PUBLIC HEARING DOCUMENTATION

IH 35E: FROM IH 20 TO EIGHTH STREET
US 67: FROM FM 1382 TO IH 35E

DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

CSJs: 0261-02-044, 0261-03-030, 0442-02-088

Prepared by:

US DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MAY 2006

CONTENTS

CERTIFICATION OF PUBLIC HEARING

Project Number: NH, NH ( ) M, NH ( ) M

County: Dallas County

CSJs: 0261-02-044, 0261-03-030, 0442-02-088

Highway Number and Project Limits: IH 35E: from IH 20 to Eighth Street
US 67: from FM 1382 to IH 35E

This is to certify that:

1. Two (2) Public Hearings were held covering the project location and design on August 22, 2005 and August 25, 2005.

2. Consideration has been given to the economic, social and environmental effects of the project's location and design.

3. The statutory provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 have been considered in determining the economic, social and environmental effects.

4. The project's consistency with the goals and objectives of such urban planning as has been promulgated by the community has been considered.

_____ _____

William L. Hale, P.E. Date
Dallas District Engineer
Texas Department of Transportation

2. PUBLIC HEARING SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS / RECOMMENDATION

District / County: Dallas District / Dallas County

Highway / Limits: IH 35E: from IH 20 to Eighth Street
US 67: from FM 1382 to IH 35E

CSJ / Project Number: 0261-02-044/NH ( ), 0261-03-030/ NH ( ) M,
0442-02-088/ NH ( ) M

Proposed Improvements: The proposed improvements on IH 35E and US 67, collectively referred to as "The Southern Gateway," extend along 19 miles of urban freeway; from 8th Street (south of the Trinity River) to IH 20 on IH 35E and on US 67 from IH 35E south to FM 1382. The project encompasses all interconnecting cross-streets and associated direct connections and access ramps, including the IH 35E interchanges at US 67, Loop 12, and IH 20, and the US 67 interchanges at Loop 12, IH 20, and FM 1382.

IH 35E from 8th Street to US 67 is proposed to be a ten-lane freeway with a two-lane reversible high occupancy vehicle (HOV)/Managed facility with discontinuous frontage roads and auxiliary lanes. IH 35E from US 67 to IH 20 is proposed to be a six-lane freeway with a one-lane reversible HOV/Managed facility with frontage roads. US 67 from IH 35E to IH 20 is proposed to be a six-lane freeway with a two-lane reversible HOV/Managed facility with frontage roads. US 67 from IH 20 to FM 1382 is proposed to be a six-lane freeway with a one-lane reversible HOV/Managed facility with frontage roads. Freeway lane widths would be 12 feet with 10-foot wide inside and outside shoulders.

Proposed reconstruction of existing bridges would occur at Five Mile Creek, Woody Branch, Ten Mile Creek, Bentle Branch, Ricketts Branch, and Mauk Branch in compliance with USACE flood protection requirements. A wetland investigation has identified one jurisdictional wetland within the proposed right-of-way (ROW).

The existing, state-owned ROW widths for IH 35E and US 67 vary from approximately 244 feet to 435 feet and 305 feet to 469 feet, respectively. The proposed minimum ROW width for IH 35E ranges from 313 feet to 472 feet and the ROW width for US 67 ranges from 306 feet to 436 feet. The ROW requirements for the reconstruction would result in the conversion of approximately 23 acres of land to transportation use; this amount includes approximately 0.082 acres of parkland from the City of Dallas Zoo. The additional ROW needed is primarily comprised of narrow land slivers adjacent to the existing freeway facilities throughout the length of the project corridor. The proposed acquisition of parkland is discussed in the Environmental Assessment and Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation prepared for the project. The project would result in the potential displacement of approximately 9 residences and 27 commercial buildings.

Purpose and Need: The purpose of the proposed IH 35E and US 67 project is to develop long-term transportation improvements for this corridor and southern Dallas County. The proposed project is designed to enhance the regional and national transportation system by increasing capacity, reducing traffic congestion, improving mobility, improving design deficiencies, and improving system linkages. The current transportation network in the project area is insufficient to accommodate the increased demand projected by Transportation Planning and Programming (TPP) and the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG).

Environmental Document Approval: An Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared for the proposed project. The project received a satisfactory for further processing on June 30, 2005.

Notices and Articles: The Public Hearing notice was published in the following newspapers:

The Dallas Morning News:

Legal Notice – July 23 and 29, and August 5 and 12, 2005
Display Advertisement – August 22, 2005

Al Dia:

Legal Notice – July 23 and 29, and August 5 and 12, 2005
Display Advertisement – August 18, 2005

Dallas Weekly:

Legal Notice – July 20 and 27, and August 3 and 10, 2005
Display Advertisement – August 17, 2005

Oak Cliff Tribune:

Legal Notice – July 21 and 28, and August 4 and 11, 2005
Display Advertisement – August 18, 2005

Today Newspapers (Cedar Hill, DeSoto, Duncanville, Midlothian and Lancaster editions):

Legal Notice – July 21 and 28, and August 4 and 11, 2005
Display Advertisement – August 18, 2005

Public Hearing Dates and Places: Open Houses and Public Hearings were held on August 22, 2005 at the Ramada Inn, 711 East Camp Wisdom Road, Duncanville, TX 75116, and on August 25, 2005 at the Townview Magnet Center, 1201 East 8th Street, Dallas, TX 75203.

Attendance: The registration attendance for the August 22, 2005 Public Hearing totaled 133 and 11 people registered to speak. In addition to the 126 registered attendees, 17 project staff members from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and 15 project consultants were in attendance.

The registration attendance for the August 25, 2005 Public Hearing totaled 67 and no people registered to speak. In addition to the 67 registered attendees, 17 project staff members from TxDOT and 15 project consultants were in attendance.

The following lists TxDOT and consulting firm representatives in attendance at the Public Hearings:

Name	**Agency/Firm**
Timothy Nesbitt	TxDOT
David Stauder	TxDOT
Brian Barth	TxDOT
Travis Henderson	TxDOT
Stan Hall	TxDOT
Richard Mason	TxDOT
Erma Wisham	TxDOT
Sonya Roston	TxDOT
Sheila Locke	TxDOT
George Reeves	TxDOT
David Lott	TxDOT
Mike Bostic	TxDOT
Dianah Ascencio	TxDOT
William Hale	TxDOT (Aug. 22 only)
Tony Payberah	TxDOT (Aug. 22 only)
Angela Loston	TxDOT (Aug. 22 only)
Jerome Waters	TxDOT (Aug. 22 only)
Tom O'Grady	HNTB Corporation
Angie Stoddard	HNTB Corporation
Kelly Johnson	HNTB Corporation
James Frye	HNTB Corporation
Sam Lopez	HNTB Corporation
Kelly Dlouhy	HNTB Corporation (Aug. 22 only)
Floyd Martinez	HNTB Corporation (Aug. 22 only)
Scott Inglish	HNTB Corporation (Aug. 25 only)
Jennifer Halstead	HNTB Corporation (Aug. 25 only)
Lupe Pettit	HNTB Corporation (Aug. 25 only)
Alva Baker	Baker Consulting Associates
Sam Williams	Baker Consulting Associates
Ian Bryant	Civil Associates (Aug. 22 only)
Naser Abusaad	Civil Associates (Aug. 25 only)
Martin Rodin	LGG
Jeff Neal	NCTCOG (Aug. 22 only)

Brian Flood	NCTCOG
Chad McKeown	NCTCOG
Kara Huffman	CPY (Aug. 22 only)
Bill Parsons	CPY (Aug. 25 only)

The following lists representatives from governmental organizations in attendance at the Public Hearings:

Name	**Agency/Firm**
Barbara Maley	FHWA
Barbra Leftwich	Dallas County
Doug Dykman	City of Dallas, Dallas Zoo
Ruth Antebi-Guten	City of Cedar Hill
Dennis Schwartz	City of Duncanville

Conducted By: The presiding official for both of the Public Hearings was Brian Barth, P.E., Director of Transportation Planning and Development with the Dallas District of TxDOT. Mr. Barth convened the hearing and introduced elected public officials and key TxDOT staff in attendance. Mr. Barth outlined what would happen during the Public Hearing.

Mr. Timothy Nesbitt, P.E., TxDOT Project Manager then presented an overview of the project and related aspects. Mr. Tom O'Grady, Project Manager for HNTB Corporation, reviewed the project's proposed design and related environmental aspects. Mr. Travis Henderson, TxDOT ROW Administrator, explained the ROW acquisition procedures and the relocation assistance program for displaced persons and businesses.

Mr. Barth called a recess and when the hearing reconvened, he called on citizens wishing to speak.

Exhibits: Plans and maps illustrating the proposed improvements were displayed for public view and comments. These plans included schematic plans, project area map, IH 35E/US 67 constraints map, urban design concepts, and proposed noise wall locations. In addition, an urban simulation animation video was shown. Copies of the TxDOT State Purchase of ROW booklet and copies of the Environmental Assessment were also available.

Comments from Elected / Local Officials: Mr. Grady Smithey from the Duncanville City Council addressed the audience during the Public Hearing on August 22, 2005.

No elected/local officials addressed the audience during the Public Hearing on August 25, 2005.

Summary of How Comments / Issues were Addressed: The comments from the public suggest overall support of the proposed project; however, some concern was indicated due to the modification to entrance and exit ramps for IH 35E and US 67. TxDOT thoroughly analyzed and responded to all comments. In summary, although both verbal and written concerns were expressed, TxDOT has addressed the comments and desires to move the proposed project forward.

Comments from the Public:
Five verbal comments were made during the August 22 Public Hearing, and eighteen written comments were submitted.

No verbal comments were made during the August 25 Public Hearing. Two (2) written comments were submitted.

53 comments were submitted by mail during the ten day comment period.

Recommendation:
All comments have been satisfactorily addressed, and the project is recommended for approval as a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

3. PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT AND RESPONSE REPORT

I. VERBAL COMMENT AND RESPONSE

Verbal Comment 1: Mr. Grady Smithey

Mr. Smithey stated that (A) there were a number of places along US 67 that needed "X" ramps and flyover ramps. He feels they are not a significant cost as compared with the total project cost, and would like to see them looked at. (B) Mr. Smithey felt that any amenities that could be added, specifically landscaping, should be done. (C) He felt one of the biggest problems is the bottleneck at IH 20. (D) Mr. Smithey asked if we could convert the current HOV lane into a regular lane. And if the design stays as a single lane in the median we need to look at using it has a High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lane.

Response to Verbal Comment 1

(A) Various ramping scenarios along US 67 have been considered throughout project development. The "X" ramps Mr. Smithey references have been considered (two pair between Wintergreen and Main and two pair between Main and Danieldale); however, the location and distances of cross streets do not allow desirable geometric design conditions to be met. A flyover ramp is proposed at Zang Boulevard

(B) A preliminary urban design concept has been developed for The Southern Gateway. The Southern Gateway proposes signature gateway bridges and full context sensitive urban design elements, all of which would require cost sharing with local agencies.

(C) The proposed design addresses the current bottleneck situation at IH 20.

(D) HOV lanes are a region-wide solution to congestion and air quality issues. TxDOT is committed to the HOV system and conversion of current HOV lanes or reduction in proposed HOV lanes would have a negative impact on regional air quality and congestion. Currently the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) is conducting a "HOV/Managed Lane Regional System Plan Study" to inventory HOV lanes and proposed HOV lanes in the region and assess how they interconnect and function. Pending the results of this study, HOT lanes would be considered if they fit into the regional HOV plan and have the proper interconnectivity to the regional HOV system. If design/ROW changes occur to accommodate a revised HOV design further along in the project development process, the environmental document would be re-evaluated.

Verbal Comment 2: Mr. John Keese

Mr. Keese stated that noise was a problem and he asked if the freeway could be put in a trench (like US 75 and Dallas North Tollway), as a sound barrier wall will not be enough.

Response to Verbal Comment 2

Although it is possible to depress the roadway section adjacent to the vicinity of Mr. Keese's neighborhood, additional ROW would be needed and the associated cost eliminated this option from being the locally preferred alternative. Noise walls have been deemed both reasonable and feasible and are proposed in his neighborhood.

Verbal Comment 3: Mr. Joe Bluitt

Mr. Bluitt was concerned about noise walls behind his house. Mr. Bluitt stated he was concerned about property value, potential crime (as the proposed 12 foot wall would prevent people from seeing what is going on behind the wall), and the possibility of backing into the wall, which is ten feet from the alley. He asked if further studies could be done and if there would be a vote.

Response to Verbal Comment 3

A noise analysis was completed in accordance to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Regulation 23 CFR 772, "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise," and TxDOT's 1996 Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise. Noise walls were determined to be both feasible and reasonable for Mr. Bluitt's neighborhood and as a result a noise wall is proposed for incorporation into the proposed project. A noise workshop was conducted for adjacent property owners to inform them of the pros and cons of constructing noise barriers on September 2, 2004. All adjacent property owners were encouraged to vote on whether or not to accept the proposed noise walls. The final decision to construct the proposed noise walls will be made upon completion of the project design, utility evaluation and the public involvement process. The current alley width per City of Dallas standards is ten feet, which would provide ample room to maneuver a vehicle without backing in to the proposed noise barrier.

Verbal Comment 4: Mr. Bill Ingle

Mr. Ingle is currently developing property along US 67. While looking the design over, he noticed the Wintergreen exit has been eliminated which would adversely affect people coming to this developing location. Mr. Ingle noticed both an exit

and entrance ramp between Main and Danieldale and would like to see the same between Main and Wintergreen.

Response to Verbal Comment 4

The location of entrance/exit ramps is controlled by several factors. These include safety, meeting design standards for the minimal spacing required between ramps (1000 ft between consecutive exit ramps and 1500 ft between consecutive entrance ramps), adequate distance for motorists to merge with freeway or frontage road traffic, and the amount of space between existing cross streets. The limited distance between Wintergreen and Main Street necessitated the change in ramps at this location. Additionally, braided ramps were considered, but desirable design conditions could not be achieved.

Verbal Comment 5: Mr. Donald Wilson

Mr. Wilson states that his wife and some neighbors have respiratory issues caused by the freeway traffic (emissions from cars and trucks that pass through the area). He would like to know why this, as well as noise, has not been looked at.

Response to Verbal Comment 5

Both air quality and noise analyses were performed as part of the environmental analysis for this project.

This project is located in Dallas County, which is designated an ozone non-attainment area. Dallas County has been designated non-attainment of the 1-hour ozone standard and the 8-hour ozone standard by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

All projects in the NCTCOG's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that are proposed for federal or state funds, including The Southern Gateway, were initiated in a manner consistent with federal guidelines in 23 CFR 450 and 49 CFR 613.200 B. Energy, environment, air quality, cost, and mobility considerations are addressed in the programming of the TIP. The proposed projects are consistent with the area's financially constrained Metropolitan Transportation Plan known as Mobility 2025 Plan−2005 Amendment, and the 2006−2008 STIP was found to conform to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 by the US DOT (FHWA/FTA) on June 16, 2005. Additionally, the projects come from an operational Congestion Management System that meets all requirements of 23 CFR Highways, Parts 450 and 500. The proposed action is included in the 2006-2008 STIP.

The primary pollutants from motor vehicles are volatile organic compounds (VOCs), carbon monoxide (CO), and nitrogen oxides. Volatile organic

compounds and nitrogen oxides can combine under the right conditions in a series of photochemical reactions to form ozone (O_3). Because these reactions take place over a period of several hours, maximum concentrations of ozone are often found far downwind of the precursor sources. Thus, ozone is a regional problem and not a localized condition. The procedures for modeling ozone require long-term meteorological data and detailed area wide emission rates for all potential sources (industry, business, and transportation) and are normally too complex to be performed within the scope of an environmental analysis for a highway project. Therefore, concentrations of ozone for the purpose of comparing the results of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) are modeled by the regional air quality planning agency for the SIP.

The topography and meteorological conditions of the area in which the project is located would not seriously restrict dispersion of the air pollutants. The traffic data used in the analysis was obtained from the TxDOT TPP Division.

Using the CALINE3/MOBILE6 computer program and TPP traffic data, CO concentrations were determined in accordance with the TxDOT Air Quality Guidelines. CO background ambient concentrations of 3.7 parts per million (PPM) for a one hour average and 2.3 ppm for an eight hour average were used in the analysis. The National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for CO is 35.0 ppm for one hour and 9.0 ppm for eight hours. CO concentrations for this segment of The Southern Gateway were modeled under the worst meteorological conditions**.**

In addition to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), the EPA also regulates air toxics. Most air toxics originate from human-made sources, including on-road mobile sources, non-road mobile sources (e.g., airplanes), area sources (e.g. dry cleaners) and stationary sources (e.g., factories or refineries).

In the 2001 rulemaking, EPA identified six priority Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs): acetaldehyde, benzene, formaldehyde, diesel exhaust, acrolein, and 1, 3 butadiene (66 FR 17230). EPA is in the process of assessing the risks of various kinds of exposures to these pollutants.

Additional information on Air Toxics can be found in Response to Written Comment 29.

Additionally, the noise analysis was completed in accordance to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Regulation 23 CFR 772, "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise," and TxDOT's 1996 Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise. Noise walls were determined to be both feasible and reasonable for several locations throughout the proposed project corridor. As a result approximately six miles of noise walls are proposed for incorporation into the proposed project, including noise wall #13, which is proposed for Mr. Wilson’s neighborhood. Any subsequent project design changes may require a reevaluation of this proposal. The final decision to

construct the proposed noise walls will be made upon completion of the project design, utility evaluation and the public involvement process.

II. Written Comment and Response

Written Comment 1: David C. Dybala, City of Dallas

> Mr. Dybala submitted a list of comments on the design schematic on behalf of the City of Dallas. He stated that most of the comments have minimal or no impacts to current proposed ROW and can be addressed during detailed geometric design. However, he was submitting the comments so TxDOT would be aware of ROW needs prior to the preparation of ROW mapping and acquisition. In general the comments stress the need to maintain minimal cross-sections on cross-streets, maintaining turning radii on skewed streets, lane assignments through intersections, and lane widths on bike routes. Mr. Dybala thanked TxDOT for the opportunity to review and comment on the schematic. A copy of the letter with a detailed listing of comments can be found in Section 5: Copy of Written Comments

Response to Written Comment 1

> The design and development of the locally preferred alternative has been done in coordination with the City of Dallas and other stakeholders. The current design schematic, as shown at the Public Hearing, already incorporates many of these comments. Schematic comments which have not been addressed may be considered and evaluated during detailed design. If substantial changes to design or ROW occur during detailed design, the environmental document would be re-evaluated.

Written Comment 2: (1) Mr. Joseph Hernandez, (2) Mr. Lyndon A. Mitchell, (3) Mr. Michael Cooper, (4) Mr. Joe Merola, (5) Ms. Olga Acevedo, (6) Mr. Richard Cast, (7) Mr. James Son, (8) Ms. Juanell and Mr. Antonio Garcia, (9) Mr. John Arney, (10) Mr. Eric Pillet, (11) Ms. Janie Skotak, (12) Lavon Key, (13) Mr. John Orvis, (14) Ms. Barbara Nunn, (15) Ms. Jan Scott, (16) Ms. Winnie Kaspar, (17) Ms. Harriet Mitchell, (18) Mr. Richard London, (19) Mr. Roger Wells, (20) Ms. Sue May, (21) Mrs. Fred Monk, (22) Ms. Mary Grafflin, (23) Ms. Quinnette Johnson, (24) Mr. George Cason, (25) (26) Mr. Joseph Connelly, (27) Mrs. M.R. Yates, (28) Mr. Albert Hudgins, Jr., (29) Mr. Guy Albright, (30) Mr. Alejo Delacruz, (31) Ms. Sandra McFreely, (32) S.M. Carroll, (33) Mr. Henry Sandoval, (34) Mr. John Blizzard, (35) Mr. Thomas Sala, (36) Ms. Debra Hodges, (37) Ms. Mary Forrester, (38) Mr. Greg Gormley, (39) Mr. Gary Tyler, (40) Ms. I. Miller, (41) Ms. Melanie Loe, (42) Mr. Donald Wales, (43) Ms. Stacy Caldwell, (44) Ms. Kathleen Stewart, (45) Mr. Fred Dueren, (46) Mr. Kevin Pheiffer, (47) Ms. Linda Tittle, (48) Mr. Douglas Norton:

> The previous individuals sent or faxed a form letter stating that the neighborhood currently experiences noise from the freeway and expressed their concern for future noise levels in the Wynnewood North Neighborhood. They requested that

TxDOT reconsider extending the currently planned noise wall on the west side past Brookhaven to Clarendon Drive. Additionally, if this is not feasible, they requested a single slope traffic barrier (42-inch high) and rubberized asphalt pavement to minimize noise levels from the widened and elevated freeway.

Response to Written Comment 2

A noise analysis was completed in accordance to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Regulation 23 CFR 772, "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise," and TxDOT's 1996 Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise. Noise walls were determined to be both feasible and reasonable for several locations throughout the project and as a result approximately six miles of noise walls are proposed for incorporation into the proposed project. Extensions of proposed noise walls to or past Brookhaven were not feasible and reasonable. Zang Boulevard, which is a city street, currently separates the Wynnewood North Neighborhood from IH 35E and would act as the primary noise generator in this particular area. The use of a single slope 42-inch high traffic barrier is typically reserved for safety reasons and would not effectively reduce noise in the Wynnewood North Neighborhood. Additionally, TxDOT does not recognize the use of specialized pavements, such as rubberized asphalt or permeable pavement, as a form of noise abatement.

Written Comment 3: Mr. Lyndon A. Mitchell

Mr. Mitchell submitted an additional letter to the one above stating that traffic noise in his neighborhood surely exceeds standards which have been set by appropriate entities. Mr. Mitchell feels his neighborhood has been overlooked for noise abatement since the road was built and lists several instances where he feels noise abatement could have been installed. He claims that highway departments, including Texas, have been retrofitting noise walls “just about everywhere”. He states that the ROW is kept scalped, preventing natural wooded vegetation from growing which would dampen the noise. He feels something fishy is going on since his neighborhood does not have a noise barrier some fifty years after the freeway was constructed.

Response to Written Comment 3

A noise analysis was completed in accordance to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Regulation 23 CFR 772, "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise," and TxDOT's 1996 Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise. Noise walls were determined to be both feasible and reasonable for several locations throughout the project and as a result approximately six miles of noise walls are proposed for incorporation into the proposed project. There is currently no criteria for existing noise levels, and therefore no state or federal abatement measures for current

noise on an existing facility. Retrofitted walls are not built in Texas due to this lack of criteria. Vegetation along the roadway is kept clear for safety reasons, such as maintaining sight distance. In order for vegetation to abate noise, a dense area of trees and other vegetation with a minimum width of 100 feet is needed. Normal urban landscaping does not effectively abate traffic noise.

Written Comment 4: Ms. Frances James

Ms. James wrote regarding the McAdams Cemetery (IH 35E/US 67 south of the Illinois exit), which is a Historic Texas Cemetery. Ms. James wanted to know the status of the design in this area.

Response to Written Comment 4

The McAdams Cemetery was identified early in the project development. The locally-preferred alternative does not require ROW or change the access to the cemetery. The cemetery was included in the historic report that was sent to the Texas Historical Commission.

Written Comment 5: Mr. Jason Morahan

Mr. Morahan, owner of the current Oak Cliff Chamber of Commerce building, proposed that TxDOT realign Zang Boulevard. Current design has the Zang flyover straddling the building, which is scheduled to be demolished when the Oak Cliff Chamber of Commerce moves. Mr. Morahan suggested a land swap that would benefit both the Chamber and TxDOT.

Response to Written Comment 5

The realignment of the proposed Zang flyover is not being considered at this time, but may be further studied during detailed design/ROW acquisition and coordinated with the appropriate parties involved. TxDOT is presently waiting for funding before proceeding with either design or ROW acquisition. If design and/or ROW changes occur further along in the project development process, the environmental document would be re-evaluated.

Written Comment 6: Dr. Diane Wagner

Dr. Wagner wanted the designers to be aware that if right-of way acquisition is required from her business then she would have no room for parking.

Response to Written Comment 6

No ROW will be required from Dr. Wagner's business.

Written Comment 7: Dr. Diane Wagner

Dr. Wagner thanked the designers for listening to her concerns about ROW. She thanked the designers for going above and beyond to save her business.

Response to Written Comment 7

Comment noted.

Written Comment 8: Ms. D'ann Cobb-Steele

Ms. Cobb-Steele wanted to know the height and locations of proposed noise walls and whether or not her business (Ann's Health Food Center and Market) will retain visibility from the roadway. She also wanted to know what form of compensation she will be offered for the change in access she will be experiencing.

Response to Written Comment 8

No noise walls are proposed along the west side of IH 35E between Saner and Illinois. Ann's Health Food Center and Market would maintain the current visibility from the freeway. Access to Ann's Health Food Center and Market is from Zang Boulevard, not IH 35E. Although access to Zang Boulevard from IH 35E would change from the Saner exit to the Illinois exit, compensation to businesses along Zang Boulevard for changes in access along IH 35E would not be provided.

Written Comment 9: Mr. Matthews

Mr. Matthews would like a copy of the CD.

Response to Written Comment 9

As with the environmental document and schematic, copies of the Public Hearing presentation (including the DVD) are available at the Dallas District office for review, copying, and/or purchase.

Written Comment 10: Mr. Wayne Johnson

Mr. Johnson is the owner of American Harbor Self Storage. He states that acquisition of additional ROW will require all of the parking in front of his office and gate. Also, the grade change correction will come into the facility which would then no longer be functional. Mr. Johnson would like to see the exit ramp moved north and additional access points added so that he could build a new office and have access. He also is worried about set-back requirements from the City of Dallas.

Response to Written Comment 10

A small amount of ROW would be required from American Harbor Self Storage. The needed ROW would not affect parking. The location of entrance/exit ramps is controlled by several factors. These include meeting design standards for the minimal spacing required between ramps (1000 ft between consecutive exit ramps and 1500 ft between consecutive entrance ramps), adequate distance for motorists to merge with freeway or frontage road traffic, and the amount of space between existing cross streets. The distance between cross streets and the proximity of the IH 20 interchange would not allow for the shifting of the Camp Wisdom ramp to the north as it would result in less than desirable conditions. Additionally, IH 35E is a controlled access freeway and additional access is typically restricted near the gore of an entrance or exit ramp. Requests for additional access would need to be sent to TxDOT for review and approval. Set back distances are set by the City of Dallas. Requirements and compliance would need to be coordinated with the appropriate City office.

Written Comment 11: Mr. Rob Franke

Mr. Franke stated he was very much in favor of the project.

Response to Written Comment 11

Comment noted.

Written Comment 12: Mr. Khaldoun Khalaf

Mr. Khalaf would like a copy of the DVD.

Response to Written Comment 12

As with the environmental document and schematic, copies of the Public Hearing presentation (including the DVD) are available at the Dallas District office for review, copying, and/or purchase.

Written Comment 13: Ms. Cynthia Williamson

Ms. Williamson objects to losing her home.

Response to Written Comment 13

Ms. Williamson is the owner of 821 S R L Thornton Freeway, which, according to Dallas County Central Appraisal District, is a single family residence that is zoned limited Office District 2. Although the description of the property is "converted residence", Ms. Williamson has recently homesteaded the property. Compensation for the loss of her home would be in accordance with all State and Federal regulations, including the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Policies Act of 1970, as amended.

Written Comment 14: Mr. Cory Spillman, Mayor Pro Tem, Cedar Hill

Mr. Spillman is in favor of the project, noting immediate relief of the IH 20 bottle neck is crucial. Mr. Spillman would also like to see more fly over ramps through Duncanville and Cedar Hill.

Response to Written Comment 14

Comment in favor of the project noted. The proposed design addresses the current bottleneck situation at IH 20. The addition of flyover ramps in Duncanville and Cedar Hill would be addressed during detailed design.

Written Comment 15: Ms. Nora Ransom

Ms. Ransom wanted to know if her address would be affected.

Response to written comment 15

No new ROW is proposed near Ms. Ransom's home (135 Beckleywood) and access in the area will remain the same. A noise wall is proposed along IH 35E between Louisiana and Circle, which includes Beckleywood.

Written Comment 16: Mr. David W. Hunt

Mr. Hunt stated that sound barrier walls were his main concern and he asked that TxDOT protect his home value and privacy by considering expanding the use of sound barrier walls and sound barrier landscaping.

Response to Written Comment 16

Noise walls were considered, especially in areas along residential development. Current Federal and State policy recommends construction of a noise wall or use of other noise abatement measures provided it reduces noise levels by at least five decibels and costs less than $25,000 per receiver or $5,000 per decibel noise reduced per receiver. The cost does not include the costs of additional ROW, utility adjustments or access rights.

Once concurrence regarding justification of noise abatement measures is obtained from the Federal Highway Administration and TxDOT Austin Offices, all affected first-row property owners are polled by mail to determine if they are in favor or oppose the abatement measures, such as construction of a noise wall. A simple majority determines whether a wall is built or not. A noise wall would not be built if the majority of landowners oppose noise wall abatement. Preliminary results indicate noise walls would be justified along numerous sections of the IH 35E / US 67 corridor resulting in approximately six miles of proposed noise walls. Mr. Hunt (601 Brookside Drive, Cedar Hill, TX) is not an adjacent property owner, however the neighborhood in which he lives is adjacent to U.S. 67, where a noise wall is proposed.

According to TxDOT's 1996 Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise, the planting of vegetation should not be considered as a noise abatement measure. Roadside vegetation such as trees, shrubs and tall grasses provides little reduction in noise levels. Vegetation that is tall enough, (4.5 meters, or approximately 15 feet), wide enough (30 meters or approximately 100 feet), and dense enough that it cannot be seen through will decrease highway traffic noise by only a barely perceptible amount. Trees and shrubs provide psychological benefits and may be provided for visual, privacy or aesthetic treatment. The texture and landscaping elements of the proposed project would be determined further along in the project development process.

Written Comment 17: Ms. Billie Duval

Ms. Duval wanted to know the time frame for the completion and approval of construction plans and how long it would take to build. She also wanted to know the cost to the surrounding communities (DeSoto, Duncanville, and Cedar Hill).

Response to Written Comment 17

Construction plans would be developed and approved between environmental approval and construction. Due to the length and cost of the proposed improvements, The Southern Gateway would be stage constructed. Construction would begin after 2015 and completion would be expected by the end of 2025. The cost to surrounding communities is expected to be minimal, as the current project cost are currently being divided between the FHWA (90 percent) and TxDOT (10 percent).

Written Comment 18: Ms. Ethelrene Shields

Ms. Shields requested another meeting.

Response to Written Comment 18

To date there have been eight advertised public meetings, and 13 community work group meetings. Additional meetings are not anticipated as this round of Public Hearings would conclude this phase of project development.

Written Comment 19: Mr. Dan Eddy

Mr. Eddy commented that the exit ramp at Camp Wisdom and IH 35E will be a "gateway" to the new University of North Texas at Dallas Campus and crucial to the success of the campus. He is the Director of Community Development for the University of North Texas at Dallas and stated the facility for 25,000 students will open permanent buildings in the area in January 2007.

Response to Written Comment 19

Comment noted.

Written Comment 20: Mason Trust Partners

Mason Trust Partners is in support of the project as designed.

Response to Written Comment 20

Comment noted.

Written Comment 21: Phyllis Fogle

Ms. Fogle requested that the northbound exit ramp to Camp Wisdom be moved south and more drive approaches to her property (Good Luck RV Park) from the frontage road.

Response to Written Comment 21

The location of entrance/exit ramps is controlled by several factors. These include meeting design standards for the minimal spacing required between ramps (1000 ft between consecutive exit ramps and 1500 ft between consecutive entrance ramps), adequate distance for motorists to merge with freeway or frontage road traffic, and the amount of space between existing cross streets. The distance between cross streets and the proximity of the IH 20 interchange would not allow for the shifting of the Camp Wisdom ramp to the south as it would result in less than desirable conditions. Additionally, IH 35E is a controlled access freeway and additional access is typically restricted near the gore of an entrance or exit ramp. Requests for additional access would need to be sent to TxDOT for review and approval.

Written Comment 22: Ms. Wendy Lopez

Ms. Lopez requested TxDOT reconsider the “Adjacent Residential Property” requirement for the Wynnewood North neighborhood Association since Zang Boulevard parallels the roadway and separates them from being adjacent.

Response to Written Comment 22

A noise analysis was completed in accordance to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Regulation 23 CFR 772, "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise," and TxDOT's 1996 Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise. These policies define what is considered adjacent properties and for the sake of consistent and uniform application of the policy can’t be redefined for individual situations.

Written Comment 23: Ms. Sue May

Ms. May stated that she was distressed to hear the Zang Boulevard bridge would be 30+ feet high. She claims traffic noise will be considerable and requests that some sort of sound barrier be built for her neighborhood.

Response to Written Comment 23

A noise analysis was completed in accordance to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Regulation 23 CFR 772, "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise," and TxDOT's 1996 Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise. Noise walls were determined to be both feasible and reasonable for several locations throughout the project and as a result approximately six miles of noise walls are proposed for incorporation into the proposed project, including the Wynnewood North Neighborhood. Noise walls were not considered reasonable or feasible in this area near Zang Boulevard. Zang Boulevard, which is not part of the proposed project, runs parallel to IH 35E and separates this portion of the neighborhood from the proposed project.

Written Comment 24: Mr. Joseph Hernandez

Mr. Hernandez requested that 42 inch crash barriers be used on the west side of the freeway between Illinois and 12th. Since sound walls were not drawn or approved, he requests the taller 42" crash barrier and rubberized asphalt to be used instead of traditional materials.

Response to Written Comment 24

See response to Written Comment 2

Written Comment 25: Mr. Donald Wilson

Mr. Wilson states that his wife and some neighbors have respiratory issues caused by the freeway traffic (emissions from cars and trucks that pass through the area). He would like to know why this has not been looked at (as well as noise).

Response to Written Comment 25

See response to Verbal Comment 5.

Written Comment 26: Ms. Carole Twitmyer

Ms. Twitmyer states that the proposed intersection configuration at Zang/Zang Flyover is unnecessary, excessive and against the preferred neighborhood village creation principals**.**

Response to Written Comment 26

The design of The Southern Gateway, including the Zang flyover, was based on future traffic projections and input from local governments, neighborhoods and other stakeholders. The Zang flyover meets the needs of future traffic projections and local access demands and is part of the locally preferred alternative. The elimination or realignment of the proposed Zang flyover is not being considered at this time, but may be further studied during detailed design/ROW acquisition and coordinated with the appropriate parties involved. TxDOT is presently waiting for funding before proceeding with either design or ROW acquisition. If design and/or ROW changes occur further along in the project development process, the environmental document would be re-evaluated.

Written Comment 27: Mr. Joseph Hernandez

Mr. Hernandez requested that 42-inch crash barriers be used on the Westside of the freeway between Illinois Avenue and 12th Street. Since sound walls were not drawn or approved, he requests the taller 42-inch crash barrier and rubberized asphalt to be used instead of traditional materials.

Response to Written Comment 27

See response to Written Comment 2

Written Comment 28: Mr. Paul Nielsen

Mr. Nielsen claims the driveway to his business office is missing.

Response to Written Comment 28

The drive to Mr. Nielsen's business (Nielsen Insurance Group) is new and did not appear on the schematic. Access to the business will be maintained throughout project development and the drive will be incorporated during detailed design.

Written Comment 29: Mr. Ali Abdul Ghanni

Mr. Ghanni states his wife and neighbors have respiratory disorders and he is concerned that increased dust, emissions and other air pollutants will increase with the proposed improvements. He would like to know what TxDOT is going to do about it.

Response to Written Comment 29

The primary pollutants from motor vehicles are volatile organic compounds (VOCs), carbon monoxide (CO), and nitrogen oxides. Volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides can combine under the right conditions in a series of photochemical reactions to form ozone (O_3). Because these reactions take place over a period of several hours, maximum concentrations of ozone are often found far downwind of the precursor sources. Thus, ozone is a regional problem and not a localized condition. The procedures for modeling ozone require long-term meteorological data and detailed area wide emission rates for all potential sources (industry, business, and transportation) and are normally too complex to be performed within the scope of an environmental analysis for a highway project. Therefore, concentrations of ozone for the purpose of comparing the results of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) are modeled by the regional air quality planning agency. In addition to ozone, CO analysis was performed. The NAAQS for CO is 35.0 ppm for one hour and 9.0 ppm for eight hours. CO concentrations for the Southern Gateway were modeled at 10.0 for the one hour standard and 6.1 for the eight hour standard.

In addition to the criteria air pollutants for which there are National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), EPA also regulates air toxics. Most air toxics originate from human-made sources, including on-road mobile sources, non-road mobile sources (e.g., airplanes), area sources (e.g., dry cleaners) and stationary sources (e.g., factories or refineries).

Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs) are a subset of the 188 air toxics defined by the Clean Air Act. The MSATs are compounds emitted from highway vehicles and non-road equipment. Some toxic compounds are present in fuel and are emitted to the air when the fuel evaporates or passes through the engine unburned. Other toxics are emitted from the incomplete combustion of fuels or as secondary combustion products. Metal air toxics also result from engine wear or from impurities in oil or gasoline.

The EPA is the lead Federal Agency for administering the Clean Air Act and has certain responsibilities regarding the health effects of MSATs. The EPA issued a Final Rule on Controlling Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants from Mobile Sources. 66 FR 17229 (March 29, 2001). This rule was issued under the authority in Section 202 of the Clean Air Act. In its rule, EPA examined the impacts of existing and newly promulgated mobile source control programs, including its reformulated gasoline (RFG) program, its national low emission vehicle (NLEV) standards, its Tier 2 motor vehicle emissions standards and gasoline sulfur control requirements, and its proposed heavy duty engine and vehicle standards and on-highway diesel fuel sulfur control requirements. Between 2000 and 2020, FHWA projects that even with a 64 percent increase in VMT, these programs will reduce on-highway emissions of benzene, formaldehyde, 1,3-butadiene, and

acetaldehyde by 57 percent to 65 percent, and will reduce on-highway diesel PM emissions by 87 percent.

As a result, EPA concluded that no further motor vehicle emissions standards or fuel standards were necessary to further control MSATs. The agency is preparing another rule under authority of CAA Section 202(l) that will address these issues and could make adjustments to the full 21 and the primary six MSATs.

Unavailable Information for Project Specific MSAT Impact Analysis

Available technical tools do not enable us to predict the project-specific health impacts of the emission changes associated with the Build Alternative in the EA. Due to these limitations, the following discussion is included in accordance with CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1502.22(b)) regarding incomplete or unavailable information:

Information that is Unavailable or Incomplete: Evaluating the environmental and health impacts from MSATs on a proposed highway project would involve several key elements, including emissions modeling, dispersion modeling in order to estimate ambient concentrations resulting from the estimated emissions, exposure modeling in order to estimate human exposure to the estimated concentrations, and then final determination of health impacts based on the estimated exposure. Each of these steps is encumbered by technical shortcomings or uncertain science that prevents a more complete determination of the MSAT health impacts of this project.

1. Emissions: The EPA tools to estimate MSAT emissions from motor vehicles are not sensitive to key variables determining emissions of MSATs in the context of highway projects. While MOBILE 6.2 is used to predict emissions at a regional level, it has limited applicability at the project level. MOBILE 6.2 is a trip-based model--emission factors are projected based on a typical trip of 7.5 miles, and on average speeds for this typical trip. This means that MOBILE 6.2 does not have the ability to predict emission factors for a specific vehicle operating condition at a specific location at a specific time. Because of this limitation, MOBILE 6.2 can only approximate the operating speeds and levels of congestion likely to be present on the largest-scale projects, and cannot adequately capture emissions effects of smaller projects. For particulate matter, the model results are not sensitive to average trip speed, although the other MSAT emission rates do change with changes in trip speed. Also, the emissions rates used in MOBILE 6.2 for both particulate matter and MSATs are based on a limited number of tests of mostly older-technology vehicles. Lastly, in its discussions of PM under the conformity rule, EPA has identified problems with MOBILE6.2 as an obstacle to quantitative analysis.

These deficiencies compromise the capability of MOBILE 6.2 to estimate MSAT emissions. MOBILE6.2 is an adequate tool for projecting emissions trends, and

performing relative analyses between alternatives for very large projects, but it is not sensitive enough to capture the effects of travel changes tied to smaller projects or to `predict emissions near specific roadside locations.

2. Dispersion. The tools to predict how MSATs disperse are also limited. The EPA's current regulatory models, CALINE3 and CAL3QHC, were developed and validated more than a decade ago for the purpose of predicting episodic concentrations of carbon monoxide to determine compliance with the NAAQS. The performance of dispersion models is more accurate for predicting maximum concentrations that can occur at some time at some location within a geographic area. This limitation makes it difficult to predict accurate exposure patterns at specific times at specific highway project locations across an urban area to assess potential health risk. The NCHRP is conducting research on best practices in applying models and other technical methods in the analysis of MSATs. This work also will focus on identifying appropriate methods of documenting and communicating MSAT impacts in the NEPA process and to the general public. Along with these general limitations of dispersion models, FHWA is also faced with a lack of monitoring data in most areas for use in establishing project-specific MSAT background concentrations.

3. Exposure Levels and Health Effects. Finally, even if emission levels and concentrations of MSATs could be accurately predicted, shortcomings in current techniques for exposure assessment and risk analysis preclude us from reaching meaningful conclusions about project-specific health impacts. Exposure assessments are difficult because it is difficult to accurately calculate annual concentrations of MSATs near roadways, and to determine the portion of a year that people are actually exposed to those concentrations at a specific location. These difficulties are magnified for 70-year cancer assessments, particularly because unsupportable assumptions would have to be made regarding changes in travel patterns and vehicle technology (which affects emissions rates) over a 70-year period. There are also considerable uncertainties associated with the existing estimates of toxicity of the various MSATs, because of factors such as low-dose extrapolation and translation of occupational exposure data to the general population. Because of these shortcomings, any calculated difference in health impacts between alternatives is likely to be much smaller than the uncertainties associated with calculating the impacts. Consequently, the results of such assessments would not be useful to decision makers, who would need to weigh this information against other project impacts that are better suited for quantitative analysis.

Summary of Existing Credible Scientific Evidence Relevant to Evaluating the Impacts of MSAT: Research into the health impacts of MSATs is ongoing. For different emission types, there are a variety of studies that show that some either are statistically associated with adverse health outcomes through epidemiological studies (frequently based on emissions levels found in occupational settings) or that animals demonstrate adverse health outcomes when exposed to large doses.

Exposure to toxics has been a focus of a number of EPA efforts. Most notably, the agency conducted the National Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) in 1996 to evaluate modeled estimates of human exposure applicable to the county level. While not intended for use as a measure of or benchmark for local exposure, the modeled estimates in the NATA database best illustrate the levels of various toxics when aggregated to a national or State level.

The EPA is in the process of assessing the risks of various kinds of exposures to these pollutants. The EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) is a database of human health effects that may result from exposure to various substances found in the environment. The IRIS database is located at http://www.epa.gov/iris. The following toxicity information for the six prioritized MSATs was taken from the IRIS database *Weight of Evidence Characterization* summaries. This information is taken verbatim from EPA's IRIS database and represents the Agency's most current evaluations of the potential hazards and toxicology of these chemicals or mixtures.

- **Benzene** is characterized as a known human carcinogen.
- The potential carcinogenicity of **acrolein** cannot be determined because the existing data are inadequate for an assessment of human carcinogenic potential for either the oral or inhalation route of exposure.
- **Formaldehyde** is a probable human carcinogen, based on limited evidence in humans, and sufficient evidence in animals.
- **1,3-butadiene** is characterized as carcinogenic to humans by inhalation.
- **Acetaldehyde** is a probable human carcinogen based on increased incidence of nasal tumors in male and female rats and laryngeal tumors in male and female hamsters after inhalation exposure.
- **Diesel exhaust** is likely to be carcinogenic to humans by inhalation from environmental exposures. Diesel exhaust as reviewed in this document is the combination of diesel particulate matter and diesel exhaust organic gases.
- **Diesel exhaust** also represents chronic respiratory effects, possibly the primary noncancer hazard from MSATs. Prolonged exposures may impair pulmonary function and could produce symptoms, such as cough, phlegm, and chronic bronchitis. Exposure relationships have not been developed from these studies.

There have been other studies that address MSAT health impacts in proximity to roadways. The Health Effects Institute, a non-profit organization funded by EPA, FHWA, and industry, has undertaken a major series of studies to research near-roadway MSAT hot spots, the health implications of the entire mix of mobile source pollutants, and other topics. The final summary of the series is not expected for several years.

Some recent studies have reported that proximity to roadways is related to adverse health outcomes -- particularly respiratory problems[1]. Much of this research is not specific to MSATs, instead surveying the full spectrum of both criteria and other pollutants. The FHWA cannot evaluate the validity of these studies, but more importantly, they do not provide information that would be useful to alleviate the uncertainties listed above and enable us to perform a more comprehensive evaluation of the health impacts specific to this project.

Relevance of Unavailable or Incomplete Information to Evaluating Reasonably Foreseeable Significant Adverse Impacts on the Environment, and Evaluation of impacts based upon theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community: Because of the uncertainties outlined above, a quantitative assessment of the effects of air toxic emissions impacts on human health cannot be made at the project level. While available tools do allow us to reasonably predict relative emissions changes between alternatives for larger projects, the amount of MSAT emissions from each of the project alternatives and MSAT concentrations or exposures created by each of the project alternatives cannot be predicted with enough accuracy to be useful in estimating health impacts. (As noted above, the current emissions model is not capable of serving as a meaningful emissions analysis tool for smaller projects.) Therefore, the relevance of the unavailable or incomplete information is that it is not possible to make a determination of whether any of the alternatives would have "significant adverse impacts on the human environment."

FHWA acknowledges that the Build Alternative may result in increased exposure to MSAT emissions in certain locations, although the concentrations and duration of exposures are uncertain, and because of this uncertainty, the health effects from these emissions cannot be estimated.

In a typical project, the VMT estimated for a Build Alternative is slightly higher than that for the No Build Alternative, because the additional capacity increases the efficiency of the roadway and attracts rerouted trips from elsewhere in the transportation network. This increase in VMT would lead to higher MSAT emissions for the action alternative along the highway corridor, along with a corresponding decrease in MSAT emissions along the parallel routes. The emissions increase is offset somewhat by lower MSAT emission rates due to increased speeds; according to EPA's MOBILE6 emissions model, emissions of all of the priority MSATs except for diesel particulate matter decrease as speed increases. The extent to which these speed-related emissions decreases will offset VMT-related emissions increases cannot be reliably projected due to the inherent deficiencies of technical models. Also, regardless of the alternative chosen,

[1] South Coast Air Quality Management District, Multiple Air Toxic Exposure Study-II (2000); Highway Health Hazards, The Sierra Club (2004) summarizing 24 Studies on the relationship between health and air quality); NEPA's Uncertainty in the Federal Legal Scheme Controlling Air Pollution from Motor Vehicles, Environmental Law Institute, 35 ELR 10273 (2005) with health studies cited therein.

emissions will likely be lower than present levels in the design year as a result of EPA's national control programs that are projected to reduce MSAT emissions by 57 to 87 percent between 2000 and 2020. The design year for this proposed project is 2030. Local conditions may differ from these national projections in terms of fleet mix and turnover, VMT growth rates, and local control measures. However, the magnitude of the EPA-projected reductions is so great (even after accounting for VMT growth) that MSAT emissions in the study area are likely to be lower in the future in nearly all cases.

The additional travel lanes contemplated as part of the Build Alternative will have the effect of moving some traffic closer to nearby homes, schools and businesses; therefore, under this alternative there may be localized areas where ambient concentrations of MSATs could be higher in the Build Alternative than the No Build Alternative. Bases on these studies of ambient concentrations of MSATs, the localized increases in MSAT concentrations would likely be most pronounced along the expanded roadway sections that would be built between Illinois Avenue and Clarendon Drive. However, as discussed above, the magnitude and the duration of these potential increases compared to the No Build alternative cannot be accurately quantified due to the inherent deficiencies of current models. In sum, when a highway is widened and, as a result, moves closer to receptors, the localized level of MSAT emissions for the Build Alternative could be higher relative to the No Build Alternative, but this could be offset due to increases in speeds and reductions in congestion (which are associated with lower MSAT emissions). Also, MSATs will be lower in other locations when traffic shifts away from them. However, on a regional basis, EPA's vehicle and fuel regulations, coupled with fleet turnover, will over time cause substantial reductions that, in almost all cases, will cause region-wide MSAT levels to be significantly lower than today.

TxDOT, in cooperation with the North Central Texas Council of Governments and other regional partners, remains committed to providing efficient transportation solutions that comply with state and federal environmental guidelines, including the Clean Air Act. The Southern Gateway, which is part of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), was found to conform to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, by the US DOT on April 16, 2005.

Dust from construction is a temporary condition and can be controlled by sprinkling water on disturbed sites during dry periods.

4. PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPT

5. COPY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS

6. COPY OF ATTENDANCE SHEETS

7. COPY OF PUBLIC HEARING PRESENTATION