

Appendix E

Setting Up A Self Managed Program in Small Communities

Often times local agencies are confronted with complaints from citizen groups, and or individuals regarding traffic problems pertaining to their respective neighborhoods. Typical complaints involve speeding, cut-through traffic, high traffic volumes, accidents, noise, pollution, sight distance, safety of children, pedestrians, and bicyclists, etc. The local agencies also have to respond to the complaints of this nature received by a mayor or a City Council person. What should a local agency do and what steps should it follow in order to address these complaints? This section provides an overview of everything that a local agency needs to know about setting up a RTM program that has guidelines to deal with problems of this nature.

Authority to undertake RTM programs

Before setting up a RTM program, a local agency would want to know the authority it has in implementing any such program. Although there are no specific state statutes related to residential traffic management, the authority for RTM programs can be derived from the same statutes which allow jurisdictions to install and maintain other traffic control devices such as stop signs and traffic signals. Titles 46 and 47 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) contain the statutes dealing with motor vehicles, public highways and transportation in the state of Washington. The chapters and sections of the laws applicable to the residential traffic management are discussed below.

Section 46.90.010 of the RCW directs the Director of the Department of Licensing to adopt a model traffic ordinance containing a comprehensive set of uniform traffic laws for Washington communities. The model ordinance is codified in Chapter 308-300 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC).

The basic authority for the installation and maintenance of traffic control devices rests with the "traffic engineer" for each local jurisdiction. WAC 308-330-260 (pursuant to RCW 46.90.010) establishes the office of "traffic engineer" and generally describes his or her duties. Absent a specific position of traffic engineer in a jurisdiction, the statutory duties of the traffic engineer may be carried out by the jurisdiction's engineer or other person appointed to carry them out.

The authority for specific acts by the traffic engineer is provided by WAC 308-330-265. The predecessor of this WAC regulation (formerly RCW 46.90.265) was cited by traffic engineers in Bellevue, King County and Seattle as the source of their authority for the RTM programs in these jurisdictions. Under the more recent RCW 46.90.010, the WAC regulation should have the same effect.

For RTM programs, the following subsections of the WAC apply:

WAC 308-330-265 (1). The traffic engineer is authorized to place and maintain official traffic control devices when and as required under the traffic ordinances or resolutions of the local authority to make effective the provisions of said ordinances or resolutions, and may place and maintain such additional official traffic control devices as he/she may deem necessary to regulate, warn, or guide traffic under the traffic ordinances or resolutions of the local authority;

(4) To establish safety zones of such kind and character and at such places as he/she may deem necessary for the protection of pedestrians;

(23) To test new or proposed traffic control devices under actual conditions of traffic.

The latter section (23) establishes the authority of the traffic engineer to undertake demonstration projects involving traffic control devices under actual conditions of traffic. This section allows jurisdictions to test various RTM measures under the guidance of the local traffic engineer.

Speed Limits. The basic speed limits for unposted streets in cities and towns in Washington is set at 25 mph by RCW 46.61.400(2). The basic rule of speed restrictions is more applicable to RTM settings:

RCW 46.61.400 Basic Rule and maximum limits. (1) No person shall drive a vehicle on a highway at a speed greater than is reasonable and prudent under the conditions and having regard to the actual and potential hazards then existing. ... (emphasis added)

RCW 47.24.020 requires WSDOT approval for speed limits established by local authorities on city streets that are part of the state highway system.

Goals and Objectives

The goals selected for RTM program should be consistent with local needs, desires and resources, should be non-conflicting and accepted and easily understood by local officials. The primary goal could be the improvement of living and environmental conditions in residential streets.

The objectives must be clear, concise, and unambiguous, should be consistent with goals and priorities. The objectives could be improvements in safety, and reduction in noise and air pollution.

Identification of the Needs

Growing public awareness of the neighborhood traffic problems and related issues mounted to increasing pressure on the local agencies in dealing with the problems. These problems range from high speeds, high traffic volumes to excessive non-resident parking, to poor geometrics and pavement surface. The issues range from safety to pollution, to inconvenience. The local agencies use two approaches to identify and address the problems and issues associated with residential traffic management.

Based on Complaints

In most cities, neighborhood traffic problems are identified primarily through the complaints they receive from the residents. Some cities have established standard procedures for assessing a complaint and dealing with it. Usually, they require citizens to document their problems in a standard format (e.g., the Citizens' Action Request Form in this appendix). If the complaint is from an individual, the problem is confirmed either by conducting interviews with the residents of the neighborhood or by requiring the individual to obtain problem confirming signatures from other residents in the neighborhood. Before undertaking a detailed assessment, based on a complaint, of the nature and the gravity of a neighborhood traffic problem, it is important to ascertain whether it is a widely experienced problem or the one that is perceived by one or two individuals of the neighborhood. A written complaint with signatures corroborating the problem provides the local agency with enough justification to address the problem.

Based on Inventory Information

Some cities periodically update inventory of the conditions of local streets. Typically, the inventory updates are done for traffic volume, speed, accident, and composition data, pavement condition data, data on traffic control devices, signs, and markings, and other pertinent information. These cities use either locally developed standards or state standards or guidelines from other established sources, to identify conditions of streets in need of attention.

Assessment of the Problem

Once it is confirmed that there exists a problem in a neighborhood, the local agency should undertake field studies to understand the nature of the problem, its complexity, magnitude, and origin. In general, the field studies are conducted for information on traffic volume counts, speed, accidents, traffic operations, parking patterns, traffic composition, design features and geometrics of the roadway, and land use. Analysis of all these factors and other pertinent factors would help reveal the real cause(s) of the problem. Sometimes,

contrary to the beliefs of the residents, the real cause of the problem may be lying within the neighborhood. For instance, on-street parking shortages in certain neighborhoods have been found to be the result not only of commuter use of the spaces, but partly due to residential off-street parking standards being below the level needed to handle resident's cars.

Development of Alternatives

Community involvement plays a crucial role in the development of alternatives for alleviating neighborhood traffic problems. In developing alternative plans, all affected groups should be invited for an open discussion of the problem and possible solutions. Transportation professionals should educate the community groups, emergency service personnel, and other affected parties of various possible ways in which a problem may be addressed. It is equally important to listen to the solutions that the affected groups might have in dealing with a particular problem. The communities should be informed of both long and short term solutions, although they usually prefer a quick fix solution to their respective neighborhood problems. Usually a combination of short-term and long-term solutions may be in the best interest of the community. For example, a short-term solution to excessive non-resident parking on local streets might be to implement resident permit parking. Longer-term solution would include developing a commute-reduction program to reduce the percentage of non-residents arriving by auto, improving the management of available commercial parking facilities, and constructing additional parking facilities for non-residents' use.

While preparing alternative schemes, some of the important factors to be considered are the access restrictions to emergency vehicles, safety issues, traffic operational impacts, and environmental impacts.

Evaluation of Alternatives

A detailed assessment of the selected alternatives should be conducted in order to determine their feasibility of implementation of an alternative and likelihood of its success in mitigating a neighborhood traffic problem. The impacts to be assessed include:

Access restrictions to the emergency vehicles, school and transit buses, other service vehicles because of the alternatives

- > Safety issues associated with the alternatives**
- > Impacts of the alternatives on the adjacent neighborhoods**
- > Other Traffic and parking operational impacts**
- > Land use impacts**
- > Environmental impacts including noise pollution, air pollution, and fuel consumption**
- > Impacts on the aesthetics of the neighborhood**

Besides these issues, financial and economic feasibility, socio-political impacts, and legal implications of the alternatives should also be studied in detail. Lastly and most importantly, legal aspects of the traffic control devices involved in the alternatives should be given due consideration.

Selection of an Alternative

The alternatives should be compared in a matrix format in relation to the factors and issues listed in the above section. Using the matrix, transportation professionals can help the decision makers in their choice by identifying the merits and demerits of various alternatives and by recommending some of them. The final selection of an alternative is usually the responsibility of elected officials. Neighborhood groups also have considerable influence in the selection process. However, it is the duty of transportation professionals to inform the decision makers of all possible consequences of the alternatives.

Implementation

The implementation of a neighborhood traffic control plan involves several issues including public notice and involvement, enforcement, the choice of temporary and permanent installations, financing implementation, incremental versus one step implementation, timing of various phases of installation. Besides, care should be taken to see that the plan satisfies all the legal requirements. If the traffic control plan involves installation of any devices, standard manuals, and texts should be referred to for guidelines.

Public notice, citizen involvement, and police enforcement

Public and motorists should be informed of the implementation plan so that they are fully aware of the changes about to take place. The information can be passed to the affected interests by distributing notices, posters, and flyers. Also, emergency services including police, fire, paramedics, and other services such as public transit, school buses, and delivery services should be made fully aware of the implementation schedule and the changes.

Since the enforcement is the key for the successful implementation of any program, it is important to apprise the enforcement personnel of the plan, of the laws related to new controls, and expected construction schedule.

Also, local magistrates should be informed of the purpose of the program, the planning process involved, the legal basis for the devices, and the planned enforcement program. This could be useful in case of any future legal entanglements.

Temporary versus permanent devices

The choice between temporary and permanent devices involves substantial trade-offs. Temporary devices are easy to modify, and cost effective for installation in several locations. They can be used as experimental devices, modified or upgraded if proved to be successful,

dismantled otherwise, without involving huge losses. On the negative side, they may create technical, legal, aesthetic, and political problems. Vandalism and disobedience is also a possibility with these devices.

Permanent devices on the other hand are aesthetically pleasing, command better obedience and respect. However it is financially risky to install them if their effectiveness is subject to question.

Financing and Implementation

The costs of a neighborhood traffic control scheme vary depending upon the type and the extent to which the devices are used. The funds for financing these schemes are obtained from general funds in most states of the U.S. However in some states, fuel taxes, motor vehicle taxes, parking revenues, and other transportation funds are utilized for funding these schemes. Occasionally, commercial developments contributing to the neighborhood problems fund these schemes while community development funds or other grants are used in certain lower income neighborhoods to help pay for traffic control schemes.

Incremental Vs One-Step Implementation

Incremental approach is followed when the resources are limited, and the implementation plan is large. This approach allows for careful evaluation of the impacts associated with individual installations and provides room for rectifying the mistakes in later installations. However, series of changes in traffic operations spread over a longer period of time could lead to adverse public reactions. Controversies may raise over which neighborhood was chosen for early implementation of the plan over others.

One-Step implementation on the other hand avoids issues of favoritism and repeated changes in the traffic operations. However, one time-large scale changes in traffic conditions could lead to complicated traffic flow and control problems and could become a target for political opposition.

Timing of Installations

Ideally, installation of any traffic devices should be done when least number of drivers and residents are around. e.g. Summer time in a university town. In the communities where such situation is not likely to occur, effort should be made to avoid implementation of the programs in peak traffic seasons like Christmas shopping season near downtown etc.

Evaluation

Evaluation process of any RTM traffic control program is the most critical process since it forms the basis for any future program of similar nature. It helps determine how well the scheme performed and how effective it was in achieving the intended objectives. Before conducting the evaluation process, a waiting period of three to six months should be given to allow for the residents and traffic to adjust to the new program.

A "before-after" traffic study should be a part of the evaluation process to study the impacts of the scheme on various factors such as traffic volumes, vehicle composition, trip diversion, accidents, speeds, aesthetics, safety. Residents' perceptions on these factors and input from the personnel of emergency services, public transit, and school buses regarding their experiences with the program could be very valuable in the evaluation process.

Public Participation

In all the steps listed above, it could be noticed that public participation had a prominent role to play in shaping any RTM program. Public involvement in all steps of the program builds the trust of citizens in their governing bodies, and increases the chances of success of a program. Also, it is very crucial to a city committed to improving the living conditions, welfare, and safety of its citizens and the neighborhoods they live in.

Program Monitoring and record keeping

Successful programs should be monitored constantly and records should be kept on the problems and issues associated with them. These records could be very beneficial for similar programs of the future.

Where (and When) to Get Help?

In case of any ambiguity concerning any issue related to RTM, the small communities could consult the following sources.

1. Experienced staff of the cities where successful RTM programs exist (e.g. City of Portland, City of Bellevue, City of Seattle, etc.)
2. Private traffic consultant
3. WSDOT and the Northwest Technology Transfer Center
4. References listed in this report (Public libraries could be encouraged to have them)

Common sense, reasonableness and liability exposure

Clearly best protection is a reasonable, logical and well thought out plan with good guidelines. While reasonableness should be exercised in implementing any Residential Traffic Management program, tradeoffs and risks should be recognized in case of any discretionary action.

As in the case of any other traffic engineering activity or improvement, care should be taken to follow the guidelines suggested in standard manuals before installing any traffic control devices for RTM.

All facts and engineering decisions should be documented to minimize the possibility of lawsuits. Residential Traffic Management programs in place should be followed upon to evaluate their effectiveness in neighborhood traffic control.

CITIZEN ACTION REQUEST FORM

FOR THE FIRST PHASE IN NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Contact Name: _____ Day Phone: _____

Address: _____ Today's Date: _____

Neighborhood: _____

Concerned Location: _____

What concerns have you identified at the above location?

What Phase I solutions do you feel would address your concerns? (Check one or more)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Trimming Bushes | <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhood Traffic Safety Campaign |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Signing | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Enforcement | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Speed Humps | _____ |

Thank you for taking the time to fill out the Citizen Action Request Form. After completing the form, fold it for mailing (address appears on the other side of this form). *Don't forget to use first class postage.* Once we receive the form, we will contact you to investigate traffic solutions.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
Date Received: _____		Project Number: _____	
Field Investigated: _____			
Accidents <input type="checkbox"/>	Speeds <input type="checkbox"/>	Volumes <input type="checkbox"/>	Map <input type="checkbox"/>
Neighborhood Contacted: _____			
Traffic Improvement Plan Selected: _____			



City of Phoenix

STREET TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT DEVICES

Traffic Management Device	Traffic Reduction	Speed Reduction	Noise and Pollution	Safety	Traffic Access Restrictions	Emergency Vehicle Access	Maintenance Problems	Level of Violation	Cost
Speed Bumps	Possible	Limited	Increase Noise	No Documented Problems	None	Minor Problems	None	Not Applicable	Low
STOP Signs*	Unlikely	None	Increase	Unclear	None	Minor Problems	None	Potentially High	Moderate
NO LEFT/RIGHT TURN Signs	Yes	None	Decrease	Improved	No Turn(s)	No Problems	Vandalism	Potentially High	Low
One-Way Street	Yes	None	Decrease	Improved	One Direction	One Direction	None	Low	Low
Chokers	Unlikely	Minor	No Change	Improved For Pedestrians	None	No Problems	Trucks Hit Curbs	Not Applicable	Moderate
Traffic Circle	Possible	Likely	No Change	Unclear	None	Some Constraint	Vandalism	Low	Moderate
Motion Barrier	Yes	None	Decrease	Improved	Right Turn Only	Minor Constraint	None	Low	Moderate
Forced Turn Channelization	Yes	Possible	Decrease	Improved	Some	Minor Constraint	Vandalism	Potentially High	Moderate
Semi-Diverter	Yes	Likely	Decrease	Improved	One Direction	Minor Constraint	Vandalism	Potentially High	Moderate
Diagonal Dividers	Yes	Likely	Decrease	Improved	Some	Some Constraint	Vandalism	Low	Moderate
Cal-de-Sac	Yes	Likely	Decrease	Improved	Total	Some Constraint	Vandalism	Low	Moderate

*Must meet legal requirements for installation
 **May result in high roadway user costs

WHAT IS THE NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAM?

The Neighborhood Traffic Management Program was created in 1989 by the Phoenix City Council and is operated by the Street Transportation Department. Since that time the program has been addressing neighborhood traffic safety concerns by enabling citizens and/or community groups to become involved with the improvement process.

In this way, the Street Transportation Department and the neighborhood community work together to create a pleasant and safe environment in which to live.



WHY WOULD OUR NEIGHBORHOOD BECOME INVOLVED?

There could be many reasons. Some major ones include:

- Vehicles travelling faster than the posted speed limit.
- Non-local traffic using the neighborhood as a short cut.
- High number of traffic accidents.
- Pedestrian safety.

HOW DOES THE PROGRAM WORK?

The program involves a two-phase process. Depending on the nature of the problem, some solutions can be resolved and action taken immediately, while others may take longer.

PHASE I

The first phase measures the extent of the problem and focuses on using effective but less restrictive measures first. Doing so allows the opportunity to change driver behaviors and correct the problem *without* imposing severe and drastic changes.

- Citizen request from Home Owners' Association or by petition
- Traffic Engineering Reviews... 1-2 months
- Organize neighborhood and develop traffic management plan..... 1-3 months
- If approved by the neighborhood and Phoenix City Council, work is completed... 1 month

PHASE II

The second phase focuses on physical measures. These are *only necessary or desirable, if the first phase improvements are ineffective.*

- Review 1st Phase Improvements .. 1 month
- *If necessary, modify or develop additional traffic control measures* 1 month
- A petition is circulated by neighborhood with at least a 70% majority 1-2 months
- Public Hearing 1-2 months
- If approved by the neighborhood and the City Council, work is completed..... 1-3 months

HOW DOES OUR NEIGHBORHOOD BEGIN THE PROCESS?

1. Identify the **PROBLEMS** in your neighborhood. For example:
 - Limited visibility or sight distance.
 - Unusually high traffic volumes.
 - Speeding vehicles.
 - Unsafe walking routes.
2. Discuss the types of **SOLUTIONS** with your neighbors. Possible solutions may be as follows:

Trimming Bushes

Trim bushes either by the homeowners or City crews to provide better sight distance.

Signage

Install appropriate traffic control signs. These may include speed limit, parking restrictions, turn restrictions, etc.

Target Enforcement

Increased enforcement of the speed limit by the Phoenix Police Department. Police cannot be at all places at all times. However, with neighborhood assistance they can target their efforts to those times when speeding is most prevalent and through their presence increase driver awareness.

Speed Humps

The installation of 3" asphalt humps placed across the street to slow motorists down. Residents may elect to use one hump or a series of humps along a street to control speeds.

3. **FILL OUT** the Citizen Action Request Form enclosed.

Please note: Each project will be evaluated and prioritized on a first come, first serve basis, and the ability of the neighborhood to show consensus for a traffic management plan.

IS THE PROGRAM SUCCESSFUL?

The success of the program is reflected by the positive comments and results achieved in neighborhoods throughout Phoenix. The most successful efforts occur where the neighborhood establishes traffic safety as a community priority and becomes actively involved. By working as a community, you have taken the first step toward a more pleasant and safer neighborhood in which to live.

*A Public Awareness Program
Sponsored by the City of Phoenix
Street Transportation Department*



APPENDIX E - ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

Rogue Valley

Council of Governments

Grants Pass Urban Area Transportation Plan Update Environmental Documentation

Transportation Department

June, 1995

OVERVIEW

Most environmental legislation comes from the federal government. Implementation, however, is relegated to the states. This document describes some of the more commonly used environmental laws and their applicability to transportation planning in the Grants Pass area. The document is presented in two sections: (1) a brief summary of federal legislation relevant to the Grants Pass Master Transportation Plan update including the implementing authorities; and (2) a description of documents containing environmental reviews pertinent to the Grants Pass area and their findings.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Clean Air Act (CAA)

Air quality became a national issue in the 1960s. Legislation passed in 1963 and in 1967 provided the foundation for today's air quality laws. The acts divided the United States into air quality regions and set national emission standards for air pollutants. It required states to develop state improvement plans (SIP)s to conform with the national emission standards. In 1970, the Federal Clean Air Act was enacted. It was a product of dissatisfaction over enforcement of the earlier laws and the continued feeling that poor air quality threatened public health. The 1970 Act contains three elements: (1) deadlines for meeting federal air quality standards; (2) health and welfare criteria for CO, NO, SO, ozone, lead, particulate matter, and toxic pollutants; and 3) requirements for the use of the best available technology to meet air quality standards. This was also the first act to provide for citizen suits as a means of enforcement. Although amended in 1977 and 1990, the principles of the 1970 act still apply. Today, the Act protects areas which are cleaner than ambient standards from degrading to the federal ambient standard, provides for tail pipe emission standards, hazardous air pollution emission standards, contingency plans for accidental releases, acid rain research, and enforcement procedures. Non-attainment areas are defined for areas not meeting ambient standards. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the State Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) regulate the act.

Transportation planning is closely tied with the Clean Air Act. Grants Pass is currently a non-attainment area for both carbon monoxide (CO) and Particulate Matter (PM₁₀). CO is a concern in the downtown core, where ambient standards are approached at certain concentrated areas called "hot spots". Particulate matter is a concern for the entire planning area.

Clean Water Act (CWA)

The Clean Water Act prohibits discharge of pollutants into the waters of the United States, and seeks to restore and maintain the integrity of the nations waters. In 1972, the Act set three broad goals for United States water quality: (1) maintain biological integrity of waters; (2) maximum the use of available technology; and; (3) zero discharge. The act distinguishes between point and non-point sources, divides responsibilities between federal, state, and local governments and distinguishes between water discharge and in filling of wetlands. It set up the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) which requires permits for discharging into navigable waters. The scope of NPDES was recently expanded to include storm water discharge in municipalities over 100,000 in population. The EPA issues permits and the DEQ reviews

standards and sets monitoring criteria. The Clean Water Act is of concern to the Grants Pass area for wetland maintenance (see below).

Statute 404 of the Clean Water Act: Wetlands

Wetland regulation primarily falls under Statute 404 of the Clean Water Act. The statute prohibits the discharge of fill or dredge material into U.S. waters without a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers. In 1988, then Vice-President Bush campaigned on the idea of "no net loss" of the nation's wetlands. Once elected he implemented the federal Emergency Wetlands Resource Act of 1986. The act recognized areas of specific wetland loss around the nation and established mechanisms for public-private cooperation in wetland protection. Authority for wetland regulation falls upon the Army Corp of Engineers, the EPA, the Department of the Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service.

Wetlands are a concern in transportation planning. Construction usually requires the movement, in filling, or grading of soils. Oregon has a planning policy (benchmark) of no net loss of the state's wetlands. The Grants Pass Urban Area contains significant wetland areas.

Endangered Species Act (ESA)

Passed in 1973, ESA protects both threatened and endangered species and their habitat. Species refers to plants as well as animals. The Department of the Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service continually updates a list of threatened and endangered species.

In planning, a biological assessment must be completed to determine if a species or its critical habitat is effected by a project. If impacts are discovered they must be satisfactorily mitigated before a project receives approval.

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

This act refers to the protection of fish stock and habitat. A cost benefit analysis of relevant projects must be completed prior to approval. If impacted, provisions for conservation, maintenance, and management of fish resources on project land and water must be made. The Department of Interior's Fish and Wildlife Department is the primary regulator.

The Rogue River, a major fishery resource for the state of Oregon, cuts through Grants Pass. Projects must not impact the riparian zones along the river or the river itself with runoff, habitat removal or other impacts.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

NEPA was signed into law January first 1970. Its purpose is to identify and to mitigate environmental impacts early in the planning process. NEPA requires an environmental assessment of all projects receiving federal funds. If significant impacts are found, a written environmental review, called an environmental impact statement (EIS), must be conducted. Significant impacts are those considered to effect the "quality of the human environment or are

expected to be controversial on environmental grounds." The process includes public comment periods.

NEPA may affect specific projects identified in the Grants Pass Master Transportation Plan update.

Noise Control Act

As population and population densities increase, so do levels of noise. Noise pollution is of specific concern to those located near airports, industrial areas, or freeways. The Noise Control Act provides noise controls for surface transportation, construction, aviation and railways. It also protects against inadvertent exposure through education and through the labeling of "noise intensive" products. The EPA and state Department of Transportation regulate the Noise Control Act.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)

RCRA regulated the management and disposal of solid and hazardous waste. A hazardous waste causes or contributes to mortality or human and/or environmental health. Solid waste are materials not immediately reused. Recyclable materials may be considered part of the solid waste problem. Solid waste can be a solid, a liquid, a gas or a sludge.

RCRA applies to transportation planning where hazardous and solid wastes are routed during transport. For completion of the Grants Pass Master Transportation Plan update, hazardous and solid waste transport routes should be known. An understanding of potential disasters, natural or otherwise, along those routes is also recommended.

Comprehensive Environmental Response Act (CERCLA)

Superfunds Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA)

Toxic Control Substances Act (TSCA)

The three acts above address hazardous waste clean-up and disposal. CERCLA (a.k.a. Superfund) and SARA provide the financial mechanisms for the remediation and clean up of hazardous waste. TSCA controls toxic and chemical substances posing an "unreasonable risk to environmental and/or human welfare". It requires manufactures to provide information on the health and environmental risks associated with products and with manufacturing processes. The EPA regulates the aforementioned acts.

Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA)

The Safe Drinking Water Act serves to protect drinking water by setting standards for water source and quality. It involves: (1) a national drinking water standards program and; (2) an underground injection control program. The first program requires public water facilities to treat water to meet minimal national standards for contaminants. The second program establishes a permit process for the underground disposal of liquid wastes. SDWA is regulated by the EPA.

The act applies to transportation planning when a project impacts groundwater wells. It is not anticipated as a significant concern for current transportation planning in Grants Pass.

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

This act protects rivers possessing either pristine corridors or unique scenic, recreational, historic and/or cultural characteristics. Its intent is to protect free-flowing rivers or sections of rivers which symbolize the vanishing heritage of the United States' frontier landscape for present and future generations to enjoy. The Department of Interior's Bureau of Land Management and the Department of Agriculture's United States Forest Service administer the act.

Projects which affect a designated river must provide a detailed description and explanation of the impacts. The Rogue River contains 84 miles of designated wild and scenic river way. The designated area does not fall within the Grants Pass area, yet projects may still fall within the scope of the act if impacts flow downstream.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

Existing documents with environmental information were reviewed as part of this process. This screening was done to identify potential environmental issues for projects recommended in the Grants Pass Urban Area Master Transportation Plan.

Title: 6th Street / 7th Street Couplet Redwood Hwy (US-199) Grants Pass, Josephine County.
Date: June 1994.
Author: ODOT, Environmental Services. Vince Carrow, Air Quality Specialist.
Document Type: Air Quality - Conformity Analysis.
Geographic Area: Area-wide Analysis: Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary.
Local Analysis: 6th St, between G and H streets, in the central business district.

Synopsis:

A local and regional analysis of air quality was conducted on four alternatives for rebuilding a section of the Redwood Highway through downtown Grants Pass. The area-wide study concentrated on carbon monoxide (CO) emissions, while the local study examined CO concentrations. The four alternatives were (1) continuous three lanes, (2) four lanes from "A" Street to the bridge, (3) four lanes from "Midland" Street to the bridge and (4) a no build scenario. Each alternative was examined with and without curbside parking.

Findings:

Conformity with CO criteria (project does not increase CO emissions over those in 1990 or over no build alternative levels nor does it increase CO "hot spots") was achieved with both four lane options without curbside parking. A conformity analysis needs to be done on particulate matter 10 (PM10) as soon as a method of analysis is approved by the EPA.

Title: Preparation Plan for Revising the Hellgate Recreation Area Management Plan.
Date: September 1993.
Author: U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management.
Document Type: Preparation Plan.
Geographic Area: Hellgate Recreation Area of the National Wild and Scenic Rogue River (from Applegate River to Grave Creek). 27 miles.

Synopsis:

The desire to revise the management plan for the Rogue River grew from increases in visitor use and concurrent conflicts. The revision attempts to refocus implementation of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act 1968 (see p. 4). A preparation plan is prepared to document boundaries and goals of previous planning efforts, explain the need for a revised plan, explain the revision process and identify issues, players and alternatives.

Findings:

The BLM proposed to limit recreation use. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) needs to be prepared. The Preparation Plan discusses the following issues: (1) conflicts between private boating (motorized and non-motorized) and commercial boating and angling, and serenity (in reference to motorized boating); (2) commercial regulation; (3) user fees; (4) management of recreational opportunities, including fishing, camping, hiking, and interpretive resources, and; (5) enforcement. The preparation plan discusses four scenarios; (1) less visitor use, requiring permits for all recreational use except sightseeing, dining or lodging; (2) the status quo. This is the baseline alternative to which the other alternatives can be compared; (3) angler and floater enhancement/more visitor use and watercraft. This alternative emphasizes the fishing and floating experience. All motorized boating would be banned during spawning season and strictly regulated the rest of the year. No regulations would be placed on the number of visitors interested in angling or floating. Three new fishing sites would be developed, and; (4) maximum visitor use. This alternative seeks to maximize visitor use, through heavy management, but with few fees and limits. Many new facilities would be developed. Each alternative will be examined in an EIS. The Preparation plan is not available for public comment (public comment is inherent within an EIS) but it will become a public document after plan completion.

Title: Grants Pass Urban Area Wetlands Inventory.
Date: April 1992.
Author: City of Grants Pass.
Document Type: Map.
Geographic Area: Grants Pass, Oregon.

Synopsis:

This is a draft map of wetland locations in the Grants Pass urban area. A final map and a report are in production.

Findings:

Wetlands are located throughout the Grants Pass area, especially on the outer edges of development.

Title: Wetland Determination and Delineation in Grants Pass, Oregon.
Date: July 24, 1991.
Author: Scientific Resources, Inc.
Document Type: Technical.
Geographic Area: Southeast corner of Redwood Hwy #25 and Terry Lane, Grants Pass, Oregon. 10-acres.

Synopsis:

A study was undertaken to determine and to delineate wetlands on a 10 acre site proposed for development. The *Federal Manual for Identifying and Delineating Jurisdictional Wetlands* was the main resource consulted for the determination. The study examined the soil, the hydrology and the vegetation for wetland characteristics. One-foot diameter holes were excavated in selected areas to determine soil content and hydrology. A visual percent cover analysis was completed for vegetative species. To receive wetland status, a site must contain wetland characteristics in all three areas.

Findings:

It was found that no area tested within the site contained the combined wetland characteristics.

Title: Lonnon Road-Fish Hatchery R, New Hope Rd, Josephine County, Oregon.
Date: April 1990.
Author: Oregon Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration.
Document Type: Environmental Assessment.
Geographic Area: New Hope Road, South of Grants Pass. 2.43 miles.

Synopsis:

The environmental assessment pertains to the widening of New Hope Road. At the time of publication, New Hope road was too narrow to adequately allow emergency parking, pedestrian or bicycle traffic. The accident rate on this section of roadway was 17 % higher than the average for rural secondary highways during the five year study period of 1983-1988. The proposed project widens the road from 24 feet to 40 feet, extending the shoulders from 3 feet to 8 feet. It also reconstructs a curve to reduce curvature. Three alternatives were identified and an environmental assessment of the area and of the proposed project was completed.

Findings:

The project would cause the relocation of one residential and possibly one business site. Approximately 8 acres of right-of-way must be obtained from 53 parcels. Impacts on businesses, residents and land use were found to be minimal. Water ways and quality, threatened and endangered species, and other natural resources were not found to be significantly impacted. The drainage method, however, has not been determined although no significant impact is expected.

Historical, cultural, and archeological resources are not anticipated to be a concern, nor is aesthetic resources. Air quality standards would not be exceeded with construction. Three underground storage tanks fall within the proposed right-of-way area, making hazardous materials are a potential concern. Noise levels are also a concern. Project completion results in noise levels for 34 residences exceeding the Federal Highway Administration noise impact criteria. Construction would cause occasional traffic delays and noise impacts. Mitigation measures were proposed for traffic, right of way, noise and hazardous material impacts.

Title: The Third Bridge Corridor Development Plan.
Date: September 1987.
Author: City of Grants Pass.
Document Type: Report and Plan.
Geographic Area: The land area bisected by the pending arterial highway which connects the Redwood spur at the city's south interchange with Interstate 5 and Redwood Highway (U.S. 99). Grants Pass, 868.5 acres.

Synopsis:

The Third Bridge Corridor Development Plan is an urban renewal plan. It is under the jurisdiction of the Development Agency, whose mission statement is to "eliminate blight and depreciating property values". Public utility systems in the area need upgrading, as does the existing street system. This is especially important, in that ODOT plans on constructing a third bridge over the Rogue River. Its connecting streets would bisect the project area. This places development pressure upon the area. Public work activities are proposed to create conditions in the area which facilitate jobs and support the cost of public services. All redevelopment projects will comply with the Grants Pass Comprehensive Plan.

Findings:

Public utility improvements should decrease operation and delivery costs of the city, as well as encourage businesses to locate in the area, creating jobs. The improved roadway system is seen as reducing energy consumption per vehicle mile traveled and reducing air pollution and travel time. Assessed property values are expected to rise as a result of the project.

Title: Final Environmental Impact Statement for Foothill Boulevard, Rogue River and Redwood Highway (3rd Bridge, Grants Pass).
Date: 1987.
Author: Oregon Department of Transportation.
Document Type: Final Environmental Impact Statement.
Geographic Area: Rogue River crossing from Interstate 5 to Highway 99, 199, and 238. Grants Pass, Oregon.

Synopsis:

The proposal of a bypass of the downtown area of Grants Pass, including the construction of a third bridge over the Rogue River, is examined in this Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The document examines the environmental impacts of four alternatives and the no build

alternative. Alternative 1 was proposed for construction. The document identifies project impacts on geology, wildlife, aquatic habitat, energy, transportation, land use, recreation, social and economic environments, historical and archeological resources, aesthetics, air quality, and noise levels.

Findings:

Insignificant impacts were found for historic and archeological resources. Geological impacts were discovered regarding soil type (low strength, high water table, and significant shrink-swell capacities). Mitigation measures provide for drainage which alleviates high water table problems and for the use of lime soil treatment or cement to mitigate soil strength and shrink swell potential. A secondary impact of such is the irretrievable loss of soil resources to urban land uses. Maintenance costs of embankments are significant. Project construction results in the loss of biological habitat, which reduces wildlife production. Secondary impacts of project completion will result in more rapid habitat loss, than the no-build alternative. The project is expected to increase development along its corridor. No threatened or endangered species were found on the project site. Overall impacts were considered minor, in that they are localized and a natural result of development. Following the no build alternative wouldn't avoid this impact, only delay it. Aquatic impacts were found to be minimal, and could be mitigated. Riparian zones supplying organic materials to the river and some stream side pools would be disrupted. The affected area is small and similar habitat is available nearby. The project entails crossing the 50 and 100 year floodplains. Measures are to be taken which alleviate the impediment of floodwater. Alternative 1 intrudes four acres upon the flood plain. Energy consumption is favorably impacted by the project.

Traffic impacts of the project are also considered favorable. Peak hour traffic would be alleviated for downtown Medford as well as travel time. Access to the industrial section of would be improved, resulting in a decrease of through town truck traffic. Access would also be improved for emergency services. The project alone is not considered to cause land use impacts in the entirety. Recreational impacts of the project are deemed beneficial, providing increased access to parks and a bikeway. Noise levels at H.W. Baker Park, although not significant, have been mitigated. Social impacts include improved access for emergency services, improved safety for pedestrians in the downtown area, and the displacement of property. Alternative 1 displaces seven residences and one day care center. Measures have been secured to reimburse those displaced. Residents are agreeable with the action. The project separates a neighborhood. Noise control barriers would be constructed to mitigate the neighborhood noise increase, but in the long run neighborhood character would change. Five businesses would be affected by the project. Overall the project would facilitate business in the central business district and in the industrial area of the city. Aesthetic impacts to the river corridor would occur. Air quality impacts are determined to be beneficial.

Title: Grants Pass Carbon Monoxide Plan.
Date: June 1986.
Author: Rogue Valley Council of Governments.
Document Type: Air Quality Compliance Document.
Geographic Area: Grants Pass Carbon Monoxide Non Attainment Area, Grants Pass,
Oregon.

Synopsis:

Pursuant to the 1977 Clean Air Act amendments, states must submit plans documenting how it will conform with air quality standards. Grants Pass is in an air quality non-attainment area for carbon monoxide. A plan to comply with health standards for CO by December 16, 1990 was needed. Most CO pollution originates for vehicles. The plan, consequently, addresses transportation improvements which result in acceptable CO levels.

Findings:

The City of Grants Pass chose a combination of the federal emissions control program and the construction of a third bridge over the Rogue River as its control measures. (The third bridge program is included in the Six Year Highway Improvement Program by ODOT (see above).) This plan is projected to decrease CO emissions 50 % between 1984 and 1990.