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Screening Policy Criteria

Background...

- Screening policy needs FHWA approval
- Some SHAs had Screening Policies approved prior to the regulation changes
- Needed to be conservative enough not to fail identifying noise impacts, as required by NEPA and 23 CFR 772.
States with Approved Screening Policies...

- Idaho
- Montana
- Oregon
- Virginia
- Washington State
- Wisconsin
- Others?

*Pre-2011 Screening Policies preserved but needed to be tailored to conform with the new regs.
Each Approved Policy has Unique Features...

E.G., Idaho:

- 10-point transect (50 ft., 75 ft., 100 ft., 125 ft., 150 ft., 200 ft., 250 ft., 300 ft., 400 ft., and 800 ft.) plus the closest receptor.
- Hard alpha, flat terrain, and no shielding effects (design year and dhv).
- Category A and D referred to FHWA for consultation...
- Identification of impacts leads to on-site screening of the closest receptor.
- All of the future alternatives under consideration must be modeled.
Types of “Screening” Procedures:

- Low Volume Road Tool
- KYTC’s methodology of 3 impacted receptors needed for abatement analysis
- Montana’s (MDOT) Case Study illustrated how full blown noise studies are not practical and a good use of SHA’s limited resources
- Florida’s ETDM (Environmental Technical Advisory Team) Process
Other Methods/Methodologies of Screening:

- No TNM Lookup Tables - 23 CFR 772 shot them down!
- Straight line TNM can be used to respond to residents
- “(Screening) Methodologies can help in INTEGRATING NOISE INTO THE PLANNING PROCESS allowing for better proposed alternatives”
- The Low Volume Road Tool is a type of screening and can help with planning process.
What’s Next?

• Ivan Racic: Currently using TNM 3.0 as a screening tool.

• Adam Alexander: Status and application of the Low-Volume Road Tool.
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• Identification of impacts leads to on-site screening of the closest receptor.
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AT THE 2015 PRACTITIONER’S SUMMIT, 4 TYPES OF “SCREENING” PROCEDURES WERE PRESENTED:

- Low Volume Road Tool

- KYTC’s methodology of 3 impacted receptors needed for abatement analysis

- Montana’s (MDOT) Case Study illustrated how full blown noise studies are not practical and a good use of SHA’s limited resources

- Florida’s ETDM (Environmental Technical Advisory Team) Process
OTHER METHODS/METHODOLOGIES OF SCREENING:

- No TNM Lookup Tables - 23 CFR 772 shot them down!
- Straight line TNM can be used to respond to residents
- “(Screening) Methodologies can help in INTEGRATING NOISE INTO THE PLANNING PROCESS allowing for better proposed alternatives”
- The Low Volume Road Tool is a type of screening and can help with planning process.
METHODOLOGY

• Still a gap between doing a full blown noise study and getting a good understanding of potential noise impacts and different alternatives early in the Planning Process/Project Development

• Gap of Needing Development of Noise Impacts Early in Project Development

• So,

  1) Will the Low Volume Road Tool bridge the gap?
  2) TNM 3.0?
WHAT’S NEXT?

- Ivan Racic: Currently using TNM 3.0 as a screening tool.
- Adam Alexander: Status and application of the Low-Volume Road Tool.
LPA PROJECT SCOPING - PLANNING & PROGRAMMING

• Identify needs through local programming process
• Be commensurate with the complexity of the proposed project
• Identify any environmental issues that will take time and funding to address
• Define project cost and budget sufficiently to allow the project to be programmed
• Be sufficient to support the environmental analysis required during the design phase

LPA - Local Public Agency
LPA – SIMPLIFYING ANALYSIS FOR LOCAL STREETS AND PROJECTS WITH LOWER VOLUMES

1. Design is done on MicroStation platform (InRoads)
2. Roads converted to *.dxf with stations, Horizontal and vertical coordinates taken from *.alg and copied into model
3. Receivers, aerial imported in MicroStation to determine coordinates
4. Receivers coordinates copied into model

ADOT Continuous Improvement: Everyone, everywhere, solving problems, every day!
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Answer ready in 3 hours?
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