

Alternatives Evaluation Criteria and Results Table

	Evaluation Criteria Key	Alternative does not adequately address this evaluation criterion	Alternative somewhat addresses this evaluation criterion.	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: • 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	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	
Purpose and Need	Enhancing safety within the corridor							
	Aligned with TxDOT's Road to Zero Initiative and City of Austin's Vision Zero Initiative.	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.	Yes/No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	Aligned with additional local plans	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.	Yes/No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	Improves emergency response time for EMS, police, fire, and hospitals	Adequate ramps, detour routes for emergency vehicles	High/Medium/Low (High = more reliable response time; Low = delayed response time)	Low	Medium	High	High	
	Emergency egress requirements	Ability to provide emergency egress	High/Medium/Low (High = fewer requirements; Low = more requirements)	High	Low	High	High	
	Reduction in fatalities and injury crashes.	Review potential for crash reductions on mainlanes, managed lanes, ramps, and frontage road intersections	% change compared to No Build in 2030	N/A	-35%	-34%	-32%	
	Addressing demand by prioritizing the movement of people, goods, and services through and across the corridor; improving operational efficiency.							
	Mainlanes travel time	Average northbound/southbound travel time along mainlanes between US 290E and US 290W/SH 71	% change from No Build	N/A	-47%	-50%	-39%	
	Managed lanes travel time	Average northbound/southbound travel time along managed lanes between US 290E and US 290W/SH 71	Travel time (min.)	N/A (No managed lanes provided)	9 min.	8 min.	9 min.	
	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)	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)	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 and major parallel facilities (Mopac, US 183)	Network travel cost (Y2021 Dollars) (% change from No Build)	\$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	Enhanced vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian crossings	High/Medium/Low (High = more connectivity; Low = less connectivity)	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	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)	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)	N/A	High	Medium	Medium	
	Utility conflicts	Anticipated utility relocation effort	High/Medium/Low (High = more conflicts; Low = fewer conflicts)	N/A	High	Medium	Medium	
	Drainage infrastructure complexity	Construction and maintenance of drainage infrastructure	High/Medium/Low (High = more complexity; Low = less complexity)	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)	N/A	Low	Medium	Medium	
	Amount of new right of way (ROW) required	Acres of ROW	Acres	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	N/A	96 total displacements: 50 commercial and 46 residential (single and multifamily)	147 total displacements: 72 commercial and 75 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	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)	High	Low	Low	Medium	
	Archeological sites and cemeteries	Risk and probability of encountering or disturbing sites containing intact cultural resources	Number of Archeological Sites	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	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	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	
	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)	Low	High	Medium/High	Medium	
	Parks purchased with Land and Water Conservation Funds impacts	Acres of Section 6(f) park impacts	Acres	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	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)	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)	Low	High	High	Medium/High	
Preliminary Project Costs	Minimize design-build costs	Preliminary design/build construction cost estimate	Dollars	N/A	Estimated design-build costs approx. = \$7.72 billion	Estimated design-build costs approx. = \$3.54 billion	Estimated design-build costs approx. = \$3.67 billion	
Minimize operation and maintenance cost	Preliminary operation and maintenance cost estimate	Dollars	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 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: • 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.	
The Alternatives Evaluation Technical Report is available on My35CapEx.com.								