

Alternatives Evaluation Criteria and Results Table

	Evaluation Criteria Key	Alternative does not adequately address this evaluation criterion	Alternative somewhat addresses this evaluation criterion.	Data Sources used for the Evaluation	Alternative addresses this evaluation criterion.	Alternative more effectively addresses this evaluation criterion.	Alternative is highly effective at addressing this evaluation criterion.	Sources for all data are listed in the Alternatives Evaluation Technical Report, available online at My35CapEx.com.
<p>Alternatives Carried forward into Draft EIS</p>	<p>Alternative 1 will not be carried forward for further analysis in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Alternatives 2 and 3 will be carried forward based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faster response times for EMS, police, fire department and hospitals. Shorter construction duration by 1.5 years. Improved traffic operations during construction with fewer lane closures. Fewer utility conflicts and lower relocation costs. Fewer drainage conflicts. Lower construction costs. Lower annual and lifetime maintenance requirements and cost. 				<p>The No Build Alternative will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.</p>	<p>Alternative 1 will not be carried forward into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.</p>	<p>Alternative 2 will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.</p>	<p>Alternative 3 will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.</p>
<p>Alternatives Evaluation Criteria</p>	<p>Criteria Description</p>	<p>Evaluation Parameters</p>	<p>Metrics/Units</p>	<p>Source</p>	<p>No Build Alternative</p>	<p>Build Alternative 1 Managed Lanes Tunnel Section</p>	<p>Build Alternative 2 Managed Lanes Lowered Section</p>	<p>Build Alternative 3 Managed Lanes Lowered Section Modified at Airport Boulevard and Woodland Avenue</p>
<p>Enhancing safety within the corridor</p>								
	<p>Aligned with TxDOT's Road to Zero Initiative and City of Austin's Vision Zero Initiative.</p>	<p>Supports TxDOT's mission to cut traffic fatalities in half by 2035 and then entirely by 2050. Supports the City's mission to eliminate traffic deaths and serious injuries on Austin streets.</p>	<p>Yes/No</p>	<p>Texas Strategic Highway Safety Plan 2017-2022: https://tts.txdot.gov/pub/ttsdot/info/library/pubstg/gov/shsp.pdf. Accessed November 20, 2020. Austin Strategic Mobility Plan 2019: https://www.austintexas.gov/department/austin-strategic-mobility-plan. Accessed November 20, 2020.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>Aligned with additional local plans</p>	<p>Aligns or is consistent with the following local plans: City of Austin - Strategic Mobility Plan, Street Design Guide, Downtown Austin Plan, Parks Department Long-Range Master Plan, Strategic Direction 2023 Plan, Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan, Sidewalk Master Plan and ADA Transition Plan Update, and Bicycle Master Plan, Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) - Regional Transportation Plan.</p>	<p>Yes/No</p>	<p>Austin Strategic Mobility Plan 2019: https://www.austintexas.gov/department/austin-strategic-mobility-plan. Accessed November 20, 2020. City of Austin (COA) Street Design Guide 2017: https://austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Transportation/Austin_Street_Design_Guide_June_2017_Public_Launch_Updated_June_20200211.pdf. Accessed March 3, 2021. COA Downtown Austin Plan 2011: https://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Houain%26%20Planning/UrbanForm20Design/das_approved_12-8-2011.pdf. Accessed March 3, 2021. COA PARO Long-range Master Plan 2030-2040: https://austintexas.gov/page/our-parks-our-future-long-range-plan. Accessed March 3, 2021. COA Strategic Direction 2012 Plan: https://assets.austintexas.gov/financeonline/downloads/AustinStrategicDirection_2023.pdf. Accessed March 3, 2021. Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan 2012: https://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Plansand%20Imag/Austin/webacproposed.pdf. Accessed March 3, 2021. COA Sidewalk Master Plan and ADA Transition Plan Update 2016: https://austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/PublicWorks/Street%26%20Bridge/Sidewalk_MPU_Adopted_06.16.2016_adopted.pdf. Accessed March 3, 2021.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Purpose and Need</p>	<p>Improves emergency response time for EMS, police, fire, and hospitals</p>	<p>Adequate ramps, detour routes for emergency vehicles</p>	<p>High/Medium/Low (High = more reliable response time; Low = delayed response time)</p>	<p>Preliminary Alternative Designs</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>High</p>
	<p>Emergency egress requirements</p>	<p>Ability to provide emergency egress</p>	<p>High/Medium/Low (High = fewer requirements; Low = more requirements)</p>	<p>Preliminary Alternative Designs</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>High</p>
	<p>Reduction in fatalities and injury crashes</p>	<p>Reduction in fatalities and injury crashes</p>	<p>% change compared to No Build in 2030</p>	<p>IHSDM (Interactive Highway Safety Design Model software)</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>-35%</p>	<p>-34%</p>	<p>-32%</p>
<p>Addressing demand by prioritizing the movement of people, goods, and services through and across the corridor; improving operational efficiency.</p>								
	<p>Mainlanes travel time</p>	<p>Average northbound/southbound travel time along mainlanes between US 290E and US 290W/SH 71</p>	<p>% change from No Build</p>	<p>2030 p.m. peak hour microsimulation corridor traffic model</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>-47%</p>	<p>-50%</p>	<p>-39%</p>
	<p>Managed lanes travel time</p>	<p>Average northbound/southbound travel time along managed lanes between US 290E and US 290W/SH 71</p>	<p>Travel time (min.)</p>	<p>2030 p.m. peak hour microsimulation corridor traffic model</p>	<p>N/A (No managed lanes provided)</p>	<p>9 min.</p>	<p>8 min.</p>	<p>9 min.</p>

Alternatives Evaluation Criteria and Results Table

	Evaluation Criteria Key	Alternative does not adequately address this evaluation criterion	Alternative somewhat addresses this evaluation criterion.	Data Sources used for the Evaluation	Alternative addresses this evaluation criterion.	Alternative more effectively addresses this evaluation criterion.	Alternative is highly effective at addressing this evaluation criterion.	Sources for all data are listed in the Alternatives Evaluation Technical Report, available online at My35CapEx.com.
--	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Alternatives Carried forward into Draft EIS	Alternative 1 will not be carried forward for further analysis in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Alternatives 2 and 3 will be carried forward based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faster response times for EMS, police, fire department and hospitals. • Shorter construction duration by 1.5 years. • Improved traffic operations during construction with fewer lane closures. • Fewer utility conflicts and lower relocation costs. • Fewer drainage conflicts. • Lower construction costs. • Lower annual and lifetime maintenance requirements and cost. 				The No Build Alternative will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 1 will not be carried forward into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 2 will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 3 will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
----------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Alternatives Evaluation Criteria	Criteria Description	Evaluation Parameters	Metrics/Units	Source	No Build Alternative	Build Alternative 1 Managed Lanes Tunnel Section	Build Alternative 2 Managed Lanes Lowered Section	Build Alternative 3 Managed Lanes Lowered Section Modified at Airport Boulevard and Woodland Avenue
	Person-carrying capacity along mainlanes and managed lanes, including vehicles and transit	Mainlane lane and managed lane person capacity at given point along corridor	Person-carrying capacity (people per hour) (% change from No Build)	Transportation Research Board. 2016. Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition: A Guide for Multimodal Mobility Analysis.	13,455 people/hour	33,860 people/hour (+152%)	33,695 people/hour (+150%)	33,695 people/hour (+150%)
	Travel demand along adjacent transportation roadway network	Travel demand patterns/traffic volumes along major (Mopac, US 183) and minor (e.g., downtown arterials) parallel facilities to I-35	Network distance traveled (daily vehicle-miles) (% change from No Build)	Modified 2045 CAMPO travel demand model	14,600,820 daily VMT	14,370,965 daily VMT (-1.6%)	14,396,516 daily VMT (-1.4%)	14,404,688 daily VMT (-1.3%)
	Annual cost of travel	Cost of travel based on vehicle-hours of travel along I-35 mainlanes and managed lanes	Travel cost (Y2021 Dollars) (% change from No Build)	Modified 2045 CAMPO travel demand model	\$564M	\$530M (-6.0%)	\$497M (-11.8%)	\$497M (-11.8%)

Creating a more dependable and consistent route for the traveling public including bicyclists, pedestrians, emergency responders, and transit.

Improves east-west connectivity	Provides enhanced vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian crossings	High/Medium/Low (High = more connectivity; Low = less connectivity)	https://www.austintexas.gov/page/austin-bicycle-plan . Accessed March 3, 2021. Austin Strategic Mobility Plan 2019: https://www.austintexas.gov/department/austin-strategic-mobility-plan . Accessed November 20, 2020.	Low	High	High	High
Accommodates Capital Metro's service plan at east-west crossings	Ability to accommodate Project Connect's proposed light rail system at east-west crossings	Yes/No	Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority Project Connect System Plan: https://www.capmetro.org/project-connect/system-plan . Accessed December 20, 2020.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Improves facilities for disabled populations	Conforms with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Texas Accessibility Standards	High/Medium/Low (High = enhanced improvements; Low = no improvements)	Sidewalk Master Plan and ADA Transition Plan Update 2018: https://austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Public_Works/Street_3026_Bridge/Sidewalk_MPU_Adopted_08.16.2018_reduced.pdf . Accessed December 20, 2020. Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation, Texas Accessibility Standards.	Low	High	High	High

Feasibility, Design, and Engineering	Constructability risk	Construction duration, construction staging/sequencing complexity, local access, and construction easements	High/Medium/Low (High = longer construction duration and more risk/complexity; Low = shorter construction duration and less risk/complexity)	Preliminary Alternative Designs	N/A	High	Medium	Medium
	Utility conflicts	Anticipated utility relocation effort	High/Medium/Low (High = more conflicts; Low = fewer conflicts)	Preliminary Alternative Designs	N/A	High	Medium	Medium
	Drainage infrastructure complexity	Construction and maintenance of drainage infrastructure	High/Medium/Low (High = more complexity; Low = less complexity)	Preliminary Alternative Designs	N/A	High	Medium/High	Medium
	Opportunity and complexity of future expansion	Ability to allow for future modification and technologies	High/Medium/Low (High = less complexity and more opportunities for expansion; Low = more complexity and fewer opportunities for expansion)	Preliminary Alternative Designs	N/A	Low	Medium	Medium

Alternatives Evaluation Criteria and Results Table

	Evaluation Criteria Key	Alternative does not adequately address this evaluation criterion	Alternative somewhat addresses this evaluation criterion.	Data Sources used for the Evaluation	Alternative addresses this evaluation criterion.	Alternative more effectively addresses this evaluation criterion.	Alternative is highly effective at addressing this evaluation criterion.	Sources for all data are listed in the Alternatives Evaluation Technical Report, available online at My35CapEx.com.
Alternatives Carried forward Into Draft EIS	<p>Alternative 1 will not be carried forward for further analysis in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Alternatives 2 and 3 will be carried forward based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faster response times for EMS, police, fire department and hospitals. • Shorter construction duration by 1.5 years. • Improved traffic operations during construction with fewer lane closures. • Fewer utility conflicts and lower relocation costs. • Fewer drainage conflicts. • Lower construction costs. • Lower annual and lifetime maintenance requirements and cost. 				The No Build Alternative will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 1 will not be carried forward into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 2 will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 3 will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
Alternatives Evaluation Criteria	Criteria Description	Evaluation Parameters	Metrics/Units	Source	No Build Alternative	Build Alternative 1 Managed Lanes Tunnel Section	Build Alternative 2 Managed Lanes Lowered Section	Build Alternative 3 Managed Lanes Lowered Section Modified at Airport Boulevard and Woodland Avenue
	Amount of new right of way (ROW) required	Acres of ROW	Acres	Preliminary Alternative Designs for ROW Travis Central Appraisal District for parcel data, available online at: https://www.traviscad.org/ . Accessed September 2020.	520 total adjacent parcels; 0 acres of ROW acquisition	181 parcels impacted and 16 acres of ROW acquisition.	199 parcels impacted and 32 acres of ROW acquisition.	190 parcels impacted and 30 acres of ROW acquisition.
Environmental Resources	Minimize displacements	Travis Central Appraisal District property data	Number of Potential Displacements	Travis Central Appraisal District for parcel data, available online at: https://www.traviscad.org/ . Accessed September 2020.	N/A	96 total displacements: 50 commercial and 46 residential (single and multifamily)	147 total displacements: 75 commercial and 72 residential (single and multifamily)	142 total displacements: 72 commercial and 70 residential (single and multifamily)
	Minimize minority and low-income property displacements	Travis Central Appraisal District property data and American Community Survey Data	Number of Potential Displacements	Travis Central Appraisal District for parcel data, available online at: https://www.traviscad.org/ . Accessed September 2020. United States Census Bureau 2020, American Community Survey tables B19013 and B03002, accessed August 1, 2020.	N/A	45 minority/low-income displacements (47% of total displacements)	52 minority/low-income displacements (35% of total displacements)	52 minority/low-income displacements (37% of total displacements)
	Minimize visual impacts	Quality of views from frontage road and cross streets	High/Medium/Low (High = greater visual impact; Low = lesser visual impact)	FHWA Guidelines for the Visual Impact Assessment of Highway Projects, 2015: https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/emv_topics/other_topics/VIA_Guidelines_for_Highway_Projects.aspx . Accessed May 25, 2020.	High	Low	Low	Medium
	Archeological sites and cemeteries	Risk and probability of encountering or disturbing sites containing intact cultural resources	Number of Archeological Sites	Texas Archeological Sites Atlas data. Available online at: https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/Account/Login . Accessed May 25, 2020.	N/A	3 archeological sites	3 archeological sites	3 archeological sites
	Historic properties	Direct impacts to historic properties/districts	Number of Historic Properties Directly Impacted	Texas Historical Sites Atlas data. Available online at: https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/ . Accessed September 2020. TxDOT Historic Districts and Properties of Texas map: https://tddot.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?m7e=071104987672487b96320c424d588a2 . Accessed October 2020. TxDOT NHP Listed and Eligible Bridges of Texas map: https://tddot.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?m7e=0c4f3452a3240b6961a0c8b4e4d898 . Accessed October 2020. City of Austin Landmarks Database. Available online at: https://data.austintexas.gov/locations-and-maps/Historical-Landmarks/vvuz-m3y4 . Accessed October 2020.	N/A	6 historic properties (all impacted by ROW acquisition only; no displacements)	5 historic properties (4 impacted by ROW acquisition and 1 displacement)	4 historic properties (3 impacted by ROW acquisition and 1 displacement)
	Hazardous materials	Number of potential regulated materials sites within 200 feet of the proposed footprint that may be disturbed	Number of Hazardous Materials Sites	Geosearch, E RecSearch Report/Radius Report, May 26, 2021.	N/A	90 sites (some with multiple listings) within 200 feet of the proposed ROW	95 sites (some with multiple listings) within 200 feet of the proposed ROW	95 sites (some with multiple listings) within 200 feet of the proposed ROW

Alternatives Evaluation Criteria and Results Table

Alternatives Evaluation Criteria and Results Table								
	Evaluation Criteria Key	Alternative does not adequately address this evaluation criterion	Alternative somewhat addresses this evaluation criterion.	Data Sources used for the Evaluation	Alternative addresses this evaluation criterion.	Alternative more effectively addresses this evaluation criterion.	Alternative is highly effective at addressing this evaluation criterion.	Sources for all data are listed in the Alternatives Evaluation Technical Report, available online at My35CapEx.com.
Alternatives Carried forward Into Draft EIS	Alternative 1 will not be carried forward for further analysis in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Alternatives 2 and 3 will be carried forward based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faster response times for EMS, police, fire department and hospitals. Shorter construction duration by 1.5 years. Improved traffic operations during construction with fewer lane closures. Fewer utility conflicts and lower relocation costs. Fewer drainage conflicts. Lower construction costs. Lower annual and lifetime maintenance requirements and cost. 				The No Build Alternative will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 1 will not be carried forward into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 2 will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 3 will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
	Alternatives Evaluation Criteria	Criteria Description	Evaluation Parameters	Metrics/Units	Source	No Build Alternative	Build Alternative 1 Managed Lanes Tunnel Section	Build Alternative 2 Managed Lanes Lowered Section
	Traffic noise	Potential to reduce noise impacts sensitive receptors	High/Medium/Low (High = more ability to reduce traffic noise impacts; Low = less ability to reduce traffic noise impacts)	Texas A&M Transportation Institute. Traffic Noise Effects of Elevated, Depressed, and At-Grade Level Freeways in Texas, 2007. Available online at: https://static.tti.tamu.edu/tti.tamu.edu/documents/1327-3.pdf . Accessed June 13, 2021.	Low	High	Medium/High	Medium
	Parks purchased with Land and Water Conservation Funds impacts	Acres of Section 6(f) park impacts	Acres	Land and Water Conservation Fund Database. Available online at: https://www.doi.gov/land . Accessed October 2020. City of Austin. GIS Data. Available online at: https://austintexas.gov/department/gis-data . Accessed October 2020.	N/A	Impacts being evaluated between TxDOT and City of Austin	Impacts being evaluated between TxDOT and City of Austin	Impacts being evaluated between TxDOT and City of Austin
	Park impacts	Acres of Section 4f park impacts	Acres	City of Austin. GIS Data. Available online at: https://austintexas.gov/department/gis-data . Accessed October 2020.	N/A	0.54 acres of park impacts	0.10 acres of park impacts	0.15 acres of park impacts
	Reduce air quality impacts to adjacent communities	Estimated total future year emissions for the build alternatives analyzed compared to existing conditions	High/Medium/Low (High = more Air Quality impacts; Low = fewer Air Quality impacts)	Texas Transportation Institute. 2014. www2.econ.utd.edu/~jzhang/papers/201404060008.pdf . Available online at: https://www.tti.tamu.edu/tti.tamu.edu/documents/1910-01_mob.html . Accessed June 8, 2021. Federal Highway Administration. 2016. Updated Interim Guidance on Mobile Source Air Toxic Analysis in B199.	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
Local Enhancements	Deck Cap Local Enhancements	Best accommodates cap and enhanced east/west bridge construction by minimized ROW needs, ease of constructability, and lower cost to City of Austin	High/Medium/Low (High = more opportunities for enhancements; Low = fewer opportunities for enhancements)	Preliminary Alternative Designs; Coordination with City of Austin	Low	High	High	Medium/High
Preliminary Project Costs	Minimize design/build costs	Preliminary design/build construction cost estimate	Dollars	Preliminary Alternative Designs; Cost Analysis	N/A	Estimated design/build costs approx. =\$8.08 billion	Estimated design/build costs approx. =\$3.92 billion	Estimated design/build costs approx. =\$3.94 billion
	Minimize operation and maintenance cost	Preliminary operation and maintenance cost estimate	Dollars	Preliminary Alternative Designs; Cost Analysis	Estimated O&M cost approx. = \$1.7 million/yr	Estimated O&M cost approx. = \$14.4 million/yr	Estimated O&M cost approx. = \$2.2million/yr	Estimated O&M cost approx. = \$2.2 million/yr

Alternatives Evaluation Criteria and Results Table

	Evaluation Criteria Key	Alternative does not adequately address this evaluation criterion	Alternative somewhat addresses this evaluation criterion.	Data Sources used for the Evaluation	Alternative addresses this evaluation criterion.	Alternative more effectively addresses this evaluation criterion.	Alternative is highly effective at addressing this evaluation criterion.	Sources for all data are listed in the Alternatives Evaluation Technical Report, available online at My35CapEx.com.
Alternatives Carried forward Into Draft EIS	Alternative 1 will not be carried forward for further analysis in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Alternatives 2 and 3 will be carried forward based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faster response times for EMS, police, fire department and hospitals. • Shorter construction duration by 1.5 years. • Improved traffic operations during construction with fewer lane closures. • Fewer utility conflicts and lower relocation costs. • Fewer drainage conflicts. • Lower construction costs. • Lower annual and lifetime maintenance requirements and cost. 				The No Build Alternative will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 1 will not be carried forward into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 2 will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 3 will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
Alternatives Evaluation Criteria	Criteria Description	Evaluation Parameters	Metrics/Units	Source	No Build Alternative	Build Alternative 1 Managed Lanes Tunnel Section	Build Alternative 2 Managed Lanes Lowered Section	Build Alternative 3 Managed Lanes Lowered Section Modified at Airport Boulevard and Woodland Avenue
Alternatives Carried forward Into Draft EIS	Alternative 1 will not be carried forward for further analysis in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Alternatives 2 and 3 will be carried forward based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faster response times for EMS, police, fire department and hospitals. • Shorter construction duration by 1.5 years. • Improved traffic operations during construction with fewer lane closures. • Fewer utility conflicts and lower relocation costs. • Fewer drainage conflicts. • Lower construction costs. • Lower annual and lifetime maintenance requirements and cost. The Alternatives Evaluation Technical Report is available on My35CapEx.com.				The No Build Alternative will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 1 will not be carried forward into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 2 will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Alternative 3 will be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.