Plaza bus bays (located along streets) will be minimal due to DARTzoom with most redesign based on the additional of the headhouse access point and reconfiguration of the statue and water wall. DARTzoom will be complete in 2021; no items added to appendix.
	Construction		2	In Section 5.3.3 5-25 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, is additional evaluation needed for construction and train operational vibration effects to sensitive sites such as Dallas World Aquarium.	Noise and vibration for construction is covered in <b>Section 5.3.5</b> , including monitoring during construction. There were no operational impacts identified to sites such as the Dallas World Aquarium as documented in Appendix B.10. DART did coordinate with Dallas World Aquarium and it was determined that pumps in their facility generate substantial vibration in their building already.
	Noise/Vibration; Construction Impacts		2	In Section 5.3.5 5-27 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, with 24/7 construction, noise mitigation will be needed in sensitive areas (residential & hotel)	Comment noted. Mitigation and construction hours will be coordinated with the City and communicated to residents and businesses.
	Ridership		3	In Appendix B-21 3 7 Figure 4, suggest adding a dot for the new Live Oak station	Figure 4 was updated in Appendix B-21.
	Ridership		3	In Appendix B-21 6.1 16 Table 8, the difference in VMT from the No-Build scenario to the Build scenario ranges from about 0.04% at the regional level to 0.12% for the Dallas 360 study area. Section 5.1.1 downplayed the 2% drop in light rail ridership as being within the margin of error. Moreover, nearly two-thirds of the reduction in VMT appears to be generated from outside the DART service area. Some discussion of why this drop in VMT is statistically significant (and not just attributable to model error) would be appropriate--especially since these numbers are used to calculate monetized air quality and safety benefits in section 6.2.	The regional travel demand model is the only tool available to estimate changes in VMT. The change is minor and not significant give the potential margin of error in the model but is the only available data available. Language added to Appendix B-21 to reflect this.
	Ridership		3	In Appendix B-21 6.1 16 Table 9, as with VMT, the improvements in VHT are also very small. Some discussion of their significance would be appropriate. Also, is the benefit to VHT offset by the increased travel time on the Orange (and presumably Green) line as described in 5.1.2? Also, the title for Table 9 says "Vehicle Hours of Congestion Delay" but the columns say VHT, which is Vehicle Hours of Travel. These are two slightly different concepts. Which is shown in the table?	See above. Similar language added to Appendix B-21. Table 9 corrected to be hours, not VHT.



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
			3	In Appendix B-21 Appendix D 32 Table D1, this table exists in isolation, with no reference in the earlier text and no explanation, although it seems to be an expansion of Table 6 in 5.1.3. Suggest adding a reference to this table (D1) in the discussion of Table 6. Also suggest adding a description of the various modes, e.g. what is the DART CBD mode vs the DART Feeder, as well as which scenario this dataset represents. It might be worth adding a version of this table for the other scenario as well.	Reference to Appendix D added. Notes added to describe modes and data source. Additional versions were not created for the FEIS.
A0008 Letter	Historical, Archeological and Cultural Resources	Texas Historical Commission	2	Thank you for the recent notice of the publication of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART) D2 Subway Project, prepared by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and DART. This letter serves as comment on the proposed undertaking from the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Executive Director of the Texas Historical Commission (THC). THC staff, led by Justin Kockritz, Rebecca Shelton, and Pam Opiela, have completed their review of the SDEIS and offer the following comments on the potential effects of the proposed project on historic properties.	Comments noted.



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
			4	<p>THC concurs that because the effects on historic properties cannot be fully determined prior to approval of the undertaking, developing and executing a programmatic agreement (PA) will ensure that FTA's responsibilities for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act are met. To the suggested PA stipulations found at Chapter 4.6.5 of the SDEIS, THC also recommends including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifying how design/build contractors, if any, will be bound to the PA and its terms;</li> <li>• Identifying what aspects of the project may not be altered by a design/build contractor, if any;</li> <li>• A process for evaluating and consulting on any post-review design changes;</li> <li>• A process for monitoring, evaluating, and consulting on any discovery of unanticipated effects to historic properties;</li> <li>• A process for evaluating potential construction by entities other than DART, including the City of Dallas or non-profit organizations, that are part of this FTA undertaking, or clarifying that such construction is <i>not</i> part of the FTA undertaking;</li> <li>• Provisions for annual or semi-annual reporting by DART to the consulting parties summarizing the design and construction progress and compliance with the PA;</li> <li>• A process for amending the PA as needed; and,</li> <li>• A process for resolving any disputes related to the PA or its implementation.</li> </ul> <p>Further consultation will likely be required to develop mitigation appropriate for, and commensurate with, the proposed adverse effects to historic properties.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Consultation has occurred to develop and execute the Programmatic Agreement. <b>Section 4.6.5</b> has been updated to reflect the inclusion of the Programmatic Agreement as Appendix E to the FEIS/ROD.</p>
			3	<p>The Deep Ellum Historic District (DEHD) was previously determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places; see the Historic-Age Resource Reconnaissance Survey Report (Appendix B.4, Survey Report) and our related correspondence for more information. Because the full boundaries of the DEHD likely extend far beyond the D2 Subway Project's Area of Potential Effect (APE), THC agreed that delineating the full boundaries of the district was beyond the scope of this project. However, several properties within the APE were determined to be contributing to the DEHD. We recommend adding the DEHD and the identified contributing resources within the APE to Table 4-8 and ensuring that the DEHD is identified consistently throughout the SDEIS.</p>	<p>Deep Ellum Historic District has been added to <b>Table 4-8</b> in <b>Section 4.6.3</b> and associated text has been modified to be consistent throughout the FEIS.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
			4	Since the Survey Report was completed and our concurrence regarding the identification of historic properties within the APE, an amendment to the National Register nomination for the Dallas Downtown Historic District was accepted by the National Park Service, which justified the historic significance of the DalPark Garage at 1600 Commerce Street (also known as the Neiman Marcus Parking Garage). Based on this documentation, the DalPark Garage was determined to be a <i>contributing</i> resource to the Dallas Downtown Historic District. A copy of this amendment was provided to Deborah Dobson-Brown of AmaTerra Environmental, Inc., on May 29, 2020. If the Commerce Station Access Portal Option through the vacant DalPark Garage lease space is pursued, further consultation will be required as part of the planned PA to evaluate the effect of the access portal on the historic property.	Comment noted. This resource has been added to <b>Figure 4-14</b> and is included in the Programmatic Agreement list of resources.
			3	Many properties shown on Figures 4-13, 4-14, and 4-15 are symbolized as "NRHP Recommended Eligible Resource" when they were determined <i>not</i> eligible for listing in the National Register during consultation on the Survey Report. Examples include property #4 Dallas World Aquarium, #26 Jackson Street Garage, and #DE01 615 North Good-Lattimer Expressway. Please ensure that these maps match FTA's determinations of eligibility resulting from the consultation on the Survey Report. For clarity, properties that were evaluated in the Survey Report and determined <i>not</i> eligible for listing in the National Register could be removed from these maps. There are also some minor spelling errors in the lists accompanying Figure 4-13, including #53 that should read "Sanger Brothers" and #54 that should read "Metropolitan." For properties without a historic or common name, we recommend including the address in the list accompanying these figures, rather than "Unknown."	Corrections have been made to <b>Figures 4-13, 4-14 and 4-15</b> . In addition, a set of maps and a summary table of the historic resources is included as an attachment to the Programmatic Agreement.
			2	We look forward to further consultation with your office and hope to maintain a partnership that will foster effective historic preservation. Thank you for your cooperation in this federal review process, and for your efforts to preserve the irreplaceable heritage of Texas. If you have questions concerning the identification and evaluation of non-archeological historic properties, please contact Justin Kockritz at Justin.Kockritz@thc.texas.gov or 512-936-7403; for questions concerning potential effects to non-archeological historic properties, please contact Pam Opiela at Pamela.Opiela@thc.texas.gov or 512-463-8952; or, for questions concerning archeological resources, please contact Rebecca Shelton at Rebecca.Shelton@thc.texas.gov or 512-463-6043.	Comment noted



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
A0009	Historic, Archeological and Cultural Resources	David Preziosi	2	<p>Preservation Dallas would like to submit comments regarding the May 2020 Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the DART D2 subway project. We are pleased to see that a thorough review and inventory of historic structures in the APE and along the proposed subway line has been undertaken and the potential impacts to those structures have been evaluated.</p> <p>After our review of the SDEIS and Appendix B for impacts to historic resources, we have the following comments:</p>	Comment noted
			1	<p>Magnolia Gasoline Station at 902 Ross Avenue – As stated in the SDEIS, this historic building is eligible for the NRHP and is proposed for demolition with the rest of the buildings on the block to serve as a temporary construction site for D2. We would request that all possible alternatives be explored for other areas to serve as a construction site, or that the corner of the block with the Magnolia Gasoline Building be excluded from the construction site since it is furthest from where the line is proposed to be built. Another alternative would be to temporarily relocate the building to another site during construction and return it to the site when construction is finished or to permanently relocate it to another site. Those and other options can be explored as part of the Programmatic Agreement process, which we would like to be a part of.</p>	Based on comments received during the SDEIS review process, DART will avoid use and demolition of the Magnolia Gasoline Station. This recommendation and associated mitigation to avoid adverse effects is included in the Programmatic Agreement.
			2	<p>St. James A.M.E. Temple at 624 N. Good Latimer Expressway – The site of this significant City of Dallas Landmark building is proposed to be impacted with the relocation of the Deep Ellum Station to become the new Live Oak Station. There are potential impacts to the sidewalk, historic marker, and foliage with the expansion of the right-of-way for Good Latimer to accommodate the new station. We share The Meadows Foundation's concerns about ADA access to the building if the City of Dallas revokes the use of the rear parking lot. The parking lot off of Good Latimer is not accessible from the street and the proposed 14% grade on the driveway caused by the right-of-way expansion does not meet ADA access standards. If that can be addressed, it would provide necessary access to this building.</p>	Comment noted. The Programmatic Agreement includes site specific mitigation for St. James A.M.E. Temple including working with the property owner to ensure ADA access from North Good Latimer Expressway, coordinating on the relocation of the historic marker, and preserving vegetation and trees.



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
			4	2424, 2500, 2511 Swiss Avenue and 2441 Pacific Avenue – These buildings are proposed for acquisition for the construction and staging area for the Swiss Avenue portal and Y connection with the Green Line. All of the buildings are historic by age but are not considered eligible for the NRHP according to the SDEIS. As mitigation for their demolition, we request that additional documentation is completed for those buildings including as-found drawings, elevation photographs, and any additional research that can be located.	These four properties have been added to <b>Section 4.3</b> under a new section for locally significant structures that were found to be not eligible through the Section 106 consultation process. DART has included a mitigation measure for these resources to develop appropriate documentation for transmittal to Preservation Dallas and the City of Dallas OHP. Summary information with photographs/drawings will be completed prior to demolition by DART contractor. Depending on final contractor staging area needs, DART may not acquire or demolish all four of these resources.
			2	Commerce Station at Pegasus Plaza – The headhouse for the Commerce Station is proposed to be located in Pegasus Plaza. Although the plaza is not technically considered historic, it does abut the Magnolia Hotel. The Magnolia is a City of Dallas Landmark and a contributing resource in the NRHP Dallas Downtown Historic District. We request that all care be taken when designing and building the headhouse so it does not negatively impact or damage the historic Magnolia Hotel.	Comment noted. Design and construction of the headhouse and associated facilities adjacent to Magnolia Hotel will be done in accordance with the Programmatic Agreement to avoid negative impacts or damage to the resource.
			2	If any additional information or clarification is needed on the comments submitted in this letter, please let us know. Preservation Dallas is appreciative of DART’s efforts in preparing the SDEIS and for following the Sections 106 and 4(f) review process for historic resources in the D2 APE.	Comment noted
A0009	Support	Tom Hammons	2	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this important regional mobility project. Based on city staff review of the reference document, we offer the comments listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We concur with the development of the D2 Subway (the Build Alternative) that provides additional capacity for the overall rail system.</li> <li>• We concur with an alignment of the subway that tends to shift Carrollton Green Line riders from the existing Transit Mall to the proposed D2 Subway. The proposed, 2.4 mile alignment generally north-south along Griffin Street, and then generally east-west along Commerce Street is acceptable.</li> <li>• We concur with the development of four new stations, and one relocated station in Downtown Dallas that provide a wide accessibility coverage, and which serve Carrollton riders.</li> <li>• We concur with the use of bus routes and/or street cars to increase accessibility in Downtown Dallas, and which serve Carrollton riders.</li> </ul>	Comment noted



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We concur with the use of federal financing to develop the D2 Subway, such as with an FTA Capital Investment Grant (CIG), while maintaining priority on the design and construction of the Silver Line further north in the DART System.</li> </ul> <p>We look forward towards the successful development of this project.</p>	
Public					
P0001 email	Noise	Dietrich Bailey	2	<p>I have a question on the noise and vibration studies. While the documents are quite technical, the basics of what I read is because the noise is not expected to be increased Greater than 3 decibels mitigation is not required per the FTA. However, some will be considered at several locations. As a resident of Live Oak Lofts which predicted to be the closest building to the tracks and have the second highest noise increase. Can you please explain how this 3 decimal increase is calculated. Prior to the construction of the Green line the noise was quite low. In your documents I only see increases from today's noise not the overall noise increase for the green line since construction. Seems as long as the construction is in phases the 3 decimal increase is not cumulative.</p>	<p>The results of a re-evaluation of noise and vibration impacts in February 2020, based on proposed modifications to the east end of the alignment, indicated that there would be no noise or vibration impacts at the Live Oak Lofts due to the D2 Project. Furthermore, the noise increase due to the project, calculated by combining the measured existing noise exposure level with the predicted noise exposure level from the project, was estimated to be only 0.2 decibels. Although the existing noise level used for the assessment was based on measurements conducted in December 2018 that included noise from DART Green Line train operations, these operations have been a part of the noise environment in the area since 2009 and it was considered reasonable to base the assessment on the current noise conditions using FTA procedures. It is true that the ambient noise levels were 3 decibels lower than the current levels prior to construction of the Green Line, based on noise measurements conducted at the Live Oak Lofts in March 2001. However, even using the pre-construction ambient noise level as a basis for the assessment, there would still be no noise impact projected at the Live Oak Lofts. In addition, the projected noise increase would be only 0.4 decibels, which is insignificant. Therefore, it is concluded that no noise impact from the D2 Project is anticipated at the Live Oak Lofts, whether the assessment is based on the current ambient noise levels or on the ambient noise levels prior to construction of the Green Line, and that no mitigation is warranted at this location.</p>
P0002 email	Design, Fare collection	Caleb Jiang	2	<p>I am concerned about the fare gates in the D2 station designs. Since all of the existing stations do not have fare gates and it would be especially costly and difficult to add them given their open design, it seems as if the fare gates' only purpose is to exist as a costly way to try to keep homeless people out of the stations. Some of the currently accepted forms of fare</p>	<p>Comment noted. Currently, fare gates remain in the project design. Long term, DART may explore additional methods to control access at other outlying stations to better manage access to the system by customers. Multiple fare gates would be located at each station and the number of gates</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				media such as the GoPass app have no way of communicating with fare readers in their current state and will need to be redesigned, increasing costs. Magnetic stripe cards as used for local and regional passes in the three DFW transit agencies are slow, frustrating, and unreliable to use (see NYC metrocard). Even if every single DART rider were issued a free GoPass tap card, station capacity will still be reduced as paying riders need to line up to use the fare gates when entering and exiting. People looking for a free ride will simply walk north two blocks (or less) and be able to hop on a train at one of the existing downtown stations. In summary, fare gates should be removed from D2 because they slow down and inconvenience paying customers while having a minimal impact at reducing fare evaders.	accounts for ridership loads to minimize queues. The actual design, technology and interface with DART fare media continues to evolve and be advanced and has not yet been determined. However, the goal is to create a convenient customer interface that maximizes safety and security while discouraging fare evaders.
P0003 letter	Support	Larry Good	2	<p>Last week I received a link to the Supplement Draft EIS for the proposed DART downtown subway (D2), which I carefully and eagerly reviewed. For more than a decade I have been a frequent participant in stakeholder meetings regarding D2, and have been particularly invested in matters of urban design for the project, such as planning charrettes for the Deep Ellum connection and the Pegasus Plaza portal to the Commerce Street Station. While on DDI's Transportation Committee, we were actively involved in formulating the urban design standards which will govern D2. Therefore, I bring a great deal of familiarity with the project and want to express my enthusiastic support.</p> <p>The SDEIS is a thorough document which is comprehensive in identifying probable impacts. The mitigation measures which are outlined are appropriate. I am very pleased with the station locations which have been selected and I agree with the access strategies for the street level pedestrian portals to the underground stations.</p> <p>In particular, I want to comment on the redesign of Pegasus Plaza to accommodate the headhouse for the Commerce Street Station, which I endorse conceptually. I was a part of the design team which created Pegasus Plaza in 1991, so I would typically be guilty of being over-protective of the park. But that <b>park needs revitalization and will greatly benefit from the increased pedestrian activity brought by DART riders</b>. The architectural concept of a transparent glass box for the headhouse is a dynamic idea, and very appropriate. I do understand that the entire park site will be excavated as a function of its use as a staging/muck out location, and will then be completely rebuilt afterwards. Providing the key art components are safely preserved in a warehouse,</p>	Comment noted. DART appreciates your participation in the January 2020 Stakeholder Workshop to outline a vision and key priorities for a reimagined Plaza.



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>and that the best healthy trees are cared for off-site, the prospect of a refreshed Pegasus Plaza after 20 years is a positive benefit indeed.</p> <p>We spent a lot of time assisting DART with the details of the D2 alignment adjacent to Carpenter Park, under Interstate 345 and along Swiss Avenue into Deep Ellum, where the tracks rise to grade and a “Y” connection to the Green Line is required. This has been carefully refined as a result of our charette, and I am very pleased with what is illustrated in the SDEIS, particularly the relocation of the Deep Ellum/Live Oak Station. (As a side comment, I want to state my opinion that the much-altered former “Lizard Lounge” building at 2424 Swiss Avenue is not an historically significant structure and should not cause any further debate, leading to adjustments to the alignment in this area.)</p> <p>In summary, I believe that the SDEIS defines the D2 project in a manner which is consistent with the input and direction of the project stakeholders as well as the Dallas City Council. The sooner we proceed, the better!</p>	
P0004 email	Support	Arthur Santa- Maria	2	<p>I'd like to share with you and the D2 team at DART Hoque Global's support for the project. As long time downtown stakeholders, we keenly understand the importance of a second alignment in downtown, particularly to provide operational relief and eliminate the single track bottle neck the whole system suffers currently. As the bottle neck removal allows for greater service frequency, we strongly believe that the whole city and region will benefit from more frequent service and better functionality in the transit system. As Dallas looks to grow South with Uptown and other northern markets largely built out, D2 can play a significant role in stewarding inclusive development and renewed urban growth to our south. Maintaining the subgrade tunnel is also an important benefit to keep downtown vibrant and encourage pedestrian traffic. We are excited to see Dallas and our region take this important step in improving mobility and transit in our area.</p>	Comment noted.
P0005 email	Safety and Security	Tammy Greenberg	1	<p>I understand you will have an entrance in West End? I am very concerned about this entrance because we already have problems with this station. This will cause a lot of problems for West End Commons. Here are my concerns</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. People hang around</li> <li>2. panhandling problem</li> <li>3. People hang around the underground at city place</li> <li>4. Urinate in the elevator</li> <li>5. If you do have this be like New York or Boston allow tickets only and West End and City place tickets only</li> </ol>	Comment noted. The access point at Lamar/Pacific in the West End has been removed from the 30% design due to public comments that indicate an at-grade pedestrian connection across Lamar is more appropriate and can be better integrated with the proposed West End Commons plaza and address the concerns you noted. The preliminary concept for the plaza is referenced in the design drawings.



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>6. I stop using the train since before the virus hit two weeks before because city place is not clean. I was only use buses and taking a longer route to downtown.</p> <p>7. Dart police needs to be restructure most of the time they are not paying attention. If you going to have this Station you need an officer upper level and the lower level</p> <p>8. I do miss riding the train however I am walking to downtown and avoid the West End right now</p> <p>9. I walk to West End if I need to</p>	
P0006 email	Safety and Security, Design	Gina Whitlock	1	A building containing nothing but elevators and escalators that occupies the majority of the Commons site will do nothing to address the quality of life issues present at the location and on the nearby streets. In fact, it will likely aggravate them by reducing visibility in and around the site and also giving people no room to do much of anything else except loiter, panhandle, and sell drugs. The site is an important gateway for the West End and downtown and should be treated as such, and not like a throwaway spot only suited for a bland, utilitarian building.	Comment noted. The access point at Lamar/Pacific in the West End has been removed from the 30% design due to public comments that indicate an at-grade pedestrian connection across Lamar is more appropriate and can be better integrated with the proposed West End Commons plaza and address the concerns you noted. The preliminary concept for the plaza is referenced in the design drawings.
P0007 email	General, Cultural Resources, Noise, Natural Environment	Darcy Zarubiak	2	<p>I have a number of concerns with omissions in the technical analysis contained in the SDEIS, including:</p> <p>1. Document is a federal document but is not compliant with Section 508, this should be remedied and the publication of the draft document should be rereleased.</p>	<p>FTA and DART are committed to making sure that all individuals have access to information relevant to participating in the NEPA process. Multiple avenues were provided to make sure the information for the SDEIS was accessible including posting it on the DART web site and providing virtual and in-person meetings to assist individuals in accessing and understanding the information. Contact information was provided to allow anyone having difficulty accessing the information a mechanism to receive assistance. DART Community Engagement contact information was provided to make alternative arrangements for viewing the document. The virtual hearings were recorded and transcribed:</p> <p>— June 11, 2020 Public Hearing - 12:00-1:00 p.m. — June 11, 2020 Public Hearing - 6:30-7:30 p.m. Audio files are available at <a href="http://DART.org/D2">DART.org/D2</a>.</p>
			2	<p>2. The Section 106 analysis does not indicate there was any consultation with ancestral tribes to determine if there is any religious or cultural significance of the project area. Absent the coordination, 36 CFR 800 has not been satisfied and the SDEIS cannot satisfy as the public notification obligations of the FTA under Section 106.</p>	<p>FTA, with coordination with and input from THC, sent consultation letters to Native American Tribes with known areas of interest in Dallas County, Texas and Native American Tribes with unknown areas of interest which may include Dallas County. Letters are included in <b>Appendix C</b>. No responses have been received to date.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
			2	3. The noise analysis notes an increase in noise on 176 residential units, however, the EJ analysis chooses to analyze by census blocks. It seems disingenuous to look at a sample size of 16,316 residences when the impacts are only experienced by 176. This looks like an attempt to obfuscate a clear presentation of the facts related to the potential to disparately impact disadvantaged communities.	The EJ analysis covers a much larger study area than the noise analysis, which is focused on adjacent sensitive receptors. No noise impacts requiring mitigation were identified. There are very few EJ communities along the corridor and no disproportionate impacts. Overall, there will be more benefits to these communities given the enhanced access and mobility associated with the project.
			2	4. The soils and geology section appears inconsistent with the water resources section – if there will be a long term draw in water because of the underground structures, this would likely have an impact on localized water tables, potentially impacting constructability on surrounding land.	There is not expected to be a long-term water draw in water due to underground structures that would affect localized water tables or impact constructability on surrounding land.
P0008 email	Support	Marcus Wood	2	I write in support of the D2 SUBWAY SDEIS as presented, except it is important to note the DEIS alternatives from years ago regarding No-Build and all surface rail alternatives as presented, evaluated, and discussed in general and in detail are obsolete and invalid. Thus if for any reason the D2 Subway alternative is rejected or compared to any of the surface alternatives the whole process needs to start all over again.	Comment noted
P0009 email	ADA access to Meadows Foundation at St. James AME Temple	Deborah Fitzpatrick	4	Meadows Foundation remains concerned about ADA access to the building. We do not own the rear parking lot and if the City of Dallas revokes our use of the parking lot, we will not have ADA access to 624 Good Latimer since the parking lot off of Good Latimer is not ADA accessible from the street. The current grade and the proposed 14% grade on the driveway does not meet ADA access standards. ADA ramp slope needs to be 1:12 or 4.8%, which should have been addressed when the DART rail was installed. We look forward to hearing how this issue will be addressed.	Comment noted. The Programmatic Agreement includes site specific mitigation for St. James A.M.E. Temple including working with Meadows Foundation to ensure ADA access from North Good Latimer. During final design, options will be discussed for modifying the walkway/steps or the driveway to meet ADA standards.
P0010 email	Support	Larry Hamilton	2	Our company has been a participant in the evolution of the D2 for the past several years. We own the DP&L complex on Commerce Street and are one of the major stakeholders that would be affected. While we expect a degree of inconvenience during construction, we feel that the plans developed by DART would mitigate the inconveniences to the extent possible and the project once completed will be an asset to Dallas and well worth the inconvenience. The use of Pegasus Park as the staging/construction area will mitigate the construction interference with the normal functioning of the Main Street area as much as possible and is a smart way to build the new line.	Comment noted
P0011 email	Support	Russell Coleman	2	I support the D2 SUBWAY SDEIS as presented. However, DEIS alternatives dating back many years - relating to No-Build and all surface rail alternatives, all as presented, evaluated, and discussed in general and	Comment noted

Dallas CBD Second Light Rail Alignment (D2 Subway)  
Final Environmental Impact Statement



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				in detail, are significantly obsolete and resultantly invalid. As a result of that obsolescence, in the highly unlikely event that the D2 Subway alternative is rejected or compared to any of the surface alternatives then the entire route selection process must begin anew.	
P0012a Email 5/15/20	Design, DalPark Garage pedestrian portal	John Tatum	2	<p>I have reviewed the federal submission for D2 and must tell you 1) I have lost confidence in what seemed like good faith negotiations for access to our property at 1616 Commerce for an eastern entrance to the Commerce Street subway station, 2) consideration of the possible impacts to our NR-eligible property (on which certified rehabilitation is now underway) must be included in this publication (by amendment I presume) for formal public review and comment, and 3) without an agreement between Dalpark Partners, Ltd. and DART by June 15, 2020 I will assume none is forthcoming and therefore will proceed accordingly to protect our property interests which may be adversely impacted and otherwise affected by the proposed D2 project.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you in response to my "deal points" memo of March 23, 2020 which you had requested and trust we will be able to work successfully together in the future.</p>	<p>Response via email 5/15/2020: Thanks for your email. I appreciate your comments and we hope to also be able to work successfully together. In response to your points, the COVID-19 discussions happening with our Board may influence our speed/ability to negotiate until schedule is more certain.</p> <p>Also, as I mentioned in response to Craig's email, the SDEIS does not reflect the NHRP eligibility since THC concurred that it wasn't eligible based on their prior review. THC did not mention it in their recent review of effects, so we will follow up with them to see if it's now showing up in their database - could have been a timing issue at the time they reviewed our information. If they amend eligibility determination then of course we'll include information in the Final EIS and any future agreements.</p> <p>While June 15 is around the corner, we may not know our ability to move forward until late summer when the financial plan and project cash flows are determined by the DART Board. We will plan to keep you informed as we try to advance some real estate activities early as part of the strategy to continue to advance the project.</p> <p>Since our 45-day comment period is open for the SDEIS, we encourage you to provide any official comments on the project in writing or through <a href="mailto:D2@DART.org">D2@DART.org</a>.</p>
P0012b Email 5/15/20	DalPark Garage		4	<p>Thanks for your timely response. I do hope you will update the information and your presentation and public filing with the most current information from THC -- as you have recently been informed of Dalpark's eligibility for NR by our architect Architexas. Your presentation is not an accurate reflection of the availability of the property for DART's use, as it creates a false impression that agreement exists between DART and the property owner. What if there is a question as to whether that location is not available -- is there an alternative location proposed? If so, what is that? If not, do you propose condemnation?</p>	<p>Comment noted. Dalpark Garage is now included as a historic resource based on recent correspondence from THC and will be subject to the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement design review process. DART will continue to work towards an agreement for use of the space.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>Please make every effort to respond by June 15, Covid-19 or not. To my knowledge, the current health situation has apparently neither held up this engineering effort, nor your public presentations, federal filings and negotiations and agreements with other private property owners.</p> <p>I look forward to concluding an agreement in the next 30 days. Please call if you have questions or need additional information.</p>	
P0012c Email 6/15/20	DalPark Garage		2	<p>While I appreciate the "financial uncertainty" that DART must accept these days, I will note that hearing of your "interest" is giving me nothing substantial on which we can proceed with our development planning.</p> <p>To restate, I adamantly oppose the proposed location of access stairs and elevators in existing Commerce Street right of way immediately in front of the main entrance to the historic banking lobby at 1616 Commerce. This construction would render our investment to redevelop that space for retail and retail-related uses ultimately unsuccessful. I suggest if you want to move forward with planning an entrance here, you should propose an option contract (I detailed in earlier memo) to conditionally commit the space for your future use. I do not support the planning currently underway presenting the station entrance located on our property for public review without a definitive agreement.</p> <p>Your finances notwithstanding, your engineers are roaring ahead with their multi-million dollar effort in the face of greater uncertainty than has ever existed as to the feasibility and schedule for this project. I will not allow your efforts to frustrate the redevelopment of our historic Dalpark Garage. Thank you.</p>	<p>Comment noted. A letter of interest was provided on June 25, 2020 to begin discussion of potential terms for use of Dalpark. DART staff is coordinating with the DART Board of Directors on the appropriate timing to advance agreements.</p>
P0012d Email 6/23/20	TOD, Station Design		2	<p>What is the plan for work of TOD grant just received for D2 including Commerce station affecting both iron cactus on Pegasus plaza and Dalpark? Looks good</p>	<p>Response via email 6/24/2020: We are working with grants department on steps to get the grant activated and for the scope of work, we need to work with the city staff over next several weeks to refine roles/responsibilities and determine if we'll procure or use existing contracts for the planning work. The emphasis will be on city actions/needs to promote TOD, maybe a zoning overlay, parking issues, etc. and also to outline a program for multi-modal access/infrastructure improvements around the project stations. There will some stakeholder/public involvement I'm sure once it gets started.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
P0012e Letter 6/28/20	DalPark Garage, Station Design		4	<p>We have reviewed the engineering drawings and other descriptive material for the proposed D2 Subway in Downtown Dallas being circulated for public comment and offer the following for the Record:</p> <p><b>Dalpark Garage</b> The concept of location an eastern subway station entrance from Commerce Street in the historic lobby at 1616 Commerce is appealing, and, from the conceptual planning and preliminary reviews to date by DART, THC, and Owner, appears to be feasible and historically appropriate. However, lease terms and conditions for DART's construction and long-term use of the property must be finalized sooner rather than later as the proposed use creates potential conflicts for the success of our rehabilitation of the larger Dalpark property.</p> <p>When we begin the restoration and redevelopment of Dalpark's ground floor premises at 1616 Commerce, great attention should be paid to protecting and enhancing the original banking entry (existing) and potential for new outdoor terraces (corner Commerce and Ervay streets). Most importantly, as has been stated at every opportunity for public comment, the option of locating station access though two elevators and a stair to be placed in existing Commerce Street ROW and in front of 1616 Commerce primary façade 1) will obscure the historically restored building entry, specifically, and detract from the quality of rehabilitation of the larger property at 1600 Commerce, and 2) will likely overwhelm the opportunity for new restaurant terraces with increased traffic, noise and trash. This alternative location for station access will likely not survive Sec. 106 review and should not be pursued.</p>	<p>Comment noted. DART will continue to coordinate on terms and conditions for use. The 30% design reflects the entrance within DalPark Garage. The garage is now included as a contributing historic resource to the NRHP listed Downtown Dallas Historic District based on recent correspondence from THC and will be subject to the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement design review process.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p><b>1520 Main/Pegasus Plaza (Iron Cactus)</b></p> <p>The restored Thompson Building at 1520 Main and its new terraced addition in Pegasus plaza has housed a successful and iconic restaurant since 2004. This (or specialty retail or headquarters office) is an ideal use for the plaza environment and will serve as the foundation of new TOD activity envisioned for the station entry and rebuilt plaza fronting our building. Every effort should be made to 1) minimize disruption and other adverse impacts during construction, specifically, restricting intrusion to the east side of the plaza adjoining restaurant terraces, landscaping and existing "muse stones", 2) restore the mature trees which create an inviting "public use" atmosphere for new restaurant, retail and destination uses, and 3) restore the existing pedestrian access and enhance access to the station entry in ways supportive of 1520 Main.</p> <p>Finally, the owners are aware of FTA's recent award for TOD studies and planning at Commerce and other D2 stations and are enthusiastic about participating in that effort.</p>	<p>Comment noted. DART appreciates your participation in the January 2020 Stakeholder Workshop to outline a vision and key priorities for a reimagined Plaza. While DART proposes a temporary construction easement on much of Pegasus Plaza to construct the project and re-establish the park, efforts will be made to minimize impacts to adjacent uses through appropriate screening and maintenance of access. Key priorities for the plaza redesign include trees and enhanced access points to the headhouse and adjacent uses including 1520 Main.</p>
P0013 Letter	Design	Brian Keith	2	<p>Greater Dallas Planning Council (GDPC) is a locally based, volunteer professional organization that shapes, promotes, and advocates for the creative, sustainable future of the Dallas region. GDPC <b>supports</b> the proposed D2 project as an important priority for the DART system and downtown Dallas.</p> <p>On behalf of the Greater Dallas Planning Council (GDPC) we are pleased to provide input to your D2 Subway Project SDEIS. GDPC sees this as a very important project for Downtown Dallas and DAR. With this perspective, we request and encourage that the DART D2 project include a robust program of urban design enhancements along all at-grade segments with a higher level of urban design improvements in the vicinity of stations. Regarding the latter, we see the need for this project to complement the environments that it is built within, as a context sensitive design approach to environmental impacts.</p> <p>Dallas, like most cities, requires additive enhancements of nearly everything constructed within the city. Enhanced development criteria such as building setbacks, material requirements, buffering, landscaping, and site improvements are standard public expectations within the urban environment. We believe comparable enhancements are appropriate for D2 project. The GDPC requests that funding allowances and implementation of these types of urban design improvements be made a part of project-wide mitigation for visual and aesthetic, transportation and construction disruption, congestion and adjacency impacts on one of the</p>	<p>Comments noted. DART has updated and refined urban design plans. Coordination will continue with the City of Dallas and the City's approved Urban Transit Design Guidelines.</p> <p>DART was awarded a \$1M grant to work with the City of Dallas on a TOD Implementation Plan. The efforts will include potential urban design/multi-modal access/infrastructure improvements and enhancements around the project stations and corridor.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>most valued real estate districts within the DFW region. These provided comments are toward our goal that the completed project serves both entities in a complimentary fashion for the long-term good of both. By means of our review comments, we reinforce our support of this project as interested community stakeholders shaping, promoting and advocating a creative, sustainable future for the Dallas region.</p> <p>We stand ready to provide ongoing input toward further design definition and funding of improvements, in particular for the upcoming 30% design package. We recognize the ambitious goals of this project will require partnerships of various types. We offer our ongoing support to help refine the positions and outcomes we encourage in our enclosed statement. The GPC applauds DART for taking such a forward-thinking approach to our City's and region's sustainable future. As an organization the GPC wishes to be included on any advisory or review committees. We also extend our support, advocacy and assistance to this continued effort for our Region's future.</p>	
P0014 email	Alignment	Benton Payne	2	<p>My name is Benton Payne and I live at 5738 Vanderbilt, Dallas, TX 75206 I work for a real estate development group which owns properties along the LPA and have worked alongside many organizations which have opinions on this project, but the views that I am representing are mine alone.</p> <p>I do not support this alignment, particularly the eastern end of the alignment.</p> <p>I do not believe that this alignment is in the best interests of Dallas citizens or Downtown Dallas.</p> <p>I do not believe that D2 is as necessary as DART claims. If operational flexibility &amp; alleviating bottlenecks were the primary concern, the current train line through the service yard could be modified to provide a reliever route in case of incidents on the downtown mall.</p> <p>I do not believe the "Y" junction where the new route intersects with the current rail line on Good Latimer is necessary for the Core Capacity element of the project. The junction will do little but render a great deal of developable land useless.</p> <p>I do not believe that DART has done its full due-diligence with TxDOT, NCTCOG, and the City of Dallas as it relates to IH-345 and many other issues. DART was acting alone trying to get ahead of other agencies rather than trying to work with them. There are too many projects happening in and around the same area for agencies to work in silos.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Use of the service yard would require a route that would not meet the purpose and need, especially relating to provision of long-term capacity to sustain the DART system and alleviate crowding on certain trips.</p> <p>A junction is required with the existing system and there are limited locations to do so. Prior junctions with other alternative alignments were unacceptable to many stakeholders and led DART to advance the current design. DART believes that air rights can be provided to allow for development over the junction like how development over both portals is being coordinated with property owners at those locations.</p> <p>DART met 12 times with TxDOT, NCTCOG, and the City of Dallas from April 2019 to April 2020 at interagency coordination meetings focused on D2/I-345 interface. Meetings have continued quarterly to review TxDOT progress on alternatives and the relationship to D2 Subway and city streets. All agencies have been actively working together.</p>

Dallas CBD Second Light Rail Alignment (D2 Subway)  
Final Environmental Impact Statement



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>I believe that DART has been untruthful. DART has described “consensus” around a refinement of the alignment near the proposed CBD East station. A February 22, 2019 letter from DART to TC Broadnax (included in the SDEIS) attaches what are said to be letters of support for this refinement, however only one of the three attached letters appears to be supportive. This is not consensus.</p> <p>Lastly, I believe that DART is currently acting without the support of the City of Dallas. Section 2 of the City of Dallas resolution on the LPA (#171426 dated September 13, 2017) clearly states:</p> <p><i>That the D2 alignment will be brought back for City Council approval, once the FTA Project Development Phase (ten percent design stage) is complete and prior to incorporation of the alignment into the DART Service Plan under section 452.304 of the Texas Transportation Code, with regard to integration of the at-grade light rail line within street rights-of-way and the analysis of impacts on adjacent properties.</i></p> <p>This City Council Approval has not happened. There has been no vote to satisfy this condition. DART says that the next City Council vote will be the incorporation of the D2 alignment into the service plan, which is tentatively scheduled for Q4 of 2020. There must be another vote from City Council in order for DART to comply with the wishes of the City Council. Until this happens, I believe that DART is acting without City of Dallas approval.</p>	<p>The CBD East refinement was done in response to focus area meetings and stakeholder input, as well as engineering and constructability concerns under Elm Street garages. Information was shared with the stakeholder work group, City of Dallas, and DART Board. While there was concern from one property owner, others supported or did not oppose the refinement when DART advanced it further into design.</p> <p>DART completes FTA Project Development phase once the FEIS/ROD is issued along with 30% design. In the past, DART projects were advanced to ten percent design; however, FTA recommends 30% design now. DART is working with City staff to schedule approval of the project into the DART Service Plan once Project Development is complete this Fall. Based on city staff coordination, an interim vote was not required. DART briefed the Dallas Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in January 2020 on project status and prior to 20% design as an interim milestone. The DART Board held a public hearing on September 22, 2020 and is not scheduled to consider approval until after the Dallas City Council has reviewed and approved.</p>
P0015 email	Safety and Security; Design	Crispin Lawson	1	<p>Even though you're well-aware of my D2 thoughts, I wanted to send another note just for the record for the public comment period.</p> <p>All-in-all, I'm a strong proponent of D2 and think you guys are doing a fine job with the design so far. I know it's a very complicated project. The primary concerns I have, of course, are with regards to the station entrance proposed for the Commons site. I and many other people in the neighborhood are worried that the existing plan for the entrance won't address the quality of life problems (drug-dealing, panhandling, etc.) at and around the site. The only thing preventing the problems from being as bad now as in past years is a constant, heavy DART PD presence. The high volume of pedestrian traffic plus the lack of much else to do will continue to attract people engaged in those activities unless the site's design is improved. A simple station entrance won't do that, and may even make things worse by making it harder for the police and concerned citizens to see everything happening at the site, and also because it removes room for other possible activities (for example, it would take out the only seating area that exists).</p>	<p>Comment noted. The access point at Lamar/Pacific in the West End has been removed from the 30% design due to public comments that indicate an at-grade pedestrian connection across Lamar is more appropriate and can be better integrated with the proposed West End Commons plaza and address the concerns you noted and create a gateway transition to West End. The preliminary concept for the plaza is referenced in the design drawings.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>There is also a significant opportunity cost. The West End could use an impressive and enjoyable gateway between it and the rest of downtown, particularly since the DART facilities make it an entrance point for many visitors from outside Dallas as well. By offering a range of positive activities and some programming, it could be an actual asset to DART and the neighborhood. It could showcase downtown, the West End, and DART itself. Since the planning is already finished and some of the implementation work had already been started (and completed in the case of some of the public art and historical markers), it could be constructed faster than identifying another site and starting over from scratch.</p> <p>Just this brief summary indicates that the station entrance would be better located elsewhere. One potential alternative is the parking lot on the south side of the tracks. Another would be to build enhanced pedestrian crossings across Lamar to entrances on the east side of Lamar. Those enhanced crossings would likely be cheaper and additionally would benefit many more pedestrians than only those transferring between stations.</p> <p>In summary, we need to deliver a solution that's about more than just mobility. We should be committed to creating a true asset for the West End that's beneficial on multiple levels: safe, fun, pleasant. I look forward to continuing to work with you all to develop the D2 plans.</p>	
P0016 Letter	General	Stephanie Hudiburg	2	<p>At the Deep Ellum Foundation, mobility and transportation accessibility are critical priorities identified by our stakeholders that we work on every day. From the introduction of new micro-mobility options to the reimagining of major vehicular infrastructure, Deep Ellum is at the center of how the Dallas region's transportation landscape is transforming. The D2 project, in its current proposed form outlined in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, will have significant negative impacts on the Deep Ellum area. The properties and businesses surrounding North Good Latimer Expressway and Swiss Avenue will especially bear the burden of this project's impacts. The majority of these area owners who serve on our Good Latimer Committee have voiced opposition to the project. While we understand the regional importance of expanded core capacity and the need for a wye junction, the D2 project's alignment and current plan to resurface to be at-grade along this corridor will disproportionately hamper area development, connectivity and traffic.</p> <p>Deep Ellum is an economic and entertainment hub attracting residents and businesses from across the region and the country. How the D2 project engages this historic neighborhood driving growth in Dallas will have significant implications for the entire region. In 2018, we shared a</p>	<p>We understand the concerns of the property owners and businesses surrounding Swiss Avenue and North Good Latimer Expressway, especially those that will be directly impacted, and the SDEIS includes a range of mitigation measures to address them. As you may know, DART received a \$1 million Transit Oriented Development (TOD) planning grant to focus on land use, zoning, and multi-modal connectivity along the D2 Subway corridor. As both the D2 Subway project and this TOD planning effort move forward, a strong working relationship with Deep Ellum Foundation (DEF) will be critical.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				letter outlining the greatest collective concerns and priorities relative to the proposed D2 project's advancement. Please find that letter enclosed here. Should the D2 project proceed, we reaffirm that these priorities and needs for mitigation must be addressed. We have appreciated the opportunity to share questions, concerns and proposed solutions with DART related to this transit project and thank you for the consideration of area stakeholder input.	
				<p>Attachment – Letter from December 5, 2018</p> <p>At the Deep Ellum Foundation (DEF), we know the district we serve is at the nexus of transportation system issues as well as opportunities in the Dallas region. In DEF's efforts to encourage sustainable growth in the area, we provide feedback to the City of Dallas, regional planners and related agencies regarding infrastructure projects within our district.</p> <p>After convening area stakeholders, in-depth deliberation, and ongoing conversations with DART representatives, the Deep Ellum Foundation (DEF) Board of Directors does not offer a recommendation as to the Swiss Avenue alignment or any alignment at this time but would like to offer input on the newly revised Swiss Avenue alignment of the DART D2 project including several major conditions. We recognize that D2 may provide capacity and safety benefits to the region in the long term. At the same time, however, this project imposes significant disruptions to multimodal traffic and development patterns and this burden appears to be born most heavily within our district.</p> <p>The loss of a DART station poses a serious challenge to future accessibility and circulation precisely during a time of tremendous residential and commercial growth in this particular segment of the Deep Ellum area. Moreover, the eminent domain (condemnation) requirements of the Swiss Avenue alignment are vast and the threat that the Y junction configuration raises for pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular connectivity to and within this area is highly problematic.</p> <p>With these long-term impacts in mind, in addition to midterm construction-related disruption, we offer several input items including but not limited to the following regarding our priorities and requirements for this D2 alignment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Improved DART Rail Service</b> – As Dallas continues to grow, specifically through greater infill development, reliable and convenient transit options will increasingly serve a critical role in our economy and quality of life. Thus, improved rail service with shorter</li> </ol>	<p>Based on DEF concerns as noted in the December 2018 letter, DART has continued to make progress to address them now or in the future. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DART has been able to retain a station within Good Latimer Expressway by shifting the Deep Ellum Station to Live Oak. Even though a station will be maintained in this corridor, DART staff is open to discussing the potential to rename the Baylor Station to include "Deep Ellum" if that is viewed as the primary station serving Deep Ellum.</li> <li>The Live Oak Station, CBD East Station, and Baylor Station are all within walking distance to Deep Ellum. As part of the TOD planning grant effort, DART and the City will engage DEF in discussions on infrastructure (sidewalks, paths, utilities, etc.), lighting, and wayfinding programs to enhance security and access.</li> <li>Potential bike and pedestrian paths along the DART Green Line can be explored as part of the TOD planning grant effort to assess feasibility and funding options.</li> <li>As part of the DART 2045 Transit System Plan effort, DART is evaluating the potential for a future infill station near Main Street and Baylor's new administration building to further enhance access as development moves eastward.</li> <li>DART continues to meet regularly with TxDOT, City of Dallas and NCTCOG to review future potential options for I-345. To date, I-345 design concepts accommodate the D2 Subway project as reflected in our 20% plans and SDEIS.</li> <li>Enhanced east-west pedestrian crossings are planned at Swiss Avenue, Live Oak Street and Pacific Avenue.</li> </ul>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>wait times as well as extended evening and early morning operations will be required to make transit a viable option for many employees and visitors to Deep Ellum and surrounding areas. Wait times of 15 to 20 minutes max as opposed to the current 30 to 45 minutes and beyond will facilitate consistent rider use. Just as important, extending operations to 3:30am will more appropriately serve Deep Ellum as the City's premier nighttime commercial destination. Extended hours will serve not only customers but bartenders, wait staff and other staff who close down area businesses between 2:00am and 4:00am. Most late-night employees spend an hour closing up and cleaning up. Thus, a 3:30am final scheduled stop in Deep Ellum will allow more time for these employees to get to the train station.</p> <p>2. <b>More Apt Orange Line Rail Access to Economic Hub</b> – Improving service also means improving access where Dallasites need it most. We know from Downtown Dallas Inc.'s 360 plan research that east-west trips from Baylor and Deep Ellum to the North Central Expressway corridor are amongst the highest frequency in the City. Thus, extending Orange Line access to Deep Ellum and the renewed Deep Ellum/Baylor Station will increase utility of the DART system as a whole and best serve the local workforce and economy.</p> <p>3. <b>Provide Inter-Transit Connectivity as Alternative to Lost Rail Stop through a Good Latimer Trolley Stop</b> – As the subway alignment is refined, so should the plans for intuitive streetcar and bus connections and expansions be solidified. While DART has made clear that the existing Deep Ellum station at Good Latimer Expressway will no longer be feasible due to the new Y junction, future trolley service to an adapted Good Latimer station should be seriously considered. The Good Latimer area is experiencing tremendous commercial and residential growth with over 250,000 sqft of new office space, nearly 700 multifamily units, and close to 100,000 sqft of new retail and restaurant space including a Tom Thumb grocery store all currently underway. Moreover, with high density CA-2 and PD 298 zoning, the area still has immense untapped development potential. Several owners are already in the beginning stages of planning large projects here. Therefore, if the rail stop is to be removed for the betterment of the entire system, the minimal replacement must include a trolley stop to continue to serve this growing economic center point. In the interim, reliable and efficient improvements to the bus system, especially the downtown area circulator system, must continue to be developed. DEF would</p>	<p>Pedestrian access would continue along both sides of Good Latimer Expressway, with special emphasis on safety treatments at the D2 wye intersection. Also, Hawkins Street would be realigned with Jett Way to enhance pedestrian access and the street grid in this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within Good Latimer Expressway, the ballasted track would be rebuilt as embedded track, creating a more seamless urban streetscape and pedestrian friendly environment.</li> <li>• DART and Westdale are conducting a feasibility study to integrate the D2 Subway tunnel portal into future Epic Phase 3 site development concepts. Opportunities for elevated connections between new buildings may be explored as development occurs on their property and other surrounding sites.</li> <li>• DART proposes to improve the Live Oak/Good Latimer intersection to widen the tracks for the station south of Live Oak. The southbound split left turn lane would be removed. This will simplify the intersection for pedestrians and automobiles.</li> <li>• DART will make every effort to minimize disruption associated with construction of this project. Construction and traffic management plans will be developed during the final design phase and your input will be key to ensuring their success.</li> <li>• As our region recovers from COVID-19, we will continue to explore the possibilities for expanded service hours and enhanced frequencies to support the growth of Deep Ellum, Baylor and the surrounding east Dallas neighborhoods, including new emerging mobility options.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you again for your continued support and participation in the D2 Subway project development process. We are confident that by working together we can achieve a positive long-term outcome for the region, the City, and Deep Ellum.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>like to be included in related discussions and planning in order to ensure minimized disruption and continuity in level of service even as DART modes of service alternate.</p> <p>4. <b>Update and Enhance Renewed “Deep Ellum/Baylor” Station</b> – With the loss of the full Good Latimer Deep Ellum station, it will be critical that DART update the current Baylor Station to both accommodate the shifted ridership and better integrate within the surrounding neighborhood. First, the Deep Ellum Foundation supports renaming the stop “Deep Ellum/Baylor” or “Baylor/Deep Ellum” to continue to indicate to riders and travelers throughout the system that the Deep Ellum district is accessible via rail. Secondly, security has been and continues to be a consistent concern at the current Baylor stop. Therefore, instating permanent security personnel coverage at this stop during early morning and late-night hours, especially on the weekends, is crucial to closing the gap in our comprehensive security program for this district. Third, this stop is currently difficult to find and suffers from extremely poor visibility along the main pedestrian routes from the station into Deep Ellum. Thus, improved lighting and better wayfinding signage not just directly at the stop but along the passageways of blocks surrounding the stop will be precursors to better rider awareness and accessibility to and from the core of Deep Ellum.</p> <p>5. <b>Explore New Rail Station Near Exposition Plaza</b> – In the process of making system-wide improvements through D2, DART also has the opportunity to create a strategic impact along the Green Line by adding a new station location at Main Street and La France Street (or, alternately Main Street at Eastside Ave). The current distance between Baylor Station and the next closest stop at Fair Park is over 1 mile (a roughly 25-minute walk) whereas the average distance between downtown stops is less than ¼ this distance. As the Deep Ellum area continues to boom, growth is moving east toward Exposition Plaza starting with Baylor’s new 300,000 sq ft office building. A forward-looking plan would account for this gap as well as this growth trajectory and even spur it by planning a new station near Exposition Plaza.</p> <p>6. <b>Create Continuous Greenway Bike Lane along DART Line to Santa Fe Trail</b> – As Deep Ellum necessarily loses some opportunities for connectivity due to D2, The Deep Ellum Foundation fully supports new opportunities being explored and implemented including establishing a dedicated greenway along the DART Rail Green Line. The new greenway should include both bike</p>	



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>and pedestrian paths, from the Y junction at Good Latimer, along CBD Fair Park Link and finally connecting to the Santa Fe Trail. To make most efficient use of funds, minimize disruption, and ensure new connectivity opportunities come to life as others are removed, the greenway's construction should coincide with D2's construction and the Deep Ellum/Baylor Station's enhancement.</p> <p>7. <b>Position East Portal Closest to Deep Ellum</b> – While it is our understanding that D2's main purpose is redundancy rather than to pick up ridership, DART does have the greatest opportunity to prevent ridership loss by positioning the new East End Station as close as possible to Deep Ellum. Downtown has no shortage of nearby station options while the Deep Ellum rail stop will be lost. Therefore, an East End station at Pacific Avenue and Cesar Chavez Blvd will have the greatest potential effect on maintaining a diversified ridership base (as City stakeholders have repeatedly called for) and the pedestrian portal should be placed as close to Deep Ellum as is practical.</p> <p>8. <b>Ensure No Interruption to All Future I-345 Options</b> – While the interconnectivity of public transit options are key, so is the impact of the D2 project on vehicular traffic. The Deep Ellum Foundation continues to hold that this transit project should in no way interfere with any future potential options for I-345.</p> <p>9. <b>Minimize Eminent Domain</b> – Currently, there are several viable operating businesses as well as projects under construction and in the planning stages which will be significantly negatively impacted by DART's Swiss Avenue alignment for the D2 project. It is DART's obligation to make every effort to minimize eminent domain takings, as well as related impacts to these businesses at each stage of this process whether it be with alignment, construction, connectivity and transportation planning or final design. It is also imperative that DART communicate to DEF and all impacted businesses and owners in a timely manner and continuously as the project evolves. This will allow DEF and impacted business and owners ample opportunity to prepare for the negative impacts they will bear and provide feedback which may mitigate unintended consequences. For instance, if a stakeholder attends a stakeholder meeting and then, after that meeting, there is a change in DART's plans (e.g. a route change or "tweak"), all stakeholders at the previous stakeholder meeting should be notified by email. Also, all owners in the area should receive mailers well in advance of any stakeholder</p>	



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>meeting as well as mailers notifying the owners about any changes since the last meeting.</p> <p>10. <b>Multimodal Connectivity at Forefront in Redesign</b> – Multimodal connectivity is already a major challenge for much of the Good Latimer Expressway portion of the Deep Ellum Public Improvement District. Businesses and residents alike are nestled into the curve of I-345 which blocks both east-west connections and north-south access except along Good Latimer. The neighborhood also contends with multiple rail crossings (pre-D2) with heavy traffic. This poor connectivity is at great threat of being exacerbated if this area is further cut off from the surrounding neighborhood because DART’s D2 project creates a Y junction directly upon the only remaining north-south throughway into Deep Ellum. Thus, it is vital that Good Latimer Expressway remain open to all transportation modes (including pedestrians and cyclists), at-grade at the Florence Street or Swiss Avenue (preferably both), and the Live Oak Street and Pacific Avenue intersections. While we recognize there are operational and safety needs that must be accounted for, connectivity within and across the infrastructure resultant of the Y junction will also be important as Good Latimer continues to grow as a pedestrian corridor connecting the area’s burgeoning businesses to Deep Ellum’s existing commercial district. Thus, seamless design and integration of elevated “eyebrow” accessways need to be studied and vetted with DEF and stakeholders as they may help mitigate the loss of connectivity, but this remains to be seen. Finally, as North Central Expressway access is severed by the new D2 alignment, DART must make accommodations to reconnect north-south accessways and the impacted properties into the street grid through other means. Before offering a letter of support, DEF and our area stakeholders need to see much greater detail regarding these issues. Retaining at-grade or near at-grade access to all transportation modes (including pedestrians and cyclists) especially along Hawkins Street will be crucial to preventing the creation of two islands unto themselves on the west side of Good Latimer. With CA-2 zoning, local stakeholders have major plans to develop these areas with significant density, knitting Deep Ellum more closely with downtown and the Arts District. D2 resulting in the creation of new no-man’s land islands isolated from both Deep Ellum and surrounding neighborhoods is therefore not acceptable and is inconsistent with the trajectory of this area.</p>	



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>11. <b>Study of Depressed Y Opportunities</b> – Related to the extreme value and necessity of ensuring connectivity in the redesign of the street grid including D2, the Deep Ellum Foundation requests DART study opportunities to depress the Y junction to several different degrees. A greater understanding of how a depressed Y might enable connectivity will be an important component of area stakeholders' ability to accurately anticipate and offer constructive feedback on the best reconstruction and new construction opportunities along with envisioning the Good Latimer cross sections and elevated passageways in greater design detail.</p> <p>12. <b>Improved Live Oak Intersection and Routh Street Safety</b> – Currently the intersection at Live Oak Street and Good Latimer Expy pedestrian connectivity over the DART rail is almost impossible and what minimal connectivity that is there is highly dangerous. There are major safety issues for vehicles as well. The southbound lanes split and go on either side of the DART rail lines causing confusion resulting in additional hazards for pedestrians and poor safety for vehicles. Moreover, there are no bike nor scooter lanes enabling expanded multimodality. Thus, this intersection's safety and design need to be addressed whether or not the Swiss Alignment is chosen, but especially if it is chosen. Routh Street has major delays at certain periods of time due to the large amount of DART infrastructure and traffic at this conglomeration of intersecting roads and trains. The D2 planning should be broadened to examine this area. Other areas outside but nearby the Swiss Avenue alignment should also be studied like this one.</p> <p>13. <b>Minimal Construction Interruption</b> – Finally, we ask that DART make every effort to minimize as much as possible the disruption to the neighborhood caused by construction of this project. Deep Ellum is slated for no less than four other major infrastructure-related construction projects between 2020 and 2022, precisely when D2 is also anticipated to begin construction. For an already congested area with few major thoroughfares, minimized construction interruption can make the difference between local businesses surviving or not. Thus, appropriate planning along with DEF, followed by continuous monitoring, communication, coordination and mitigation as issues arise are priority for the Deep Ellum Foundation.</p> <p>The Deep Ellum Foundation and area stakeholders are intimately aware that this major transit and infrastructure project comes with major costs to</p>	



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>the City and to the Deep Ellum area. Identifying and seeing through to completion the best opportunities for mitigation and, where mitigation is not possible, appropriate trade-offs are therefore paramount to our support of D2.</p> <p>We greatly appreciate DART staff's willingness to work with the Deep Ellum Foundation and area stakeholders as well as their continued accessibility throughout the design, development and construction processes. We support DART's overarching aim to improve transit service and reliability in the region and are confident fulfilling the conditions outlined above will solidify a more successful outcome for the region, the City of Dallas and Deep Ellum in the next 10 to 100+ years.</p> <p>The Deep Ellum Foundation appreciates DART's and the City of Dallas' efforts to make the region better while not impairing the City of Dallas itself, including its neighborhoods. To that end, we look forward to more information and discussion regarding items including but not limited to the above.</p>	
PH001	General, Alignment	Scott Rohrman	2	<p>Scott Rohrman. I'm with 42 Real Estate. My address is 2030 Main Street, Dallas, Texas. Thank you for allowing me to speak. I'm the general partner and I'm an investor in several partnerships that own property at the corner of Pearl and Commerce, at the corner of Pearl and Maine, at the corner of Pearl and Elm and along Elm Street. DART plans to put the new D2 train through the middle of most of these properties. I hereby go on record again as being opposed to the alignment being shown here today. I've continually opposed this alignment at every public meeting DART has had for this alignment and in a private meeting in March of 2020 with Kay Shelton, Frank Turner and Brandi Crawford, who are employees of DART or DART-hired consultants and with two of my coworkers. In that private meeting, I asked the three named persons to report back to DART that I am opposed to the alignment. To that end, I am disappointed in Gary Thomas' letter to T.C. Broadnax dated February 22, 2019 stating there is consensus. And since that letter, at that date, there was not consensus. And Mr. Thomas' letter did not reflect that. Also, the current document before us does not make any reference to the opposition voiced in many meetings subsequent to that letter or in the private meeting I had with the named persons. I specifically asked in that meeting for my opposition to be recorded and included in any submissions to the city of Dallas and to the FTA. That does not appear to have happened. It appears that DART's communications ignore that fact and misconstrue the full thinking of the community. I am disappointed in this, and it has seemed to be a pattern in which DART has continued to operate. In the letter to Mr. Broadnax</p>	<p>Comments noted. We are aware of your continued opposition and that has been communicated during meetings with both City staff and FTA. There is broad consensus for the Project based on public and stakeholder meetings over the past several years. As with any major infrastructure project there will be impacts and they will be mitigated in accordance with the FEIS/ROD. Property owners around station areas will be engaged during the TOD Implementation Plan effort, which will be done by DART and the City of Dallas under a recently awarded FTA TOD grant.</p> <p>See P0016 response to Deep Ellum Foundation letter and key issues, including progress on addressing them.</p> <p>The project does not impact the Uber tower under construction by Westdale. DART continues to work with Westdale to ensure their ability to construct future phase 3 development over and around the DART east portal.</p> <p>See P0014 response regarding City Council approval.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				dated February 22, 2019, that's in the package, three letters are referenced as being in support, these letters, two of the letters only talk about support for a portion of the alignment not the entire alignment. And one, the Deep Ellum Foundation letter does not support it at all even though it's referenced that it does support it. I'm on the board of the Deep Ellum Foundation and I helped draft that letter. And it does not, it actually states we do not have a recommendation for any alignment at this time, which is the current alignment. The current alignment causes great problems for several areas in the area, including Bottled Blonde, Uber's Westdale towers and the property I control in downtown. It will do massive damage. Furthermore, in a resolution adopted by the City Council, the Council specifically stated DART should come back to the council once 10% of the design stage is complete. This is not being done even though DART has told me they are at 20% moving quickly to 50%. This is incredibly disappointing. Several DART officials have said they do not need to go back to the City because a City Council member said they do not need to. I disagree with that. Thank you for allowing me to speak.	
PH002	General, Design	Allan Zreet	2	Yeah, this is Allan Zreet. The first name is A-L-L-A-N, last name Z-R-E-E-T. I am the Mobility Committee chair with Downtown Dallas Inc. Although the comments represent my personal opinions on the issue. And we'll have further written confirmation from Downtown Dallas Inc. later. Just a few comments, we would like to make sure that as the project advances, that the possibility of air rights development at both the Metro Center Portal, at the CBD West Bus Transfer Center, and the CBD East Station are considered in terms of integrating those stations with future development and making sure that that's been considered both from the standpoint of planning and how that's integrated into future plans there. Now the comment is that the Commerce Station in looking at the drawings, the access does not appear to be intuitive there. It's very circuitous in terms of just finding your way and wayfinding through that station, we feel like there should be a consideration given to improving the access to that station and simplifying that path of travel. Then the next one is that the wye at the east portal obviously has been an issue of much discussion in terms of how we deal with that. We want to make sure that that is not leftover space and that consideration is given there both for air rights, as well as landscaping and public art so that doesn't just become a leftover space there. And then last month at the Urban Design Peer Review committee, there were some comments regarding to the design theme of the corridor. And we agree that an identity needs to be established for the entire corridor so it is cohesive through downtown. But	<p>Comment noted. DART also supports the possibility of air rights at the Metro Center Station and CBD East Station. DART received a \$1 million Transit Oriented Development (TOD) planning grant to focus on land use, zoning, and multi-modal connectivity along the D2 Subway corridor. DART properties as well as several other areas along the corridor, including the portals are candidates for TOD.</p> <p>Commerce Station vertical circulation has been modified with the addition of the Adolphus Tower entrance, creating a more intuitive path to the station.</p> <p>The urban design plan for the wye includes fencing and landscaping. There is potential for public art to be incorporated as well. In addition, DART and Westdale are conducting a feasibility study to integrate the D2 Subway tunnel portal into future Epic Phase 3 site development concepts. Additional development east of Hawkins over the wye will be explored as part of the TOD Implementation Plan.</p> <p>DART is engaging the Dallas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) to provide guidance on issues</p>

Dallas CBD Second Light Rail Alignment (D2 Subway)  
Final Environmental Impact Statement



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				that flexibility is still integrated into the design as it advances for context sensitive design, particularly at station portals. That ends my comments.	such as the design theme and how it would be balanced with site specific context sensitive design.
PH003	General, Support, I-345 coordination	Kevin Feldt	2	Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Kevin Feldt, K-E-V-I-N. Last name F like Frank, E L-D like David, T like Tom. And I'm calling representing the North Central Texas Council of Governments that's located in Arlington, Texas. Basically I'd like to say that while we recognize the North Central Texas region is home to the longest light rail system in United States, we believe that accommodating planned and programmed improvements to the DART system and adding additional capacity is required to the Downtown Dallas area. The current LRT system converges four lines into one alignment in Downtown Dallas and to increase the light rail transit system efficiency and effectiveness an additional alignment through Downtown Dallas is essential. Light rail transit in the Dallas area provides a vital transportation choice to travelers. The regional transportation council and the North Central Texas Council of Governments support the proposed D2 project. However, planning and implementation of the D2 project should also consider proposed improvements to IH-345 in Downtown Dallas. Both projects are vital transportation components to the DFW region transportation system and the city of Dallas. While all agencies are working diligently to advance both projects, agreement on the design of both must be coordinated. Coordinating the projects to ensure each is implemented in conjunction with the other will provide an opportunity to move the D2 project forward more expeditiously. Being able to advance D2 in a timely manner is important in post COVID-19 pandemic conditions. There may be an opportunity to advance critical projects such as this in a way to provide critical economic stimulus to the region, the nation and the economy. Thank you.	Comment noted. DART will continue to meet with TxDOT, NCTCOG, and the City of Dallas to discuss D2/I-345 interface and a future agreement.
PH004	General, Support, I-345 coordination	Michael Morris	2	Thank you very much for the opportunity. Michael, M-I-C-H-A-E-L Morris, M-O-R-R-I-S, Director of Transportation at the North Central Texas Council Governments. The D2 alignment is in the federally required mobility 2045 and in the federally required air quality conformity plans. We gave testimony earlier today indicating our support for the project. If it is environmentally approved, we would like to work with DART to expedite its construction in a post COVID-19 world; getting construction of infrastructure is critical to maintain the economy that we have. I'd like to focus on one area. DART is assuming that traffic on I-345 will continue in the future as a grade separated facility. I believe that's a correct assumption that DART should assume. Otherwise in the environmental impact study you would need to have had either grade separated the light	<p>Comment noted. DART will continue to meet with TxDOT, NCTCOG, and the City of Dallas to discuss D2/I-345 interface and a future agreement.</p> <p>The FEIS/ROD reflects the current state of the TxDOT Feasibility Study and notes that TxDOT is evaluating several options. The D2 Subway has been designed in a way to allow for all three options and recent TxDOT design options include D2 Subway as designed. Based on a June 2020 meeting with TxDOT, NCTCOG and the City of Dallas, the D2 Subway portal as designed appears to work with a lowered I-345 as described above, as well as</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
				<p>rail over thoroughfare streets or thoroughfare streets would have to be grade separated over the light rail system. So, I'd like to see DART emphasize that DART needs either I-345 in its current location up in the air or I-345 in a depressed location - either way grade separated so that traffic doesn't come across it at-grade rail line. Therefore, I think it's critical for DART to continue to work with TxDOT, our office, and see if we can get D2 at-grade at I-345 giving the flexibility of TxDOT being able to lower I-345 in the future, potentially building the D2 section at I-345 now as a bridge structure permitting the skinnier, depressed, potentially fewer ramp, lowered I-345 under the existing D2. Thank you.</p>	<p>concepts for above-grade and removal with at-grade arterial improvements. Modifying D2 to be at-grade under I-345, moves the portal into downtown Dallas and would result in significant street and property impacts.</p>
PH005	General, Support	Madan Goyal	2	<p>First name M-A-D-A-N, last name G-O-Y-A-L. I'm not speaking for any organization, but I'm member of the DART Citizen Advisory Committee. Over the years we've seeing many presentations about the D2 alignment there in our committee meetings and I individually and personally feel that this needs all the support we can provide and I'm very much support of this D2 alignment and the D2 project. As soon as we can get the environmental issues report done, the better it is so we can get started on it. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this hearing.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
PH006	Acquisitions and Displacements; Soil and Geology; Construction Impacts	Allen Baskind	2	<p>My name is Allen, A-L-L-E-N, Baskind, B-A-S-K-I-N-D. I represent Pacifico Partners Ltd, P-A-C-I-F-I-C-O, Partners, P-A-R-T-N-E-R-S Ltd. 18610 Turnbridge Drive, Dallas, Texas 75252. My question is what will the environmental impact be of the tunneling in the Deep Ellum area between 345 and Good Latimer in terms of the soil that's being brought out from the tunneling and where the placement of the soil will be? What will be the effect on the current buildings that are standing there? I was told by Mr. Salin at one time, that all buildings would be leveled in order for the tunneling machine to be able to turn around, and also for the area where all the dirt earth that was brought up could be stored prior to being transported away. Thank you.</p>	<p>Soil that is removed in this area will be trucked out to a location to be determined in coordination with the City of Dallas. Some soil may be stored and screened on site before it is trucked out. City staff has indicated there may be a need for fill at other locations. Several structures are proposed to be acquired and demolished in the area bounded by I-345, Pacific, Good Latimer, and Swiss as documented in <b>Section 4.4</b>. Additional property may be required north of Swiss depending on contractor needs and the method of construction.</p>



Table F-1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC WRITTEN AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND SUBSEQUENT PROJECT CHANGES

No.	Subject	Commenter	Category	Comment	Response
PH0007	General, Funding	Brian Moore	2	My name is Brian Moore. I'm a Dallas resident, design professional, and an interested party. Our firm, as a design professional, represents various stakeholders in the -- along the D2 route, in particular. I have seen a couple of presentations of -- off and on over the past month or so and acting as an interested party. I -- we have noticed that there have been one or two articles in the media regarding a potential delay in the -- in the D2 line implementation. Any thoughts on that? We also noticed that in the various presentations, there's quite a bit of augmented- conceptual design affiliated with the platforms and the rail stations. How far out does some of that- interventions play into the surrounding community? As an interested party from the design perspective and interested in sense of placemaking and interconnecting this, it's very important for the disinvestment to be in and of itself inclusive with the rest of the neighborhood and surrounding community, as opposed to it's merely just a platform and just a- station and you allow accessibility for that. Might there be fingers out into the surrounding community as it relates to -- as it relates to that. We're also interested in the idea of public art. Is the idea of public art inclusive of this -- of this endeavor? Potentially, any DART -- is DART receiving any particular funding for project mitigation, any sort of project mitigation efforts underway in any way at all?	<p>The DART Board of Directors approved the FY21 20-year Financial Plan on September 22, 2020. The D2 Subway project schedule reflects revenue service in approximately year 2025, with a final year pending project delivery method and the Federal grant.</p> <p>DART received a \$1 million Transit Oriented Development (TOD) planning grant to focus on land use, zoning, and multi-modal connectivity along the D2 Subway corridor. As both the D2 Subway project and this TOD planning effort move forward, considerations for access improvements to enhance the project and improve connectivity will be defined.</p> <p>Project mitigation as contained in the FEIS/ROD are included in the project budget. The TOD effort referenced above will define additional enhancements that may be funded by others.</p>
PH0008	General, support	Diane Kennedy	2	Well, this community is very -- I can't speak, but I love it. DART has been very great since I moved from Dallas -- from Houston. It's -- been awesome. Y'all have been a good service. I thank God for that. Y'all never turn me down when I come to DART. Y'all are great, and y'all are awesome. Thank God for that. . . . . Y'all are wonderful. All I can say is y'all never let me down. Y'all never turn me down, even though I don't have the right ID, but y'all -- DART ID, y'all still let me know how everything was. Y'all -- customer service, y'all try to explain to me if it's not right. I got to go somewhere. So I thank God for y'all. Y'all awesome.	Comment noted.

\*Category

- 1) Substantive comment requiring modification to FEIS
- 2) General comment; response provided with no change to EIS
- 3) Minor factual correction, grammatical correction or clarification to EIS
- 4) Comment results in new or modified information included in FEIS but not a substantive change in the project