## TABLE 4-7. CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS FOR ALTERNATIVES TO DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION

Potentially Impacted Area or Resource	Flood Damage Reduction				Ecosystem Restoration			Transportation								Fill Activities				Recreation		
	Floodway Levee Raise (1) (9)	Stemmons Area (2)	Las Colinas levee Raise (3)	ATSF Bridge Modification (4)	Old Trinity (1)	Joppa Preserve (1)	Dallas Floodway (1)	Industrial (5)	Combined Riverside (5)	Split Riverside (5)	Split landside (5)	George Bush Seg. 4 (9)	TRE Bridge (6)	DART Southeast Corridor (6)	Other Floodway Bridges (7)	McCommas Bluff Landfill Extension (9)	Frasier Dam Modification	Basic Capitol Management (9)	Park / Ride Grand Prairie	Floodway Lake (10)	Texas Buckeye Trail (11)	Equestrian Center/Interpretive Center (11)
Water Quality	0	0	0	0	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	0	0	•	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	•	0	0	0
Air Quality	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>A</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>A</b>	0	0	0
Aquatic Resources	0	<b>A</b>	0	0	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	0	0	•	•	•	•	•	0	0	•	•	•	0	0	0
Wetlands	0	0	0	0	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	0	•	•	•	•	0	0	•	0	<b>A</b>	•	•	0	•	•
Forested Resources	0	<b>A</b>	0	0	**	<b>A</b>	**	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	. ▼	0	•	•	•	•	0	▼
Forested Resources (NED Plan)	0	0	0	0	0	^	•	•	**	**	•	0	•	•	•	0	•	•	•	•	0	•
Floodplain Recreation	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	0	<b>A</b>	•	<b>A</b>	**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 .	0	**	•	<b>A</b>
Natural Floodplain (EO 11988)	•	•	0	0	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	**	0	•	•	•	•	0	•	0	•	•	0	•	<b>A</b>	0	0
Public Services	0	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	0	0	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	**	•	0	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
Environmental Justice	0	0	0	0	•	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	0	0	•	••	0	0	•	<b>A</b>	0	0	0	<b>A</b>	0	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
Upstream H & H	•	•	•	<b>A</b>	0	0	••	0	•	•	0	•	0	•	•	0	•	▼	•	**	0	0
Downstream H & H	<b>A</b>	•	•	•	0	0	<b>A</b>	0	•	•	0	0	0	•	<b>A</b>	0	0	•	•	•	0	0
Flood Damages	**	0	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	0	0	•	0	0	0	0	•	0	•	•	0	0	•	•	<b>A</b>	0	▼
Aesthetics	0	<b>A</b>	0	0	<b>A</b>	•	**	0	•	•	•	0	0	•	•	•	0	0	•	**	•	<b>•</b>
Historic andCultural Resources	0	•	•	0	0	0	•	•	•	•	•	0	0	0	0	0	. •	0	0	•	0	0

Legend:

**▼▼** Moderate Adverse Effects

Slight Adverse Effects

No Affect

▲ Slight Beneficial Effects

▲ ▲ Moderate Beneficial Effects

Note: Applies to all alternatives in the Final Array of the DFE GRR/EIS, except differences as noted in table.

- (1) Corps of Engineers Studies
- (2) Elm Fork Floodplain Management Study / Dallas
- (3) Dallas County Utility and Reclamation District
- (4) Lower end of existing floodway
- (5) Roadway footprint and excavation of borrow material
- (6) Passenger / Light Rail
- (7) Project Pegasus (I-30 and I-35), Sylvan, Commerce, Woodall Rodgers, Loop 12, Hampton, 183, Corinth
- (8) Section 404 / 10 Authorities
- (9) Including proposed mitigation
- (10) Reasonably foreseeable, however, could be constructed in phases by different entities (e.g., Corps / City complete)
- (11) NED Plan would impact the design and possibly location of these recreational plans, however the cumulative impact of these features to the area are mostly the same for all DFE and Floodway action alternatives

TABLE 4 - 7
CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS