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Introduction

The purpose of this Socioeconomic and Environmental Justice technical memorandum is to discuss and disclose any potential environmental effects that may result from the proposed improvements for the Woodburn Interchange and Transit Facility project that have not been considered in the earlier 2005 Environmental Assessment (EA) and the 2006 Revised Environmental Assessment (REA) associated with this project.

The report includes evaluation of potential impacts to environmental justice (EJ) populations based on current guidance from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Executive Order 12898 (EO), Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice (EJ) in Minority and Low-Income Populations, was signed by President Clinton on February 11, 1994. The EO directed all Federal departments and Federal agency heads to take the appropriate steps to identify and address any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of Federal programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law. The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and FHWA have taken steps to ensure compliance with the EO:

- DOT’s Final EJ Strategy (June 29, 1995 – Federal Register, Vol. 60 No. 125)
- DOT’s EJ Order (April 15, 1997 – Federal Register, Vol. 62, No. 72)
- FHWA’s EJ Order 6640.23 (December 2, 1998)

This Woodburn Interchange project has been previously evaluated under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and documented in a 2005 EA and again in the 2006 REA. Since then, changes have occurred in the affected environment and to regulations and policies relevant to the proposed project. This evaluation documents changes to the project design, affected environment, and relevant regulations and policies and, as a result of those changes, any potential environmental effects to socioeconomics and populations protected by the EJ EO and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

Project Background

The Woodburn Interchange is located on Interstate 5 (I-5) at milepost (MP) 271.85 in Marion County, Oregon, see Figure 1. The overcrossing roadway is Oregon Highway 214 (OR 214) east of the interchange and Oregon Highway 219 (OR 219) west of the interchange. The proposed project consists of reconstruction of the northbound and southbound highway ramps and widening of the overcrossing, as well as related improvements along the OR 214 and OR 219 approaches to accommodate the reconfigured interchange. The project also includes construction of a public transit facility and park and ride lot at the northwest corner of OR 214 and Evergreen Road.
The 2006 REA analysis of the Recommended Interchange Alternative did not comprehensively address the development of the public transit park and ride facility, which is identified in the Woodburn Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) as a component of the improvements supporting the function of the reconstructed interchange. Due to this omission, it is necessary to incorporate the potential effects of the transit park and ride facility into a reevaluation of the 2005 EA and 2006 REA. The reevaluation will update technical studies and findings, as needed, to address the transit park and ride facility and analyze the completeness of the preceding environmental reports in terms of the latest available information on the interchange design and refinements, changes in the affected environment, regulatory changes, and NEPA compliance. The reevaluation and supporting technical reports will not be stand-alone documents, but rather supplement the previous environmental documentation.

The interchange is the only I-5 connection (Exit 271) within the City of Woodburn and also provides access to northern Marion County. Woodburn has grown to a population of 24,080 in 2010, a 20% increase from its 2000 population. In the same time period, Marion County’s population increased by 10.7% to 315,335 people. Average Annual Daily Traffic on I-5, taken from an ODOT traffic counter 0.3 miles south of the Woodburn Interchange, was 81,900 vehicles in 2009 (41,190 vehicles southbound and 40,710 vehicles northbound). At the interchange, average daily traffic (ADT) volumes on the ramps ranged from 6,620 ADT (northbound off-ramp) to 7,810 ADT (northbound on-ramp) in 2009. Total volume of all four ramps was 28,830 vehicles. The ramp volumes show a substantial increase (89.2%) in traffic over previous years—in comparison, total ramp traffic volume in 2001 was 15,240 vehicles.

The Woodburn Interchange Project ((Key No. 12518 (OR 214 @ Evergreen Rd. Transit Facility); Key No. 15739 (I-5 @ OR 219/214)) is intended to address existing operational and safety deficiencies that are anticipated to worsen with continued growth in Woodburn and the Willamette Valley as a whole. Safety deficiencies are characterized by high crash rates at six intersections and inadequate queuing storage at the southbound off-ramp, leading to traffic queues that occasionally back on to the shoulder of southbound I-5. Road grades that exceed acceptable standards are present on the eastbound and westbound approaches to the overcrossing bridge, resulting in poor sight-distance for drivers and creating delay. To help alleviate these issues and enhance overall function of the interchange area, geometric and capacity improvements to the road network are proposed as well as enhancements to other multi-modal systems associated with transportation throughout the Woodburn and Willamette Valley.
As noted earlier in this report, considerable time has been spent studying potential effects of the proposed interchange improvements on transportation conditions and the surrounding environment. An Environmental Assessment was completed in 2005. In 2006, the Recommended Interchange Alternative was evaluated in a Revised Environmental Assessment, which updated the 2005 EA, as needed, based on acceptance of the preferred alignment alternative. Following review of these environmental documents, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was signed by the Federal Highway Administration in December 2006.

The Final Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) for the Woodburn Interchange, published June 2006 and adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC), documents interchange management measures agreed to by the City and ODOT. It summarizes information on the Woodburn Interchange Project's background, purpose and need, relevant plans and policies, land use and environmental issues, transportation conditions and deficiencies, alternatives development and analysis, plan recommendations, public involvement, and implementation strategies.
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Project Description

The Recommended Interchange Alternative from the 2006 REA is a hybrid of the “widen north” and “widen equal” alternatives (developed and evaluated in the 2005 EA) that optimizes the beneficial elements of both alternatives while avoiding and minimizing impacts as possible. The project would reconstruct the interchange at the junction of I-5 and OR 214 and OR 219 to a partial cloverleaf-A (loop ramps in advance of the overcrossing structure of I-5) and widen OR 214 and OR 219 equally or northerly of the existing centerline, depending on the segment. The Recommended Interchange Alternative widens the overcrossing structure to the north. According to the 2006 REA, the design alignment along existing OR 214 east of the Woodburn Interchange is addressed using the following principles:

- Public support for widening north of the existing centerline west of Evergreen Road.
- Shift the alignment towards an equal widening on both sides of the existing centerline, as is practical and feasible, between Evergreen Road and Cascade Drive.
- Between Evergreen Road and Cascade Drive, particular attention should be given to minimizing impacts, as is practical and feasible, to the property currently occupied by Kentucky Fried Chicken and to the Senior Estates properties adjacent to OR 214.
- East of Cascade Drive, particular attention should be given to providing as much space as is practical and feasible between the medical offices at the southeast corner of OR 214 and Cascade Drive and the back of the sidewalk running along the south side of OR 214.

The Recommended Interchange Alternative includes new 6-foot sidewalks with an additional 6-foot wide landscaped buffer between the sidewalk and the curb. A bicycle lane is provided in each direction along OR 214 and OR 219. A raised median is added and modifications to access for city streets would be made at Oregon Way, Evergreen Road, and Lawson Avenue. Further, the project alternative provides dedicated turning lanes onto local streets at key intersections with OR 214 along with local street improvements along Old Arney Road (MP 36.63), Lawson Avenue (MP 36.95), Evergreen Road (MP 37.02), Oregon Way/Country Club Road (MP 37.14), and Cascade Drive (MP 37.27).

In addition to the wider sidewalks and bicycle lanes, the project includes a new transit facility and park and ride lot in the northeast quadrant of the interchange at the intersection of OR 214 and Evergreen Road, and an extension of Evergreen Road north of OR 214 to Country Club Court. Each of these components is intended to provide multi-modal choices for the residents in and around Woodburn. The transit facility site, located north of OR 214 and between the extended Evergreen Road and I-5 northbound on-ramp, will facilitate alternative mode (bus) travel at the interchange. The Evergreen Road extension will provide alternative access to adjacent properties during and after construction.
It is anticipated that construction staging areas will be located within the project footprint.

Purpose

The purpose of the Woodburn Interchange Project is to improve the traffic flow and safety conditions of the existing Woodburn/I-5 interchange.

Need

The exiting Woodburn/I-5 interchange does not meet current design and operational standards, which causes traffic to move at slower speeds and increases congestion. Future growth in the interchange area will increase congestion problems, increase the difficulty to access adjacent businesses, and increase the risk of safety to drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians.

Affected Environment

Relevant Policies and Regulations

Relevant policies, regulations, and guidance are described below, including those new or changed since publication of the 2005 EA and 2006 REA. Specifically, new guidance on EJ and NEPA was issued in a December 16, 2011 memorandum from FHWA. Also regarding EJ, Oregon Senate Bill 420 became effective in January 2008.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321-4347

This act requires that federal agencies consider disproportionate effects to social groups and possible mitigation measures that would help avoid or minimize adverse effects. It requires public involvement throughout the environmental review process, including appropriate levels of outreach to minority or low-income populations or communities.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI), 42 U.S.C 2000d, 49 CFR Part 21, 23 CFR Part 200

Title VI prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin. It requires that “no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” U.S. DOT’s regulations provide guidelines for: (a) Implementing the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Title VI compliance program under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related civil rights laws and regulations, and (b) Conducting Title VI program compliance reviews relative to the Federal-aid highway program. The Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 specified that recipients of federal funds must comply with civil rights laws in all areas, not just in a particular program or activity that receives federal funding.
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Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (Fair Housing Act), 42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.
This act prohibits housing discrimination and designates protected populations, taking into account “race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin” in relocation decisions.

This provision ensures that “possible adverse economic, social, and environmental effects relating to any proposed project on any Federal-aid system have been fully considered in developing such project, and that the final decisions on the project are made in the best overall public interest, taking into consideration the need for fast, safe and efficient transportation, public services, and the costs of elimination or minimizing such adverse effects [as] air, noise, and water pollution; destruction of disruption of human-made and natural resources, aesthetic values, community cohesion and the availability of public facilities and services; adverse employment effects, and tax and property values losses; injurious displacement of people, businesses and farms; and disruption of desirable community and regional growth.”

The Age Discrimination Act of 1975, 42 U.S.C. 6101-6107
This act prohibits age discrimination in federally assisted programs and activities.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.
This act protects persons with disabilities. The ADA gives civil rights protections to individuals with disabilities similar to those provided to individuals on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin, age, and religion. It guarantees equal opportunity for individuals with disabilities in public accommodations, employment, transportation, state and local government services, and telecommunications. Persons with disabilities must be accommodated at public meetings and in terms of information provided. Final design of transportation alternatives must meet appropriate ADA standards for sidewalks, street crossings, etc.

The Uniform Act establishes minimum standards for federally funded programs and projects that require the acquisition of real property (real estate) or displace persons from their homes, businesses, or farms. The Act's protections and assistance apply to the acquisition, rehabilitation, or demolition of real property for federal or federally-funded projects.

Executive Order 12898 – Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, 59 Federal Register 7629 (Feb. 11, 1994)
This order requires that federal agencies identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of federal programs, policies, and/or activities on minority populations and low-income populations. It addresses both the requirements for equal justice embodied in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, and the requirements for environmental protection embodied in NEPA.

This order requires that federal agencies improve access to their federally conducted programs and activities by eligible persons with limited English proficiency. This order has particular relevance to the NEPA mandate to foster public involvement in the environmental review process. It stipulates that accommodations must be made for persons with limited English proficiency who wish to participate in public environmental reviews.

U.S. DOT Final Environmental Justice Strategy – Federal Register, Vol. 60 No. 125 (June 29, 1995)

The Department of Transportation strategy for complying with Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.


The Department of Transportation issued this order to comply with Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. The Order generally describes the process that the Office of the Secretary and each Operation Administration will use to incorporate environmental justice principles (as embodied in the Executive Order) into existing programs, policies, and activities.

FHWA Environmental Justice Order 6640.23 (December 2, 1998)

The Order establishes policies and procedures for the FHWA to use in complying with Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (EO 12898).

FHWA Memorandum – Guidance on Environmental Justice and NEPA (December 16, 2011)

The guidance advises FHWA offices on the process to address EJ during NEPA review, including documentation requirements. It supplements FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A, which provides guidance for documenting the potential social, economic, and environmental impacts considered in the selection and implementation of highway projects.

Oregon Senate Bill 420

Effective on January 1, 2008, this new law established an environmental justice task force and requires the natural resources agencies (fourteen in all, including ODOT) to follow prescribed steps to provide greater public participation and to ensure the involvement of persons who may be affected by agency actions. Passing of this law places greater emphasis on inclusive public outreach for state agency projects.

Oregon Transportation Plan 2006

The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) is the state’s long range multimodal transportation plan and overarching policy document for the statewide transportation system. Policy 7.4 in the OTP is
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addresses environmental justice. The policy advocates equal access to transportation decision-making for all Oregonians, regardless of race, culture, or income. The policy is intended to avoid disproportionate impacts to environmental justice communities, in compliance with federal guidelines.

Project Design Changes

The project design concept is the same as the alternative evaluated in the REA with the exception of the inclusion of a transit facility and park and ride lot (transit facility). The transit facility is planned at the northwest corner of OR 214 and Evergreen Road. While the transit facility has been part of the interchange concept for some time, it was not evaluated as part of the Recommended Interchange Alternative in the 2006 REA and is included in this analysis. In addition, placement of noise mitigating sound barriers is an updated design element—specific design parameters were not known at the time of the previous analysis.

Inclusion of the transit facility involves the extension of Evergreen Road to the north along the existing northern leg of the OR 214 / Evergreen Road intersection, providing improved access to the transit facility and adjacent properties (extension of Evergreen Road was an element of the Recommended Interchange Alternative and included in the previous environmental analysis).

The transit facility would be constructed over an existing asphalt parking lot on parcels owned by ODOT.

Area of Potential Impact

The area of potential impact (API) for the proposed improvements does not need to change beyond what was considered in the 2005 EA. The API consisted of an approximate one-mile area surrounding the interchange and includes properties that are developed with residential, commercial, and institutional uses. This API is adequate to consider potential impacts from the interchange project, including the transit facility. The approximate one-mile API encompassed a study area of Census Block Groups used for demographic data reported in the Socioeconomics Technical Report (February 2004) and a separate EJ Report (April 2004) for the 2005 EA. These data were not changed for the 2006 REA.

The Census-based study area in the Socioeconomics Technical Report (February 2004) was comprised of US Census 2000 Block Groups 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 in Census Tract 103.01. Using the
same study area, this analysis will update the population and demographic profile with available data from the 2010 US Census.¹

The Census Block Group in the southwest quadrant of the interchange was excluded from the study area in the 2005 EA Socioeconomics Technical Report. The area is covered by Block Group 2, Tract 103.03. This Block Group was excluded because of its large extent, extending 5 miles into a rural area south of the project, with only industrial land uses within the Woodburn city limits. Based on population counts in the smaller Census Blocks and current aerial imagery, there are no residents in the southwest quadrant and no displacements occur in this area. Excluding this large Census geography from the population profile does not exclude potentially affected populations within a one-mile radius of the interchange. The Block Group study area is therefore unchanged for this analysis, shown in Figure 2 along with the City of Woodburn boundary.

Figure 2. Block Group Study Area

¹ Within the study area, some Block Group boundaries and numbers changed between the 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census. However, the overall study area boundary remains the same. The study area Census Block Groups for 2010 are 1, 3, and 4 in Census Tract 103.06 and 1, 2, and 3 in Census Tract 103.07.
As indicated in the previous Socioeconomics Technical Report (February 2004), the population in Woodburn is diverse. The 2000 Woodburn demographic profile (US Census 2000) showed that approximately 42% of the population was non-white and approximately 50% of the population identified as Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race). 2010 Census data indicates similar population characteristics, with approximately 40% of the population reporting as non-white and nearly 59% of the population reporting Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race). Table 1 compares the 2000 Census data to available 2010 Census data for the study area as well as the City of Woodburn (Figure 2 above).

Table 1: Study Area and City of Woodburn Demographics (2000 and 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study Area 2000</th>
<th>Study Area 2010</th>
<th>City of Woodburn 2000</th>
<th>City of Woodburn 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>7,427</td>
<td>10,196</td>
<td>20,100</td>
<td>24,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5,930 (79.8%)</td>
<td>7,697 (75.5%)</td>
<td>11,682 (58.1%)</td>
<td>14,551 (60.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>13 (0.2%)</td>
<td>40 (0.4%)</td>
<td>90 (0.4%)</td>
<td>129 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>56 (0.8%)</td>
<td>118 (1.2%)</td>
<td>236 (1.2%)</td>
<td>675 (2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>51 (0.7%)</td>
<td>113 (1.1%)</td>
<td>107 (0.5%)</td>
<td>191 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5 (0.1%)</td>
<td>5 (0.05%)</td>
<td>15 (0.1%)</td>
<td>26 (0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 1</td>
<td>1,129 (15.2%)</td>
<td>1,879 (18.4%)</td>
<td>7,167 (35.7%)</td>
<td>7,597 (31.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>243 (3.3%)</td>
<td>344 (3.4%)</td>
<td>803 (4%)</td>
<td>911 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino Origin (all races)</td>
<td>1,729 (23.3%)</td>
<td>3,747 (36.7%)</td>
<td>10,064 (50.1%)</td>
<td>14,183 (58.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 Years</td>
<td>1,392 (18.7%)</td>
<td>2,349 (23%)</td>
<td>6,032 (30%)</td>
<td>7,442 (30.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Years and Over</td>
<td>2,937 (39.5%)</td>
<td>2,974 (29.2%)</td>
<td>3,636 (18.1%)</td>
<td>3,705 (15.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau

1 “Some Other Race” includes all other responses not included in the White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander race categories described above. Respondents reporting entries such as multiracial, mixed, interracial, or a Hispanic or Latino group (for example, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or Spanish) in response to the race question are included in this category. (US Census Bureau, 2012)

2 Hispanic Origin. Persons of Hispanic origin were identified by a question that asked for self-identification of the person’s origin or descent. Hispanic origin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person’s parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish may be any race. It should be noted that persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race. (US Census Bureau, 2012)

Between 2000 and 2010, the study area population increased by 2,769 people. In that time, there was a general percentage increase in all non-white racial categories in the study area (with the exception of Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander), while the percentage of whites decreased by 4.3%. Still, the
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white population represents the majority at 75.5% of the study area total. Comparatively, the City of Woodburn has a larger proportion of minority populations, with 60.4% of the total population reporting as white in the 2010 Census. The largest demographic change in the study area occurred in populations of Hispanic or Latino origin (all races), increasing to 36.7% of the total study area population. Populations of Hispanic or Latino origin (all races) in the study area are proportionately smaller than the city as a whole. Just over half (50.1%) of Woodburn’s population reported Hispanic or Latino origin (all races) in the 2000 Census, and this increased to 58.9% of the total Woodburn population in 2010.

Russian immigrant populations in the study area are not evident from currently available 2010 Census data; however, the presence of Russian populations is indicated in Woodburn School District enrollment data—9.4% of the school district was comprised of students of Russian descent in October 2008. In terms of English language proficiency, the 2000 Census showed that 412 households (6.6%) spoke “other Indo-European languages” out of 6,250 total households in the City of Woodburn. Of these 412 households, 139 households (33.7%) were “linguistically isolated” in 2000. Spanish is the most common non-English language in Woodburn—1,924 households (30.8%) spoke Spanish according to the 2000 Census. Of these 1,924 households, 828 households (43%) were “linguistically isolated.” 2010 Census data regarding languages and English proficiency are not yet available for the Woodburn geographic area.

The EJ Report (CH2MHiIl, April 2004) prepared for the 2005 EA showed that 0% to 12.5% of the study area population were living below the federal poverty level (US Census 2000). Comparatively, these were the lowest percentages in Woodburn. Outside the study area, Census Block Group populations that were living below the federal poverty level ranged from 12.5% to 37.5% (US Census 2000). This includes portions of the City to the east of the study area. 2010 Census income data is not yet available for the Woodburn geographic area. According to the American Community Survey estimates from the US Census Bureau, approximately 17% of the total Woodburn population had income below the poverty level between 2007 and 2009.

Community facilities in the study area remain the same as those described in the previous Socioeconomices Technical Report (February 2004), and no new community facilities have been constructed within the study area since then. Community facilities include schools, parks, medical institutions, libraries, and police and fire stations.

No major new employers have begun operation in the project area nor has new development greatly altered economic conditions since completion of the 2006 REA. Like the rest of Oregon and the nation as a whole, growth and development has stagnated in the last few years. However, some change has occurred in the project vicinity including expansion of the Woodburn Company Stores by approximately 30,000 square feet at the north end (opened in February 2009) and development of the property west of the Woodburn Fire District station to include a new bank and approximately 9,000 square feet of office commercial space. Since 2006, additional build-out of a residential
subdivision has also occurred in the project vicinity, adding 67 single-family homes and a multi-family housing complex on a green field site about two-thirds of a mile south of the interchange.

**Public Outreach Strategies**

Public outreach and a public hearing on the interchange design alternatives considered were conducted during the environmental approval process. As part of that process, ODOT consulted with a Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) 10 times during the period March 2003 to February 2005. The SWG included representatives from the business community. Following up on that process, in 2010, the project team conducted multiple rounds of individual meetings with all businesses directly affected by the project to discuss the project and anticipated construction impacts.

The process of working with the Woodburn business community began with a public open house (August 31, 2009) with the City Council and Planning Commission to take comment on potential project impacts to businesses. As a result of that open house, the project team decided to schedule three rounds of one-on-one meetings with all businesses affected by the project.

The first round of meetings was held November 3-5, 2009. The purpose of this round was to introduce the project design team to the business owners and to give them a general description of the project. At this round, the team sent invitations to approximately 185 businesses and met with approximately 30. A significant number of these businesses were tenants of Woodburn Company Stores, a major shopping mall, and did not attend as they were represented by Company Stores Management, who ODOT did meet with.

The second round of meetings was held May 10-July 1, 2010. This round included 32 meetings with business owners. The purpose of this meeting was to display a preliminary plan of the project and elicit any concerns the owners had about it.

In the spring of 2012, the ODOT team again met individually with the same affected businesses to review the draft Traffic Control Plan (TCP), discuss their issues and work at resolving them when possible. Following these meetings, the draft TCP will be presented for feedback at small group briefings. After completing all meetings on the TCP, ODOT will process comments received from the public, following up with specific parties to work out details, and will modify the draft TCP accordingly. This process will be repeated as necessary until the Project Development Team believes it has minimized traffic and business disruption as much as possible. Once the TCP is finalized, just prior to construction, ODOT will embark on a public awareness campaign to inform the public about the expected construction impacts and traffic control measures while emphasizing that Woodburn is open for business. This campaign may involve a general public meeting and other means of communication.
On August 31, 2009, a public workshop was held for interested parties on the project plan for the transit facility and the design of bus shelters and kiosks. The meeting was attended by seven people who asked questions about various aspects of this project and the interchange project in general.

Project and consultant staffs are currently working with property owners on the Evergreen Road alignment on a vision for development along the street that is supportive of a pedestrian-friendly environment. Other work included analysis of the financial impacts on development of systems development charges. To date three workshops were held between August 11, 2011 and February 2, 2012, attended by 6—10 people. Three more meetings with this group are planned.

Per a new policy, ODOT conducted polls of households affected by proposed noise wall locations. The wall on the south side of OR 214 at Cascade Drive was not approved. All of the other proposed walls were approved by the parties polled. The walls have been designed and an informational meeting was held with the residents affected by the Oregon Broughton and Willow-Woodland walls on March 15, 2012 to show how the plan for the walls would affect their respective properties.

Environmental Consequences

The purpose of this section is to specifically evaluate potential impacts from the addition of the transit facility that were not previously considered, and to determine whether or not the prior assessments are still accurate with respect to project impacts and mitigation. Additional analyses on EJ and Title VI are also provided.

Potential Impacts

Addition of the transit facility would benefit the traveling public that increasingly depends on alternative modes of transportation given the stagnant economy and the trend of rising gas prices. This includes improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities accessing the transit facility site. All new facilities at the transit center will be American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant. The transit facility may also provide economic benefit by bringing a larger customer base into the project area. Compared to the 2005 EA and 2006 REA, construction of the transit facility would not result in new displacements or property impacts. Street and access improvements related to the extension of Evergreen Road would require ROW acquisition from adjacent commercial properties, but no displacements.

Installation of a sound barrier on the west side of the I-5 interchange (north side of OR 219) would potentially result in two single-family residential displacements that were not anticipated in the 2006 REA or 2005 EA. Four single-family residential displacements are anticipated with installation of a sound barrier on the east side of I-5 (north side of OR 214, Senior Estates development). These
four residential displacements were previously disclosed in the 2006 REA; two of the properties have been purchased by ODOT since the FONSI was issued in 2006.

No adverse impacts to community facilities, public services, or neighborhood cohesion are anticipated, consistent with the reporting in the 2005 EA Socioeconomics Technical Report. The transit facility will provide a new community facility, which was not anticipated in the 2006 REA or 2005 EA. In a concurrent process, a “gateway” visual concept is being developed that will become an element of the overall project design. A committee of local stakeholders has been formed and design elements are under consideration to create the desired aesthetic for this community entry point. Possible visual improvements include recommendations for plant materials, aesthetic enhancements to the OR 219/214 bridge over I-5, and the introduction of architectural showpieces and public art.

Other anticipated project impacts are the same as those documented in the 2005 EA and 2006 REA. These include:

• Sliver acquisitions for ROW on the north and south sides of OR 214 and OR 219 and intersecting streets
• ROW acquisitions in the NW and SE quadrants of the interchange to accommodate highway ramp improvements
• Displacement of seven business properties (one family-style restaurant, one fast-food restaurant, two gas stations, one bank, one utility trailer sales business, and one former pharmacy--the pharmacy moved out of the project area before initiation of the ROW process)
• Installation of a raised median on OR 214, restricting left-turn movements
• Traffic related noise with expansion of roadway facilities
• Temporary noise and dust impacts from construction activities

In summary, the anticipated project effects that were not previously documented in the 2005 EA or 2006 REA consist of:

• Displacement of two single-family homes in the housing development west of the interchange and north of OR 219 due to installation of a noise mitigating sound barrier
• Removal of a private billboard advertising sign
• Addition of a new community facility, the transit facility, and its benefit to public transportation and possible economic benefit by bringing potential customers to the study area

Title VI
Under Title VI, each Federal agency is required to ensure that no person is excluded from participation in, denied the benefit of, or subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, sex, disability, or religion. As noted earlier in this report, 2010 Census data showed that approximately 25% of the study area population reported in a non-white racial category. Moreover, 36.7% of the study area population reported Hispanic or Latino origins of all races (US Census 2010). Comparatively, the
City of Woodburn had approximately 40% of its population report as non-white, with approximately 59% of the Woodburn population reporting Hispanic or Latino origins (all races) (US Census 2010).

Senior Estates Golf and Country Club is a private community in the study area for persons age 55 and older. This community is located east of the interchange and on the north and south sides of OR 214 and consists of 1,510 homeowners. The presence of seniors is reflected in the study area age characteristics. The portion of the study area population age 65 years and older was 29.2% in 2010, compared to 15.4% of the City of Woodburn population age 65 years and older (US Census 2010).

According to the 2000 Census, of 17,709 people age 5 years and older in the City of Woodburn, 3,780 people (21.3%) had a sensory, physical, or mental disability (US Census 2000). In the study area, 1,841 people (27.5%) had a sensory, physical, or mental disability out of 6,699 people age 5 years and older (US Census 2000). This is based on sample data from US Census 2000 Summary File 3. Summary File 3 for Census 2010 has not been released for the Woodburn geographic area.

The Woodburn Interchange and Transit Facility project will provide community benefits to all users in terms of improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities, improved traffic movement and safety, and, with installation of the transit facility, improved access to public transportation services and a new community facility. All new facilities will be designed and constructed to meet ADA guidelines.

Project effects include ROW acquisition from adjacent properties, residential and business displacements, and traffic related noise. Noise impacts will be mitigated through the placement of sound barriers. The placement of a sound barrier on the north side of OR 214 would displace four single-family homes out of the 1,510 total homes in the 55 and older Senior Estates community. Two of these properties have been purchased by ODOT. Two potential residential displacements would also result from the installation of a sound barrier on the north side of OR 219. According to the ODOT ROW specialist, one of these homes is owned by a person of Hispanic heritage. The immediate neighborhood on the north side of OR 219 contains about 380 residential properties. Engineered solutions to avoid and minimize project impacts have been considered, with the sound barriers designed to avoid displacements as much as possible while still providing noise mitigating benefits to the adjacent neighborhoods. As such, the number of residents benefitting from noise mitigation is much higher than those that would be unavoidably displaced.

Where property acquisitions and displacements are proposed, affected persons will receive compensation pursuant to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act, which ensures that property owners of real property acquired for and persons displaced by Federal-Aid projects are treated fairly, consistently, and equitably. Project decisions have been inclusive of public participation as outlined in the Public Outreach Strategies section above.
Environmental Justice
Recent guidance (FHWA Memorandum, December 16, 2011) advises FHWA staff on the appropriate steps for evaluating potential effects on EJ populations during NEPA review of highway projects to comply with Executive Order (EO) 12898. EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice (EJ) in Minority and Low-Income Populations, was signed by President Clinton on February 11, 1994. The EO directed all Federal departments and Federal agency heads to take the appropriate steps to identify and address any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of Federal programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law.

This EJ evaluation follows the FHWA guidance for documenting potential project effects to EJ populations. The evaluation is divided into six sections: Existing Minority and Low-income Populations; Public Involvement Coordination, Access, and Information; Identifying Disproportionately High and Adverse Effects; Mitigation; Adverse Project Effects After Mitigation; and Conclusion.

EJ - Existing Minority and Low-income Populations
For the purposes of EJ and in accordance with the 2011 FHWA guidance, minority populations are identified as Black or African American, Hispanic, Asian American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. Table 2 shows demographic data for the study area (2010 Census Block Groups) and the City of Woodburn, including minority populations and general age distribution (US Census 2010).

Table 2: Study Area and City of Woodburn Demographics (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study Area 2010</th>
<th>City of Woodburn 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race / Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>10,196</td>
<td>24,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7,697 (75.5%)</td>
<td>14,551 (60.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>40 (0.4%)</td>
<td>129 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>118 (1.2%)</td>
<td>675 (2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>113 (1.1%)</td>
<td>191 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5 (0.05%)</td>
<td>26 (0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,879 (18.4%)</td>
<td>7,597 (31.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>344 (3.4%)</td>
<td>911 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino Origin (all races)</td>
<td>3,747 (36.7%)</td>
<td>14,183 (58.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 Years</td>
<td>2,349 (23%)</td>
<td>7,442 (30.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Years and Over</td>
<td>2,974 (29.2%)</td>
<td>3,705 (15.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2010
The largest minority group in the study area is people of Hispanic or Latino origin. Minority racial categories represent much smaller percentages in the study area, with 75.5% of the study area population reporting as white. The next largest racial category in the study area is “Other,” with 18.4% reporting this designation in the 2010 Census. “Some Other Race” includes all other responses not included in the White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander race categories described above. Respondents reporting entries such as multiracial, mixed, interracial, or a Hispanic or Latino group (e.g. Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or Spanish) in response to the race question are included in this category (US Census Bureau, 2012).

2010 Census income data is not yet available for the Woodburn geography. In the context of EJ, FHWA defines “low-income” as established in poverty guidelines used by the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). For the project study area, current poverty guidelines are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: 2012 Poverty Guidelines for the 48 Contiguous States and the District of Columbia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons in Family / Household</th>
<th>Poverty Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$11,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$15,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$19,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$23,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$27,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$30,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$34,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$38,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For families/households with more than 8 persons, add $3,960 for each additional person

Source: HHS, 2012

In the absence of current data identifying individual household incomes, it is statistically probable that there are households below the poverty thresholds established by HHS out of over 10,000 people in the one-mile study area. The EJ Report (CH2MHill, April 2004) prepared for the 2005 EA showed that 0% to 12.5% of the study area population were living below the federal poverty level (US Census 2000). Comparatively, these were the lowest percentages in Woodburn. Outside the study area, Census Block Group populations that were living below the federal poverty level ranged from 12.5% to 37.5% (US Census 2000). This includes portions of the City to the east of the study area. According to the American Community Survey estimates from the US Census Bureau, approximately 17% of the total Woodburn population had income below the poverty level between 2007 and 2009.

The presence of minority EJ populations in the study area is established from the Census data as well as interviews ODOT conducted with affected business owners over the past year and ODOT

---

2 Block Groups 1, 3, and 4 in Census Tract 103.06 and Block Groups 1, 2, and 3 in Census Tract 103.07.
conversations with home owners. It is probable that there are low-income populations in the study area; however, adjacent neighborhoods are characterized by single-family home ownership that is not indicative of low-income clusters.

**EJ - Public Involvement Coordination, Access, and Information**

Broad based public outreach regarding the project’s construction impacts will be augmented by targeted methods and practices outlined below in order to reach minority groups, low-English proficiency (LEP) groups, low-income, elderly and persons with disabilities and to provide opportunities for meaningful information and input. In order to reach EJ populations, the team will employ two main techniques.

First, people are more likely to get involved when they are invited by their neighbors or peers. The project team will work with community based organizations whose missions serve the needs of underrepresented groups, churches catering to specific ethnic groups and languages, schools, service providers and other stakeholders to reach out to their communities. These groups can also identify the most effective methods to support participation within their specific area, group or community. The PI Plan will be updated to incorporate this information. Specific examples of groups to communicate with include:

- Farm Worker Housing Development (Nuevo Ameneecer)
- Community Action Agency
- St. Luke’s
- Senior Estates

Second, the team will go to the public, bringing appropriate project information to where people already gather. The PI Plan initially identifies tabling at community events and providing project information displays and information posted at key locations – which can include popular gathering areas, senior or disabled housing, local bulletin boards, storefront windows and other high traffic areas to encourage community input (the PI Plan will be updated to include other areas identified by the community). The team will work with the community to distribute copies of the flyers or displays. Information will include how to request translation and interpretive services. Key project materials will be translated into Spanish (and other languages, as identified), interpretive services will be available at project open houses, and child care will be provided.

**EJ - Identifying Disproportionately High and Adverse Effects**

The 2012 Revised Environmental Assessment identifies possible project impacts across disciplines, including transportation and traffic, land use, parks and Section 4(f) and Section 6(f), noise, historic resources, air quality, right-of-way acquisitions and relocations, biological resources, wetlands, water quality, utilities, geology and soils and hazardous materials, energy, visual quality, and socioeconomics. Of these various disciplines, anticipated adverse project impacts that could affect EJ populations are limited to the following areas:
Right-of-Way Acquisitions and Relocations
- Sliver acquisitions for ROW on the north and south sides of OR 214 and OR 219 and intersecting streets
- Residential displacements due to placement of noise mitigating sound barriers
- Displacement of seven businesses

Noise
- Traffic related noise with expansion of roadway facilities
- Temporary noise impacts from construction activities

Air
- Temporary dust impacts from construction activities

The FHWA guidance advises that when there are minority or low-income populations in the study area that may be adversely impacted, steps should be followed to determine whether there is a disproportionately high and adverse impact on the EJ populations. Consistent with FHWA EJ Order 6640.23, a disproportionately high and adverse effect on a minority or low-income population means the adverse effect is predominantly borne by such population or is appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude on the minority or low-income population than the adverse effect suffered by the non-minority or non-low-income population.

This section considers the anticipated beneficial and adverse project effects, both to the overall population and to specifically known EJ populations. In terms of benefits, all users will equally receive project benefits including improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities, lessened congestion, improved traffic safety, installation of aesthetic elements, and construction of the transit facility. Such improvements may provide a greater benefit to lower-income EJ populations that, as a whole, may be more dependent on alternative transportation modes.

Potential adverse project impacts include six residential displacements of owner-occupied single-family homes and seven business displacements. Of the seven business displacements, none of the properties are minority owned or specifically cater to EJ populations. This demonstrates no disproportionately high and adverse effect on EJ populations.

According to the ODOT ROW specialist, one of the six anticipated residential displacements is owned by an EJ minority, a Hispanic household on the north side of OR 219 on the west side of the interchange. The five other residential displacements would affect non-EJ populations. The anticipated EJ displacement would result from installation of a noise mitigating sound barrier parallel to the north side of OR 219, pending final design of the barrier.

The immediate neighborhood on the north side of OR 219 contains about 380 residential properties. Engineered solutions to avoid and minimize property impacts have been considered, with the sound barriers designed to avoid displacements as much as possible while still providing noise mitigating benefits to the adjacent neighborhood. As such, the number of residents benefiting
from noise mitigation is much higher than those that would be unavoidably displaced. One EJ minority out of six total residential displacements does not represent a disproportionately high and adverse effect.

Throughout the planning process for the interchange project, efforts were made through design modifications to minimize impacts to adjacent properties (see previous public involvement section). However, sliver ROW and easement acquisitions are common along the state highways on the east and west sides of I-5 as well as intersecting streets where roadway widening, approach modifications, and sound barrier installations are proposed. Such ROW and easement acquisitions would affect an estimated 123 tax lots in total.

Based on ODOT interviews with business owners, there are two identified minority-owned business properties—a fast food restaurant and a vacant building—that would have permanent easements acquired from them and an access adjustment consistent with proposed actions for all the properties along OR 214. This does not demonstrate a disproportionately high and adverse effect on EJ populations.

Before mitigation, traffic noise impacts will affect residential areas that abut the state highways. Construction related impacts include generation of noise from heavy equipment and dust from grading. Sidewalks and existing bus service may also be temporarily affected by construction activities. Given the demographic composition of Woodburn and the study area, these potential impacts would likely effect EJ populations, but to no greater degree than all property owners and/or residents in the study area, representing a fair distribution of potential adverse effects. Moreover, standard mitigation measures would be implemented to minimize these adverse effects.

EJ - Mitigation
As mentioned above, traffic noise mitigation would be provided through installation of sound barriers as specified in the Noise Analysis and as approved by property owners and residents. Property owners with acquisition and displacement impacts will be financially compensated through ODOT’s ROW process and, where applicable, receive relocation assistance consistent with the Uniform Relocation Act. For possible construction related impacts, best management practices (BMPs) would be employed for noise and dust abatement as established through the contractor. Public information should also be provided regarding any alterations to public transportation (bus) routes or stops. As feasible, existing bus service, stops, and adequate pedestrian access should be maintained throughout the estimated 19-month construction period (possible service alterations are not known at this time).

EJ – Adverse Project Effects after Mitigation
For determining disproportionate impacts, the FHWA guidance states that consideration must be given to mitigation of adverse effects. As outlined above, potentially adverse impacts to study area residents can be mitigated through standard practices (e.g. sound barriers, construction BMPs). The
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FHWA guidance concludes that if the project effects remain adverse after mitigation is considered, than a determination must be made whether those effects are disproportionately high and adverse with respect to minority and/or low-income populations. The mitigated effects of minor sliver property acquisitions, traffic noise, and construction activities are not adverse or disproportionately borne by EJ populations.

This EJ evaluation concludes that property displacements remain an adverse project effect after mitigation, even though property owners would be compensated and provided relocation assistance in accordance with federal law. However, the quantity of displacements does not reflect a disproportionate adverse effect on EJ populations. Out of seven anticipated business displacements, none are minority owned or specifically cater to EJ populations. Out of six anticipated residential displacements (all owner-occupied), one of the homes is minority owned. Moreover, it is possible for the EJ displacement to relocate within their north of OR 219 neighborhood—current real estate listings show 11 homes for sale in the neighborhood, providing opportunity for a comparable or improved home nearby (John L. Scott Real Estate, February 20, 2012).

The EJ residential displacement does not represent a disproportionately high and adverse effect compared to the study area demographic profile. As noted earlier, 2010 Census data showed that approximately 25% of the study area population reported in a non-white racial category, with 36.7% of the study area population reporting as Hispanic or Latino origin of all races (US Census 2010).

EJ - Conclusion
The FHWA guidance stresses that fair distribution of the beneficial and adverse effects of the proposed action is the desired outcome. The project achieves this without creating disproportionate impacts on EJ populations. The FHWA guidance acknowledges that the EJ evaluation is complete in the absence of disproportionately high and adverse effects on EJ populations, including consideration of mitigation and benefits, as follows:

Based on anticipated impacts, benefits, and mitigation, the Woodburn Interchange and Transit Facility project will not cause disproportionately high and adverse effects on any minority or low-income populations in accordance with the provisions of EO 12898 and FHWA Order 6640.23. No further EJ analysis is required.

Proposed Mitigation

All property owners will be compensated where there are permanent takings of ROW and easements through ODOT’s standard ROW negotiation and acquisition process pursuant to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (URA), which ensures property owners of real property acquired for and persons displaced by Federal-Aid projects are treated fairly, consistently, and equitably. Displaced persons will be provided with relocation
assistance according to the provisions of the URA. Site specific design modifications may be implemented to further minimize adverse property impacts.

To ensure adequate understanding of project affects and property owner rights and obligations, interpreters/materials should be provided as needed to facilitate communication with low-English proficiency Spanish and Russian speakers.

Traffic noise mitigation will be provided through installation of sound barriers.

During the estimated 19-month construction period, best management practices (BMPs) should be employed for noise and dust abatement. Public information should also be provided regarding any alterations to public transportation (bus) routes or stops. As feasible, existing bus service, stops, and sidewalk facilities should be maintained throughout the construction period (possible service alterations are not known at this time). Mitigation of construction impacts would further include adequate flagging and signing, proper staging of equipment, and maintaining access to adjacent businesses during normal operating hours. Emergency response vehicles must be ensured adequate passage throughout the construction period. A Traffic Control Plan will need to be prepared.

Conclusion

Overall, the interchange project provides the benefit of improved and safer infrastructure, including development of a new transit facility. Traffic circulation would benefit from roadway improvements and the addition of the transit facility should attract additional customers to the interchange area and enhance multi-modal transportation. There are no demonstrable disproportionate adverse impacts to EJ or Title VI populations. A summary of potential project effects is provided in Table 4, including those described in the 2005 EA and 2006 REA as well as updated or new impacts identified for the 2012 REA.

Table 4: Woodburn Interchange and Transit Facility Summary of Potential Impacts, Benefits and Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice</td>
<td>• Less traffic delay and improved safety conditions for motor vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians&lt;br&gt;• Access revisions to the Senior Estates</td>
<td>• Same impacts as identified in 2005 EA/2006 REA (left column), with exception of these updates: &lt;br&gt;• 2 potential new</td>
<td>• Provide interpreters as needed for public involvement activities, and provide project notices, updates, and descriptions using local media that caters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood, benefitting traffic circulation</td>
<td>residential displacements—west of I-5 and north side of OR 219 (possibly impacting 1 EJ household)</td>
<td>to non-English speaking groups, namely for native Spanish and Russian speakers. (i.e. ROBES Newsletter, the Woodburn Independent, KWBY Radio, KPCN Radio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Displaced properties within the right-of-way would be removed from the County Tax Rolls, decreasing the property tax base</td>
<td>• Removal of a private billboard advertising sign</td>
<td>• Compensate and offer relocation assistance in accordance with federal law to displaced residents and business owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sliver acquisitions for ROW on the north and south sides of OR 214 and OR 219 and intersecting streets</td>
<td>• Improved public transportation with construction of transit facility, a new community facility for Woodburn</td>
<td>• As feasible, implement site specific design modifications to further minimize adverse property impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ROW acquisitions in the NW and SE quadrants of the interchange to accommodate highway ramp improvements</td>
<td>• Transit facility may benefit economic activity by attracting additional customers to study area</td>
<td>• Sound barrier installation to mitigate noise impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Displacement of seven business properties</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adequate flagging and signing, proper equipment staging, and maintenance of property access during the construction period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Displacement of four residential properties in the Senior Estates community</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation of Traffic Control Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Installation of a raised median on OR 214, restricting left-turn movements</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of BMPs during construction period to minimize noise and dust impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic related noise with expansion of roadway facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Temporary noise and dust impacts from construction activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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