



Environmental Assessment

for Bus Rapid Transit

Prepared by:

The Rapid

In cooperation with the
Federal Transit Administration

January 2011

Environmental Assessment
for
The Rapid
Silver Line Bus Rapid Transit
Grand Rapids, Wyoming and Kentwood, Michigan

January 2011

Submitted by:


The Rapid

In cooperation with the
Federal Transit Administration

1-20-2011
Date of Approval


FTA Regional Administrator, Region V

1-20-2011
Date of Approval


The Rapid

The following persons may be contacted for additional
information concerning this document:

Stewart McKenzie
Federal Transit Administration
200 West Adams Street, Suite 320
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Taiwo Jaiyeoba
The Rapid
300 Ellsworth SW
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503-4005

This Environmental Assessment describes the social, economic, and environmental impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative for construction of *The Rapid* Silver Line Bus Rapid Transit. The Preferred Alternative consists of a 9.6 mile alignment on existing roadways with service to the Rapid Central Station and 17 new stations.

Comments on this Environmental Assessment should be received within 30 days of the date of publication and should be sent to Stewart McKenzie or Taiwo Jaiyeoba at the address above.

Table of Contents

1.0	Purpose and Need for Action	1-1
1.1	Introduction.....	1-1
1.2	Project Background	1-4
1.3	Project Purpose	1-5
1.4	Project Need.....	1-5
1.4.1	Population and Employment.....	1-6
1.4.2	Transit Dependent Communities	1-9
1.4.3	Major Destinations.....	1-9
1.4.4	Existing Transit Ridership	1-11
1.4.5	Travel Demand	1-13
1.4.6	Congestion and Mobility	1-13
1.4.7	Transit Supportive Land Use	1-14
1.4.8	Economic Development Potential.....	1-15
1.5	Other Project Goals	1-17
2.0	Comparison of Alternatives and Selection of Preferred Alternative.....	2-1
2.1	No Action Alternative	2-1
2.2	The Locally Preferred Alternative	2-2
2.2.1	BRT Alignment Overview	2-2
2.2.2	Transit Vehicles	2-4
2.2.3	Transit Operating Characteristics	2-4
2.2.4	Transit Service Hours	2-5
2.3	Alternatives Previously Considered	2-5
2.3.1	Alternatives Analysis (GT2 Study).....	2-5
2.3.2	Downtown Alternatives Considered.....	2-8
2.3.3	Refinement of the Locally Preferred Alternative	2-9
2.4	Design Elements of the Locally Preferred Alternative.....	2-12
2.4.1	New Right-of-Way	2-12
2.4.2	Existing Right-of-way Characteristics	2-12
2.4.3	BRT Station/Platform Design.....	2-13
2.4.4	Drainage.....	2-15
2.4.5	Utilities.....	2-15
2.4.6	Signage	2-15
2.4.7	Lighting.....	2-15
3.0	Environmental Resources, Impacts and Mitigation.....	3-1
3.1	Land Use and Zoning	3-1
3.1.1	Existing Land Use.....	3-1
3.1.2	Existing Zoning.....	3-4
3.1.3	Future Land Use.....	3-6
3.1.4	Land Use Impacts.....	3-11

3.2	Social/Economic Conditions	3-12
3.2.1	Affected Environment	3-12
3.2.2	Environmental Consequences	3-20
3.3	Environmental Justice	3-20
3.3.1	Affected Environment	3-21
3.3.2	Environmental Consequences	3-29
3.4	Traffic and Transportation	3-30
3.4.1	Traffic Overview	3-30
3.4.2	Affected Environment	3-31
3.4.3	Environmental Consequences - Future 2035 Conditions	3-34
3.5	Historic and Archeological Resources	3-40
3.5.1	Consultation	3-40
3.5.2	Affected Environment - Identification of Historic Properties	3-41
3.5.3	Environmental Consequences - Assessing Effects to Historic Properties	3-42
3.5.4	Affected Environment - Identification of Archeological Resources	3-44
3.5.5	Environmental Consequences – Impacts to Archeological Resources	3-44
3.5.6	Coordination with State Historic Preservation Office	3-44
3.6	Air Quality	3-45
3.7	Noise	3-46
3.7.1	Regulatory Setting	3-46
3.7.2	Affected Environment	3-48
3.7.3	Environmental Consequences	3-48
3.8	Water Resources/Quality	3-49
3.8.1	Affected Environment	3-49
3.8.2	Environmental Consequences	3-52
3.9	Floodplains	3-53
3.9.1	Affected Environment	3-53
3.9.2	Environmental Consequences	3-54
3.10	Hazardous Waste	3-55
3.11	Parklands	3-55
3.11.1	Affected Environment	3-55
3.11.2	Environmental Consequences	3-56
3.12	Safety and Security	3-58
3.12.1	Affected Environment	3-59
3.12.2	Environmental Consequences	3-59
3.13	Construction Impacts	3-60
3.13.1	Environmental Consequences	3-60
3.13.2	Construction Mitigation	3-61
3.14	Coastal Zone Management	3-61
3.14.1	No Action	3-61
3.14.2	Locally Preferred Alternative	3-61

3.15	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	3-62
3.15.1	Project Area	3-62
3.15.2	Reasonably Foreseeable Activities	3-63
3.15.3	Indirect Impacts	3-63
3.15.4	Cumulative Impacts	3-65
3.16	Other Impacts	3-66
4.0	Capital Cost Estimates	4-1
4.1	Capital Cost Estimates	4-1
4.2	Capital Resources	4-1
4.2.1	Non-Federal Capital Resources	4-1
4.2.2	Federal Capital Resources	4-1
4.3	Implementation	4-1
5.0	Comments and Coordination	5-1
5.1	Agency Coordination	5-1
5.2	Community Meetings	5-2
5.3	Environmental Justice Outreach	5-4
5.4	Future Public Communications	5-5
6.0	List of References	6-1
7.0	List of Preparers	7-1
8.0	List of Recipients	8-1
9.0	List of Acronyms	9-1
10.0	Exhibits	10-1

List of Appendices

Appendix A - Section 106 Consultation Materials

Appendix B - Noise Calculation Worksheet

Appendix C - Agency Correspondence

Appendix D - Stakeholder Meeting Materials

Appendix E - Stakeholder Comments

Appendix F - *The Rapid System Map*

List of Tables

Table 1-1	Population and Employment Growth, 2000 to 2030.....	1-7
Table 1-2	Population and Employment Densities, 2000, 2015 and 2030.....	1-7
Table 1-3	Households and Jobs within 1/4 Mile of Major Roadways and Rail Line, 2015 and 2030....	1-9
Table 1-4	Transit Dependent and Environmental Justice Communities, 2000.....	1-10
Table 1-5	Major Destinations along the Division Avenue Corridor.....	1-10
Table 1-6	Bus Ridership within the Division Avenue Corridor, 2005 and 2009.....	1-11
Table 2-1	Comparison of Downtown Alternatives.....	2-11
Table 3-1	Planned Developments.....	3-10
Table 3-2	Population by Race for Cities of Grand Rapids, Wyoming, and Kentwood.....	3-13
Table 3-3	Public Schools within one-half mile of the Locally Preferred Alternative.....	3-15
Table 3-4	Fire Stations within a half-mile of the Locally Preferred Alternative.....	3-15
Table 3-5	Churches within a half-mile of the Locally Preferred Alternative.....	3-16
Table 3-6	Minority Populations Within ½ Mile of the Division Avenue Corridor.....	3-21
Table 3-7	Kent County Minority Percentages.....	3-22
Table 3-8	Race and Ethnicity in Block Groups within ½ Mile of Corridor.....	3-24
Table 3-9	Kent County Percentages below Poverty.....	3-26
Table 3-10	Poverty and Median Income in Block Groups within ½ Mile of Corridor.....	3-28
Table 3-11	2035 Project Conditions BRT Travel Time.....	3-36
Table 3-12	Northbound Travel Time Comparison – Existing Route 1 versus BRT.....	3-39
Table 3-13	Southbound Travel Time Comparison – Existing Route 1 versus BRT.....	3-39
Table 3-14	National Register of Historic Places-Listed and -Eligible Historic Properties in the Area of Potential Effects.....	3-41
Table 3-15	Land Use Noise Criteria.....	3-47
Table 3-16	Noise Analysis.....	3-49
Table 3-17	Parks and Recreation Facilities in the Vicinity of the Locally Preferred Alternative.....	3-57
Table 3-18	Indirect and Cumulative Effects Station Area Features.....	3-64
Table 4-1	Capital Cost Estimates (Millions), YOE Dollars (2013).....	4-1
Table 5-1	Community Meetings.....	5-3
Table 5-2	Community Organizations along Division Avenue.....	5-4

List of Figures

Figure 1-1	<i>The Rapid</i> Service Area.....	1-2
Figure 1-2	Project Location.....	1-3
Figure 1-3	Population Density.....	1-8
Figure 1-4	Major Destinations.....	1-12
Figure 1-5	Renaissance Zones.....	1-16
Figure 2-1	Locally Preferred Alternative.....	2-3
Figure 2-2	Downtown Route Options for the Locally Preferred Alternative.....	2-8
Figure 2-3	Ransom Avenue and Lafayette Avenue Detail.....	2-10
Figure 2-4	Typical BRT Platform.....	2-14
Figure 3-1	Existing Land Use.....	3-2
Figure 3-2	Zoning.....	3-5
Figure 3-3	Future Land Use.....	3-9
Figure 3-4	Community Facilities.....	3-14
Figure 3-5	Population and Employment in Locally Preferred Alternative Corridor.....	3-18
Figure 3-6	Minority Populations.....	3-23
Figure 3-7	Low-Income Populations.....	3-27
Figure 3-8	2035 No Action and BRT Conditions Comparison – AM Peak Hour.....	3-37
Figure 3-9	2035 No Action and Project Conditions Comparison – PM Peak Hour.....	3-38
Figure 3-10	National Register of Historic Places-Listed and -Eligible Historic Properties in the Area of Potential Effects.....	3-43
Figure 3-11	Noise Impact Criteria for Transit Projects.....	3-47
Figure 3-12	Streams and Watercourses.....	3-50

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK