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## Florida’s Transportation System Today

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Owner/Operator</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Highways</td>
<td>State of Florida</td>
<td>12,088 centerline miles; 6,241 bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>State of Florida</td>
<td>~4,000 centerline miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Roads</td>
<td>Local governments</td>
<td>107,279 centerline miles; 5,001 bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>Local agencies/ SFRTA</td>
<td>28 urban fixed-route systems \n1 commuter rail system (Tri-Rail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>Private sector*</td>
<td>2,786 railway miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaports</td>
<td>Local agencies</td>
<td>15 seaports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterways</td>
<td>Federal &amp; state governments</td>
<td>3,475 miles of intracoastal &amp; inland routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>Local agencies</td>
<td>19 commercial airports \n27 military aviation facilities \n110 public general aviation \n636 private general aviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaceports</td>
<td>Special District</td>
<td>2 spaceports; 5 active launch facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Florida’s Strategic Intermodal System
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[Map of Florida’s Strategic Intermodal System with key information on airports, seaports, freight rail terminals, passenger terminals, highways, rail, waterways, and facilities planned add & drop.]
FDOT Seaport Program

• 15 public seaports
  – Each functions independently with its own Governing Board
  – Each prepares its own master plan
  – On-port, land side, and navigational considerations

• FDOT responsible for statewide seaport system plan
  – Coordination with seaports coordinators and Florida Ports Council
  – Define and plan for landside transportation improvements; such as highways connecting ports to their markets
What is NEPA?

• National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
  – Requires an assessment of the environmental effects of a federal action, including use of FHWA or FTA funds for transportation improvements

• Purpose of the environmental review process:
  – Inform citizens and others of the action
  – Consideration of effects to the human, natural, and physical environment
  – Disclosure
  – Informed decisions
FDOT Project Delivery Process

- Process is consistent for both NEPA and State Environmental Impact Report (SEIR)
- FDOT is improving SEIR through Statewide Acceleration Transformation (SWAT) Team concept
  - Improved scoping, scheduling and communication
  - Project development and design overlap
  - Advanced permitting and of course advance mitigation...
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Planning Phase

• Identify Projects

• Start the conversation
  – Efficient Transportation Decision Making Process (ETDM)
  – Use of Environmental Screening Tool
  – Established resource agency participation
  – Identification of issues

• Consideration of alternatives
  – Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM)
  – Alternative Corridor Evaluation (ACE)

• Scope development
FDOT ETDM Process

- A way of considering qualifying transportation projects during planning for potential project involvement with human and natural environments
- Enables agencies and the public to provide early input to FDOT and MPOs about the potential effects of proposed transportation projects
  - Open communication
  - Transparent decision documentation
- Interactive GIS-based Environmental Screening Tool (EST)
- Established Environmental Technical Advisory Teams (ETAT) reviewers – designated agency representatives
- Informs next phase in project delivery review and analysis.
ETDM Screening Supports

• Eliminate Alternatives (Alternative Corridor Evaluation a.k.a. ACE Process)
• Identify Technical Studies to be advanced
• PD&E Study Scope of Work – Focused
• Identifies resource agency issues of concern, starts the conversation!
Alternative Corridor Evaluation (ACE)

• Define initial corridor alternative(s) and considerations
  – Use Corridor Planning Process and technology
• Define environmental setting
  – Issues/resources of focus
  – Greater understanding and coordination
• Develop Analysis Methodology Memorandum to define/refine alternatives with stakeholder input
  – e.g., Land Suitability Mapping and/or other tools
• Define/ refine corridor alternatives using methodology
• Alternative Corridor Evaluation Report (ACER)
  – Defined affected environment
  – Alternative(s) for detailed study in NEPA with stakeholder input
  – Elimination of unreasonable alternative(s)
• Planning Product to be adopted into NEPA
Alternative Corridor Evaluation (ACE)
Alternative Corridor Evaluation (ACE)
Corridors determined (concurrence by Lead Agency with Stakeholder involvement) to be reasonable for NEPA analysis
Considerations During Planning

• Corridor analysis, narrow the field
• Value to agency commentary
• Identification of wetland mitigation opportunities
• Advanced mitigation
• Conservation planning
• Integrated mitigation
• Planning and Environmental Linkages
Considerations During PD&E/NEPA

• Detailed Engineering and Environmental analysis (ground level) of the alternatives
  — Balanced consideration
  — Continued Public Involvement – public hearing

• Wetland Evaluation Report (Natural Resources Evaluation)
  — UMAM scores: Initial functional assessment (UMAM) to determine amount of mitigation projected
  — Jurisdictional determinations as appropriate
  — Opportunities for mitigation, conceptual mitigation or advance mitigation – as specific as possible
  — Permitting discussion

• Agency reviews and findings – Avoid, minimize, mitigate

• Coordinate and identify mitigation options
  — Potential for advance mitigation credit purchase from banks
  — Agreement from agencies with Corps, WMDs, USFWS...

• Final Environmental (NEPA) Document
  — Preferred alternative advances to final design
  — Commitments and potential permits and conditions identified
Considerations During Design

- Environmental Document and project concept is transmitted to Final Design

- Designers refine concept
  - 30-60-90% - Final
  - Standards, specifications,
  - Drainage design and calculations

- Design/Permitting
  - Final functional assessment performed
  - Jurisdictional determinations
  - Final mitigation identified per F.S. 373.4137
  - If mitigation bank, FDOT purchases
  - Permit coordination with same representatives that have been looking at the project since planning phase
Considerations During Construction

• Address any design changes in construction (Design-Build especially)
• Respond to and address unanticipated conditions – contamination, species, etc.
• Communicate and adhere to commitments
• Permit Compliance and monitoring
• Final Acceptance
• Beyond construction – mitigation monitoring and reporting to permit agencies, unless we used a bank
Where are we headed?

- Clarify, simplify and focus procedures
- Continue to meet requirements
- Implementing change quickly statewide - Examples
  - Use new USACE RGP (SAJ-92)
    - For screened projects and those that completed NEPA or SEIR
    - 5 acres of both direct and secondary impacts per mile of project length up to 10 miles
    - Mitigation completed via s. 373.4137, F.S. – bank is primary source
    - Exclusions – Tidal waters (all of Monroe County), New alignments and Jeopardy opinions under ESA
  - Work closer with agencies at all levels
    - Modification of FDOT SOPs
    - Develop species specific Programmatic Agreements with USFWS
    - Innovative approaches to determining Species mitigation with FWC
Conclusion

• Recognize and embrace opportunities within the process
  – Active project management
  – Iterative process, use time and tools available at every step
  – Start early and refine along the way, “connect the dots”
  – Coordinate, coordinate, coordinate
    Seek to resolve issues
    Avoid, Minimize, Mitigate
    Document decisions
  – Recognize partnership opportunities
    Enhanced results
Questions?