# Introduction

Environmental screening of transportation projects is intended to identify and avoid significant environmental impacts that can result from any construction and development activities. Identification of potential impacts can help balance the sometimes competing interests in improving mobility and preserving important environmental features. Early identification of important environmental factors will maximize opportunities to avoid or minimize environmental impacts of transportation projects, and will avoid unnecessary delays and expenses later in the project development process.

The environmental screening for the GPATS Long Range Transportation Plan will allow the project team to evaluate projects in real time using available and collected data sets. In this manner, options can be evaluated quickly and recommendations can be formulated which best accomplish the transportation goals while minimizing impacts.

In some cases, this process has been proven to effectively eliminate projects determined to have unacceptable impacts or likely to create permitting difficulties due to potential impacts. In these cases, projects actually may be eliminated from consideration. Because individual projects can significantly affect other projects, these issues must be resolved as early as possible to avoid inefficient use of time and resources. The result is a transportation plan that is respectful of the environment and cost-effective in its implementation.

Roadway projects generally have the greatest potential to create significant environmental impacts due to major land clearing and grading activities, modification of natural drainage features, increased stormwater runoff, and traffic. In addition, major roads can become important barriers within communities, affecting the way local residents live and interact.

Sidewalks and bicycle facilities are more limited in the magnitude of their impacts due to smaller cross-sections and greater flexibility to avoid problem areas. Furthermore, pedestrian and bicycle facilities often are built in conjunction with roadway facilities and have only marginal impacts, if any, beyond those of the roadway itself. Generally, stand-along bicycle lane and sidewalk projects are eligible for simplified environmental reviews called Categorical Exclusions (CEs).

Most of the transit improvements in the long-range transportation plan (LRTP) involve bus route and service expansions, which involve no new construction and have minimal impacts on either the natural or manufactured environment. However, some fixedguideway transit improvements are considered in this LRTP, and these facilities are evaluated in the same way as roadway projects. In general, transit impacts tend to be positive because increased service tends to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), reduce the need for road improvements, mitigate traffic congestion, reduce tailpipe emissions, and provide improved accessibility in disadvantaged neighborhoods.

The following discussion of the plan's environmental screening process focuses on overall screening of the natural and cultural environment. It also addresses specific issues related to environmental justice – which evaluates the potential impacts of transportation projects on low-income and minority communities.

The series of maps developed for the overall screening process is used to identify specific impacts of proposed roadway and fixed-guideway transit projects. These maps include wetlands, floodplains and floodways, endangered species, hazardous waste sites and superfund sites, historic sites and historic districts, as well as many other features. When overlaid with the proposed transportation projects, these maps will guide the project team in assessing the relative impacts to the environment.

This information also has been translated into an environmental screening matrix which provides an overview of potential project impacts when compared with qualitative performance measures. Both of these tools are discussed in context of each roadway project. It is important to note that this environmental screening is merely a cursory review of available data and is not intended as a replacement for a more thorough project by project evaluation. For most projects, more precise environmental assessments will be necessary as projects are developed. However, the environmental screening should help identify major environmental impacts that could derail projects.

# **Environmental Features**

Growth and development unavoidably generate some environmental impacts, just as virtually all human activity produces some pollution. The key is to balance the often competing human need and interest for housing, mobility, and commerce with desires for high quality of life, recreation, clean air and water, and environmental preservation. Managing the impacts associated with new infrastructure is required by state and federal laws and also is an important element of environmental stewardship. Figures 5.1 to 5.4 depict important environmental features within the GPATS study area.

Figure 5.1 maps key natural resource factors in the GPATS region. The map includes wetlands, state parks, 401 Certification sites, and threatened and endangered species sites. Wetlands within the study area are widely scattered along the rivers and major creek systems throughout the study area. Some of the largest wetland areas are located along the Reedy River, Saluda River, and Enoree River in Greenville County, as well as along the creeks north of Paris Mountain State Park. South of the City of Pickens, extensive wetlands are found on Wolf Creek west of US 178, and on Rice's Creek between US 178 and SC 8. In Anderson County, Pickens Creek and Little Brushy Creek drain significant wetland areas.

### Chapter 5

### Social and Environmental Screening



Long Range Transportation Plan

**GPATS** 

A 1 50

401 Certification sites are locations where state permits have been issued to protect water quality. Section 401 of the Clean Water Act allows requires that the State issue certification for any activity which requires a Federal permit and may result in a discharge to State waters. The focus of the 401 Water Quality Certification for impacts in wetlands is on the role wetlands play in the protection of water quality of surface waters and the uses of those waters.

Threatened and endangered species in the study area are most concentrated in northern Greenville County. Other significant areas are found along the SC 183 corridor in Pickens County west of SC 135, and in Spartanburg County south of Greer. Three endangered plant species are found in the study area: Bunched Arrowhead, Mountain Sweet Pitcher Plant, and Black-spored Quillwort. Dwarf-flowered Heartleaf is a threatened plant species. Rare plants species include Striped Maple and Oconee Bells. No endangered or threatened animal species are identified in the map, but Cooper's Hawk and the Barn Owl are rare bird species that are found in the study area.

Figure 5.2 presents 100-year floodplains within the study area. Generally, the widest and most extensive floodplains are found along the Enoree River, Reedy River, Saluda River, and Gilder Creek in Greenville County. In Pickens and Anderson counties, several creeks have wide and extensive floodplains associated with them.

Figure 5.3 inventories environmental issues within the study area. One hundred federal superfund sites are found within the GPATS area, as well as 114 dry cleaner locations. Dry cleaners are identified because of the percholorethylene solvent used in the cleaning process, which is a pervasive toxic contaminant and significant ground water contamination risk. Underground storage tanks are identified because they are often located at sites, often gasoline stations, where old tanks may have leaked and contaminated ground water. Any federally-funded land acquisition activity cannot be undertaken without remediation of groundwater contamination, which can substantially increase the cost of projects.

Figure 5.4 identifies cultural resources, including National Register of Historic Places sites and historic districts. Hospitals, golf courses, schools, churches, parks and libraries are also identified.

The Upstate's environmental features are a major component of region's high quality of life, which continues to attract newcomers and visitors to the region. These features and amenities are a key part of the area's identity, a careful consideration of these maps as potential transportation projects are identified and developed will help preserve and protect these valuable resources.

# **Environmental Justice**

Environmental justice requirements arise from an Executive Order designed to avoid the use of federal funds for projects, programs, or other activities that create disproportionate or discriminatory adverse impacts on minority or low-income communities. This effort is consistent with Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and is promoted by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) as an integral part of the long-range transportation planning process, as well as individual project planning and design. The environmental justice assessment incorporated in this LRTP update was based on three basic principles, derived from guidance issued by the USDOT:

- The planning process should avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental impacts (including economic, social, and human health impacts) that affect minority and low-income populations with disproportionate severity.
- Transportations benefits should not be delayed, reduced, or denied to minority and low-income populations.
- Any community potentially affected by outcomes of the transportation planning process should be provided with the opportunity for complete and equitable participation in decision-making.

As part of this transportation plan update, data from the Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP) was used to identify the concentration and geographic distribution of low-income, Hispanic, and minority populations as well as zero-car households. While environmental justice requirements generally arose from efforts to avoid negative impacts on these communities, the information also is useful when evaluating plans for transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements, as low-income areas generally rely more on non-automobile transportation than do more affluent areas. Figures 5.5 through 5.8 present important environmental justice characteristics of the

GPATS study area based on data at the Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) level. More detailed evaluation of neighborhoods at the project-specific level is an important supplement to this analysis, which is designed to identify broader distribution of households across the region.

Figure 5.5 depicts the distribution of low-income populations. This map reveals that the areas with the highest percentages of low-income households include:

- The area west of downtown Greenville known as the "textile crescent," which is composed largely of aging mill village housing stock and has been affected by the disappearance of textile manufacturing jobs;
- The Nicholtown community in the City of Greenville near the interchange of US 276 and SC 291;

- The area north of downtown Easley, between SC 8 and SC 135; and
- The corridor along US 25 in southern Greenville County.

**GPATS** 

A 1 54

Figure 5.6 shows the distribution of zero-vehicle households in the study area. This data is especially useful for evaluating need for sidewalks and bicycle facilities as well as public transportation services. Generally, the distribution of zero-vehicle households is similar nearly the same as the distribution of low-income households.

Figure 5.7 shows the distribution of the Hispanic population through the region. It is important to note that the U.S. Census treats Hispanic origin as an ethnic characteristic and not as a race. Hispanic persons may be racially white, black, or any other race.

Figure 5.8 shows the distribution of minority (non-white) population. Regionally, most of the TAZs with higher concentrations of minority households are found in a triangular area in central Greenville County.

In Greenville County, minority populations are greatest along the I-85 corridor in Greenville, near the Nicholtown community (near US 276 and SC 291), and west of the City of Greenville in the textile crescent. The semi-rural areas in southern Greenville County along Fork Shoals Road tend to have relatively high shares of minority population, according to 2000 Census data.

In Pickens County, high percentages of minority population are found north of downtown Easley between SC 8 and SC 135, southwest of downtown Pickens, and northeast of downtown Liberty. In Spartanburg County, the highest concentrations of minority population are found east of downtown Greer.

GPATS evaluated the distribution of minority population throughout the planning process and the public involvement process. For additional information on minority and low-income outreach efforts, please refer to Chapter 2 - Introduction and Vision.

While it is nearly impossible to construct infrastructure without impacts, it is through careful planning and early consideration that the GPATS Transportation Plan intends to manage impacts to communities effectively. Rather than an ad hoc approach to environmental justice planning, this transportation plan identified areas where income, race, ethnicity and automobile availability are important factors early in the planning process. Early identification allows for an assessment of the existing transportation plan and consideration of socioeconomic factors in the selection, distribution and alignment of future transportation improvements.

It must be stressed that the environmental justice screening conducted for this study is not intended to quantify specific impacts but rather to guide the development of a plan that is equitable in terms of both costs and benefits. More careful and detailed analysis of individual projects, including field surveys, will be needed to identify and address specific community impacts on a project-by-project basis.

## **Planning Guidelines**

During the development of the transportation plan, the project team used the available data to avoid and minimize impacts to known environmental features. The collection and consideration of this data early in the planning process is intended to lessen environmental impacts and reduce potential conflicts during permitting. In addition, when considering new roadway alignments and extensions, planners and engineers should use a guiding set of principles, including those listed below, to ensure that environmental considerations are followed:

- Avoid steep slopes and otherwise unsuitable topography
- Minimize impacts to the built environment
- Stay away from FEMA designated floodplains
- Minimize the number of wetland (National Wetland Inventory) impacts
- Minimize the amount of each wetland impact (e.g., don't cross a wide wetland when a narrower one can be crossed)
- Minimize the number and length of stream crossings
- Minimize the impact to school sites
- Minimize the number and size of impacts to historic features and districts
- Minimize the number and size of impacts to threatened and endangered species
- Minimize the number and size of impacts to hazardous waste sites
- Minimize the number and size of impacts to superfund sites
- Minimize or avoid impacts to neighborhoods
- Avoid unnecessary or disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income communities
- Avoid impacts to parks, designated open spaces, and game lands
- Be aware of emergency evacuation routes and potential emergency scenarios and targets
- Minimize the number of new facilities in critical watershed areas
- Be aware of existing development patterns
- Capitalize on street connectivity opportunities such as stub streets
- Encourage a multimodal system with the promotion of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit networks













































Long Range Transportation Plan

## **Environmental Impacts**

A qualitative screening was performed to assess the potential environmental impacts of projects included in the GPATS Long-Range Transportation Plan. This analysis consisted of overlaying roadway project alignments/locations onto a series of maps described earlier in the chapter that depict natural features, cultural/community sites, and demographic data. A windshield survey of project corridors was also conducted to verify noteworthy features. In addition, the screening considers elements for which GIS coverages were available. The results of this evaluation are summarized in matrix form and represent a qualitative assessment of potential project issues (see **Table 5.1**). The matrix evaluation criteria are grouped into three separate areas – Environment/Natural Features, Cultural and Community Resources, and Environmental Justice.

Potential project impacts (if any) are classified as "Minor," "Moderate," or "Major" for each of the above categories. This determination is based on a combination of objective and subjective criteria. For example, impacts are generally considered less severe if a project involves widening or other improvements along an existing roadway, as opposed to construction on a new alignment. The following guidelines were used to rate project impacts in these categories:

### **Minor Impacts**

**GPATS** 

A 11 50

- Minor stream crossing
- Nearby environmentally sensitive feature
- Slight environmental justice effect

#### **Moderate Impacts**

- Multiple stream crossings or minor river crossing
- Directly affects environmentally sensitive feature
- Moderate environmental justice effect

#### **Major Impacts**

- Major river crossing
- Substantially affects environmentally sensitive features
- Significant environmental justice effect

### **Environment/Natural Features**

This section is primarily focused on natural features related to water features and threatened/endangered species as well as manmade hazards such as superfund sites. The characterization of impacts is primarily related to the presences of these features within a project corridor. As the frequency of these issues is noted, the severity index increases from no impact to major impacts. Specific features in this category include:

- Hydrologic (Floodplains and Floodways, Wetlands, River and Stream Crossings)
- Threatened or Endangered Species
- Hazardous Materials (Environmental Hazards, Superfund Sites)

### **Cultural and Community Resources**

This category indicates the presence of community services, cultural resources and institutions including schools, churches, parks, protected lands, and historic areas. The impacts of these types of community resources are often that of proximity or when right-of-way is required from these sites. In the most extreme cases buildings may be directly impacted. More specifically, these features include schools, parks and open space, hospitals, churches/cemeteries, historic resources, and disrupting or fragmenting communities.

### **Environmental Justice**

Environmental justice reviews conducted at the systems planning level typically involve the analysis of available demographic data from the US census. When reviewing the LRTP, it is important to consider not only specific project impacts, but also the distribution of projects and transportation investments throughout the study area. The plan seeks to minimize disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income groups through proactive planning. As previously mentioned, the GPATS transportation planning process sought to minimize impacts to these groups by involving them in the planning process and avoiding or minimizing disproportionate impacts during the project selection.

For the purposes of this screening exercise, projects were evaluated for their relative impacts or benefits to minority and Hispanic communities as well as to low-income and zero-vehicle households.





Long Range Transportation Plan

# Environmental Screening as a Planning Tool

The collection and consideration of environmental data during the development of the LRTP serves as yet another tool to ensure that the plan respects the presence of environmentally sensitive areas within the region. When considered with best practices, this data resulted in selecting roadway projects and alignments that minimized impacts. Therefore, this analysis was used not only to eliminate any candidate projects with

"fatal" flaws, but also to improve those projects that provide true benefits to the transportation network. The information obtained from this exercise enhanced proposed projects by adjusting alignments to minimize possible environmental impacts. Finally, this screening process allows early identification of likely impacts and areas of uncertainty that will need to be investigated more fully as a particular project moves forward through more detailed planning and design.

#### Table 5.1A: Highway Project Evaluation Matrix

**GPATS** 

A 1 50

POTENTIAL IMPACT MATRIX					ENV	ENVIRONMENTAL/ NATURAL FEATURES						CULTU	RAL/ECO	DNOMIC	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE					
Recommendation	Priority or Funding	Project Name	Route Number	Project Description	Project Scope	Floodplains and Floodways	Wetlands	River and Stream Crossings	Threatened or Endangered Species	Superfund Sites	Environmental Hazards	Churches / Cemeteries	Schools / Hospitals	Parks and Open Space	Historic Resources	Disrupts or Fragments Community	Minority	Hispanic	Zero-Car Households	Low Income
TIP	High	N. Buncombe St./SC 101	SC 101/290	Wade Hampton (US 29) to Locust Hill (SC 290)	5 lane					**		**				*		,		
LRTP	High	Roper Mountain Road Ext	S-547	Pelham Rd to Roper Mountain Rd	3 lane	**		***								*				
TIP	High	SC 14	SC 14	Bethel Road to Five Forks Rd (SC 296)	5 lane	**		*								*				
LRTP	High	US 123	US 123	SC 93 to SC 8	6 lane with median			*								**				
LRTP	High	Woodruff Road	SC 146	Scuffletown Road to Bennetts Bridge (SC 296)	5 lane											*				
TIP	High	Roper Mountain Road	S-548	Garlington Road to Feaster Road	4 lane with median											*		, I		
LRTP	High	Roper Mountain Road	S-548	Roper Mtn Ext to Garlington Road	3 lane		*	**				*				*				
LRTP	High	Butler Road	S-107	Bridges Rd to Main Street (US 276)	4 lane	***		***				**	***			***	**			
TIP	High	Salters Road	City	Sulfur Springs Rd to Verdae Blvd.	4 lane with median	**		**												
TIP	High	Butler Road	S-107	Mauldin HS to Bridges Rd	5 lane								***			**				
LRTP	High	Batesville Road	S-164	The Parkway to Pelham Rd	3 lane	**		***		**	**	*		*	*	*		, J		
LRTP	High	Salters Road	City	Millennium Pkwy. to Sulfur Springs Rd	4 lane with median, new I-85 overpass	*		*												
LRTP	High	Miller Road	S-564	Woodruff Rd to Old Mill Rd	Improved 2 lane	**		*				**				***		, I		
LRTP	High	US 123	US 123	SC 93 to SC 153	6 lane divided					**	**	***				**				
LRTP	Medium	Hudson Road	S-347	Pelham Rd to Devenger Rd	3 lane			*				**	**			**				
LRTP	Medium	Powdersville Road	S-28	SC 153 to US 123	Improved 2 lane							*				*		, I		
LRTP	Medium	Batesville Road	S-164	SC 14 to Anderson Ridge	4 lane with median	**		***				***						,		
LRTP	Medium	Saluda Dam/Olive	S-21/221/36	SC 8 to Prince Perry	3 lane	***		**				*	***			***	**	i i	**	**
TIP	Medium	US 178	US 178	Edgemont Ave to Carolina Drive	3 lane											***	**	,,		
LRTP	Medium	Forrester Drive	S-326	Bi-Lo Drive to Millenuium Parkway	4 lane with median			**								*		,		
LRTP	Medium	Pelham Street Ext	new	SC 14 to I-385 Frontage Road	New 2 lane Secondary			**		*	*					**	*			
LRTP	Medium	East Washington Street Ext	new	US 276 to Lowndes Hill Rd	New 2 lane Secondary	**		**								**	**	,	**	**
LRTP	Medium	Garlington Road	S-564	Woodruff Rd to to Roper Mountain Rd	Multilane	*		**			*	*						,,		
LRTP	Medium	SC 153	SC 153	I-85 to I-185	4 lane divided	***	**	***												
TIP ACOG	ACOG funds	Farrs Bridge Road	SC 183	Hamburg Road to SC 135	LT lanes at Jim Hunt Rd and Jameson Rd					***		*	*			**		,		
TIP EM	Earmarked	West Georgia Road	S-541	Neely Ferry Rd. to E. Standing Springs Rd.	LT lanes McCall Rd, realign Stenhouse					*			**			**		,		
LRTP	Low	SC 153 Ext	new	Prince Perry to Saluda Dam	New 2 lane Primary			*								**		,		
LRTP	Low	Valley View Drive	new	SC 14 to I-385 Frontage	New 2 lane Secondary											*	*			
TIP ACOG	ACOG funds	Farrs Bridge Road	SC 183	Groce Road to Hamburg Road	LT lanes at Alex Rd (two locations)	***	***	***	*	**						**				
TIP	Low	SC 153 Ext	new	US 123 to Prince Perry	New 2 lane Primary											**				
LRTP	Low	LEC Road Ext.	new	McDaniel Ave to Secona Rd	New 2 lane Secondary			*				*				*	**		*	*
TIP EM	Earmarked	Fairforest Way	S-434/Local	US 276 to Mauldin Road	Widen and Reconstruct to 4 lane with median											*				
TIP EM	Earmarked	West Georgia Road	S-541	E. Standing Springs to Rocky Creek Rd.	LT lanes N. Moore, Barker, Calgary					*						**				
TIP EM	Earmarked	West Georgia Road	S-541	Rivereen Way to Fork Shoals Road	LT lanes Sullivan, Holcombe, Longstaff					*			**			**	**			



**GPATS** LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN Long Range Transportation Plan

#### Table 5.1B: Highway Project Evaluation Matrix - Unfunded Needs

POTENTIAL IMPACT MATRIX						ENV	ENVIRONMENTAL/ NATURAL FEATURES						CULTUR	AL/ECO	NOMIC	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE				
Recommendation	Priority or Funding	Project Name	Route Number	Project Description	Project Scope	Floodplains and Floodways	Wetlands	River and Stream Crossings	Threatened or Endangered Species	Superfund Sites	Environmental Hazards	Churches / Cemeteries	Schools / Hospitals	Parks and Open Space	Historic Resources	Disrupts or Fragments Community	Minority	Hispanic	Zero-Car Households	Low Income
	High	Park Woodruff Ext	new	Carolina Point to Miller Rd	New 2 lane Secondary											*				
	High	Grove Road	SC 20	White Horse Rd. (US 25) to Faris Rd.	3 lane and 5 lane	**		***				*				**	**			
	High	Verdae Point Drive	new	Verdae to Carolina Point	New 2 lane Secondary			**		**										
	High	SC 8	SC 8	St Paul Rd to SC 135	3 lane								***			*				
	Medium	Woodruff Road	SC 146	Woodruff Industrial to Smith Hines	7 lane					*										
	Medium	Blacksnake/Adger/135	S-73/186	SC 93 to SC 8	Improved 2 lane	**	**	**					**			***				
	Medium	Woodruff Road	SC 146	Bennetts Bridge (SC 296) to Lee Vaughn (SC 417)	Improved 2 lane									*						
	Medium	Conestee Road	S-221	Mauldin Rd to Fork Shoals	3 lane	***	*	***		***	***			**	***	*	***			
	Medium	Fairview Street	S-418	N. Nelson to SC 14	3 lane			*				***	**	**	*	**	***			
	Medium	Brushy Creek Road	S-29	US 123 to Laurel Drive	3 lane											*				
	Medium	Bridges Road	S-941	Butler Road to I-385	4 lane	*	*	**					*	*						
	Medium	SC 153	SC 153	Three Bridges Road to I-85	6 lane divided		*	*												
	Medium	SC 86	SC 86	SC 20 to SC 81	Improved 2 lane	***	***	***		*	*		*			**				
	Medium	Pine Knoll/Waddell	S-165	Rutherford Rd to Wade Hampton Blvd	Improved 2 lane	***	*	***				***	***			**				
	Medium	Bennetts Bridge Road	SC 296	Woodruff to Brockman McClimon	4 lane with median	**	**	**								*				
	Low	Fairview Road	S-55	Harrison Bridge to SC 418	Improved 2 lane	**		**		*						*				
	Low	Farrs Bridge Road	SC 183	Groce Road to Hamburg Road	4 lane with median	***	***	***	*	**						**				
	Low	Boiling Springs Road	S-447	Pelham to Phillips	Improved 2 lane			*				**					*			
	Low	US 178	US 178	Carolina Drive to US 123	3 lane											***	**			
	Low	Prince Perry Road	S-135	US 123 to Saluda Dam Rd	3 lane	**		**		**	**	*				*				
	Low	Farrs Bridge Road	SC 183	Hamburg Road to SC 135	Improved 2 lane					***		*	*			**				
	Low	SC 8 US 178 Connector	new	SC 8 to US 178	New 2 lane Primary	***	***	***			*					***				**
	Low	St. Mark Road	S-261	Wade Hampton to SC 290	Improved 2 lane							*				*	**			
	Low	Roper Mountain Road	S-548	Feaster Rd to SC 14	Improved 2 lane	**	**	**								*				
	Low	Batesville Road	S-164	Anderson Ridge to Woodruff	3 lane	**	**	**				*		*						
	Low	Butler Road	S-107	Holland to Woodruff	3 lane															
	Low	Ben Hamby Ext	new	Pelham to Batesville	New 4 lane Parkway	**	**	**			**					*				
	Low	Brushy Creek Road	S-29	Crestview Drive to St. Paul Road	Improved 2 lane											**				
	Low	Howard Drive Ext	new	SC 417 to Jonesville Rd	New 2 lane Secondary	**	*	**								***				

General Notes:

Qualitative screening only. Observations were made by overlaying potential alignments on map with environmental and community resource information. "Windshield survey" field review was also conducted. (1) (2)

General "rules of thumb" were followed (see "Key" examples below) to assess potential impacts to environmental issues.

KEY	* Minor stream crossing, nearby environmentally sensitive feature, slight environmental justice effect
"Example" Impacts	** Multiple stream crossings or minor river crossing, directly affects environmentally sensitive feature, moderate environmental justice effect
	*** Major river crossing, substantially affects environmentally sensitive features, significant environmental justice effect



5-20