

GPRA 309 Performance Measures Form

Title: Northwest I-75/I-575 Corridor Project in Cobb and Cherokee Counties, Georgia

Principal Reviewer(s): Ben West **Project Location:** Cobb, Cherokee County, GA
CEQ Number(s): 20070185 **ERP Number (optional):** FHW-E40813-GA

Environmental Impacts, Alpha-Numeric Codes:

<u>Air Issues:</u> A1= Air Quality A2= General Conformity A3= Air Toxics A4= Transportation Conformity	<u>Water Issues:</u> B1: Wetlands B2: Groundwater B3: Surface Water B4: Sole Source Aquifer B5: Aquatic Resources B6: Sediment	<u>Other Issues:</u> C1: Toxics/Hazardous Waste C2: Noise C3: Habitat C4: Essential Fish Habitat C5: Pesticides C6: Radiation	<u>Other Issues:</u> D1: Farmland D2: Endangered Species D3: Environmental Justice D4: Historic Preservation D5: Indigenous Peoples E1: Other (please specify)
--	--	---	--

1. Significant Environmental Impact:

Impact (Enter Alpha Numeric Code(s) for All that Apply): E1 (Alternatives)

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Prior To Draft Time Frame (if available) **Date of EPA Communication:** none

Description of Impact (Include Quantitative Data if Possible): _____

Recommendation: _____

Result: Decrease in Impact: No Change: Increase in Impact:

Result: _____

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Draft (including Draft Supplements) **Date of EPA Communication:** 08/13/07

Description of Impact (Include Quantitative Data if Possible): EPA is concerned that there is not a full analysis of alternatives in Section 2. Light Rail Transit (Alternative B) was eliminated from further consideration by the Northwest Connectivity Study based on cost and cost effectiveness criteria; however there is no additional information provided on the cost and effectiveness criteria used in making this decision. It appears that light rail was eliminated early using criteria (cost) that may not have been applied consistently to the other alternatives, which subsequently have been expanded significantly since the original alternatives screening process.

Recommendation: EPA recommends that the Final EIS include additional information/analysis to justify the decision to eliminate other Study stage alternatives from a more complete evaluation in the EIS.

Result: Decrease in Impact: No Change: Increase in Impact:

Result: _____

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Final (including Final Supplements) **Date of EPA Communication:** _____

Description of Impact (Include Quantitative Data if Possible): _____

Recommendation: _____

Result: Decrease in Impact: No Change: Increase in Impact:

Result: _____

3. Significant Environmental Impact:

Impact (Enter Alpha Numeric Code(s) for All that Apply): C2

* * * * *

Prior To Draft Time Frame (if available) **Date of EPA Communication:** none

Description of Impact (Include Quantitative Data if Possible): _____

Recommendation: _____

Result: Decrease in Impact: No Change: Increase in Impact:

Result: _____

* * * * *

Draft (including Draft Supplements) **Date of EPA Communication:** 08/13/07

Description of Impact (Include Quantitative Data if Possible): The Draft EIS describes nearly 1,100 properties that would be adversely affected by noise impacts from all of the build alternatives. There is virtually no difference in noise impacts between the alternatives. Therefore, mitigation measures will be vitally important to address these significant impacts.

Recommendation: EPA recommends that the Final EIS include a detailed discussion of potential noise mitigation options, including proposed noise walls, the impacts (and properties) that would be mitigated through their installation, and the specific reasons why certain barriers were not advanced. EPA also recommends that GDOT coordinate with affected communities where noise walls have been determined feasible to discuss potential visual and aesthetic mitigation measures regarding any noise walls.

Result: Decrease in Impact: No Change: Increase in Impact:

Result: _____

* * * * *

Final (including Final Supplements) **Date of EPA Communication:** _____

Description of Impact (Include Quantitative Data if Possible): _____

Recommendation: _____

Result: Decrease in Impact: No Change: Increase in Impact:

Result: _____

4. Significant Environmental Impact:

Impact (Enter Alpha Numeric Code(s) for All that Apply): D3

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Prior To Draft Time Frame (if available) **Date of EPA Communication:** none

Description of Impact (Include Quantitative Data if Possible): _____

Recommendation: _____

Result: Decrease in Impact: No Change: Increase in Impact:

Result: _____

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Draft (including Draft Supplements) **Date of EPA Communication:** 08/13/07

Description of Impact (Include Quantitative Data if Possible): EPA has several concerns about the potential impacts to low-income and minority communities from this project. A substantial number of residential displacements would occur from this project, and approximately 93 percent of all residential displacements would occur in minority and low-income communities. Apartments and mobile homes would be acquired that are a substantial portion of the residential neighborhoods. These effects would alter the community cohesion, size and social fabric of these neighborhoods. Based on the magnitude of impacts described in the Draft EIS, all alternatives would clearly result in disproportionate impacts to low-income and minority populations.

Recommendation: EPA recommends development of a comprehensive mitigation and enhancement plan for these neighborhoods to address displacement concerns and preserve the cohesiveness of these communities. EPA recommends that the plan include commitments to continue working with these communities to assist with relocation and redevelopment activities associated with BRT station area development. The plan should also identify the extent to which toll revenues and toll discounts will be used to improve mobility and equity for disadvantaged populations.

Result: Decrease in Impact: No Change: Increase in Impact:

Result: _____

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Final (including Final Supplements) **Date of EPA Communication:** _____

Description of Impact (Include Quantitative Data if Possible): _____

Recommendation: _____

Result: Decrease in Impact: No Change: Increase in Impact:

Result: _____

5. Significant Environmental Impact:

Impact (Enter Alpha Numeric Code(s) for All that Apply): B3, B6

* * * * *

Prior To Draft Time Frame (if available) **Date of EPA Communication:** none

Description of Impact (Include Quantitative Data if Possible): _____

Recommendation: _____

Result: Decrease in Impact: No Change: Increase in Impact:

Result: _____

* * * * *

Draft (including Draft Supplements) **Date of EPA Communication:** 08/13/07

Description of Impact (Include Quantitative Data if Possible): EPA has concerns about degradation of water quality in various waterways from erosion, siltation and other pollutants associated with road construction, long-term operations, and direct and indirect development associated with the proposed BRT stations and other transit facilities, including parking lots. The various project alternatives have the potential to impact several streams which appear on Georgia Environmental Protection Division's 2006 303(d) list of impaired waterbodies from several different pollutants and sources. The project should add significantly to the amount of impervious pavement surfaces in the study area.

Recommendation: EPA recommends that all stormwater runoff from the proposed roadway be collected and treated before being discharged to surface waters. Furthermore, EPA suggests employing the use of Low Impact Development (LID) practices in the preliminary engineering and design of the roadway, bus stations and other support facilities.

Result: Decrease in Impact: No Change: Increase in Impact:

Result: _____

* * * * *

Final (including Final Supplements) **Date of EPA Communication:** _____

Description of Impact (Include Quantitative Data if Possible): _____

Recommendation: _____

Result: Decrease in Impact: No Change: Increase in Impact:

Result: _____