WHITE PAPER

ACCOMPLISHING SOCIOCULTURAL EFFECTS EVALUATIONS WITHIN THE ETDM PROCESS

Prepared by
Florida Department of Transportation
Central Environmental Management Office
URS Corporation
Powell, Fragala & Associates, Inc.

October 2, 2003

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

Accomplishing Sociocultural Effects Evaluations Within the EDTM Process

OVERVIEW

Task Group Organization

The Sociocultural Effects (SCE) Task Group was formed to re-examine how sociocultural effect evaluations are conducted in the Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) Process and to recommend specific actions for improving the SCE evaluation process. This task was undertaken in response to comments received from participants of the Statewide ETDM Training directing the Central Environmental Management Office (CEMO) to provide more clarity to the process for evaluating potential Sociocultural Effects.

The Task Group consisted of District and MPO ETDM Coordinators; Community Liaison Coordinators (CLCs); FDOT FIHS, planning and CEMO staff; FHWA representatives; and others. The Task Group met on two occasions for one-day workshops held on August 13, 2003 and September 3, 2003 in Tallahassee. Meeting objectives and support documents were prepared for each meeting to facilitate the Task Group deliberations. Meeting agendas and summaries are provided in the Appendix 1.

Sociocultural Effects Task Group

George Ballo, CEMO
Task Group Chairman

- Dawn Bisplinghoff, FDOT District Five ETDM Coordinator
- Greg Burke, Tallahassee-Leon County MPO ETDM Coordinator
- Rich Clarendon, Hillsborough MPO ETDM Coordinator
- Sabrina David, FHWA
- Rusty Ennemoser, CEMO
- Louise Fragala, Powell, Fragala and Associates
- George Hadley, FHWA ETDM Coordinator
- Lee Ann Jacobs, FHWA
- Frank Kalpakis, URS Corporation
- Nancy Model, West Florida MPO's
- Kathy Neill, FDOT Policy Planning
- Pam Nielsen, Powell, Fragala and Associates
- Gwen Pipkin, FDOT District One SCE Coordinator
- Ruth Roaza, URS Corporation
- Susan Sadighi, FDOT District Five CLC
- George Sirianni, FDOT FIHS
- Suraya Teeple, FDOT District Two ETDM Coordinator

Task Group Objectives

The Task Group was assigned three primary objectives:

1. Review currently available data sets in the Florida Geographic Data Library and develop useful standardized analyses for the evaluation of Sociocultural Effects, similar to the standard analyses used for natural resource evaluations.

2. Identify desired standard analyses and required data sets that can be included within the Environmental Screening Tool to support future SCE evaluations.

3. Define how SCE evaluations are accomplished in the ETDM Process.

The Task Group reviewed the objectives and established a planned approach. The plan included the following actions:

- Define common terms used in the SCE Evaluation process. These terms include population, community, neighborhood, and project. (Definitions are provided in the Appendix 2.)
- Determine if the existing SCE questions in the ETDM Environmental Screening Tool are useful, and how they should be considered in SCE evaluations.
- Identify the desired SCE evaluations and the associated data needs.
- Determine the data availability and collection effort for each of the identified data sets.
- Determine if the desired SCE analyses are quantifiable or if they can only be qualified through public outreach techniques.
- Determine if phasing is appropriate for SCE evaluations, and if so, the applicable ETDM phase for each analysis.
- Prioritize data needs for SCE evaluations.
- Define expected graphic or tabular output for each analysis.
- Review the "Degree of Effect" guidance for Sociocultural Effects and determine if it is adequate. Modify if warranted.
- Define functional revisions to the Environmental Screening Tool.

SCE TASK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

During the two one-day workshops, the SCE Task Group recommended several enhancements to the process for evaluating potential Sociocultural Effects in the ETDM Process. After deliberating on many considerations about how Sociocultural Effects should be evaluated, the Task Group agreed to the process and functional recommendations listed below. These recommendations require no significant change to the role of the Community Liaison Coordinator or ETDM Coordinator.

- Remove the SCE Questions from the Environmental Screening Tool.
- Use the revised SCE considerations as guidance for SCE evaluations.
- Categorize SCE evaluations into six SCE issues - social, economic, land use, mobility, aesthetic, and relocation effects.
- Integrate Title VI issues into the appropriate SCE issues.
- Create separate issue maps for each SCE issue in the Environmental Screening Tool.
- Enable users to select projects and issues, view Geographic Information System (GIS) analyses for the selected project by these issues, and enter commentary about project effects on these issues.

- Reorganize the Environmental Screening Tool and revise the Planning and Programming Summary Reports that record a degree of effect for the six new SCE issues.
- Group the six new SCE issues under a header for Sociocultural Effects and others under a header for Natural Resource Effects.
- Do not use a phasing process for SCE evaluations at this time.
- Address Comprehensive Plan Consistency and Title VI adherence before or during the Programming Screen phase.
- Use the standardized evaluations listed in this report within the Environmental Screening Tool (EST) to provide quantitative information about Sociocultural Effects.
- Use the same analysis buffers currently used for the evaluation of potential effects on the natural environment.
- Analysis buffers that use community boundaries adjacent to proposed projects are desirable for future analyses.
- Implement a work plan to collect the priority data sets identified by the SCE Task Group in Tables 2 and 3 of this report.
- Until the priority data is available on the EST, the MPOs and CLCs should use data available “in-house” to perform SCE evaluations.
- The results of public outreach efforts and SCE evaluations should be summarized in the EST so that this information is useful in future project phases.
- Scoping recommendations for focused analyses (technical studies) of potential Sociocultural Effects should be documented in the EST by the CLC and/or MPOs.
- Include an input form on the EST to document MPO and District CLC commentary and scoping recommendations for each SCE issue, similar to the input form used to capture agency commentary for natural resources.
- Provide an input form that allows MPOs and District CLCs to enter information about desired project features that they may have gathered from any public involvement activities (similar to the commitments and recommendations summary in the EST for natural resources).
- Provide additional guidance as outlined in this report to MPOs and CLCs regarding the assignment of “Degree of Effect” for potential Sociocultural Effects.
- Performance measures should be developed to evaluate the effectiveness of the MPOs and District CLCs for conducting public involvement and addressing Sociocultural Effects in the ETDM Process.

A summary of these recommendations is provided in Table 1 below and is followed by a detailed description of the recommendations. Table 1 also identifies if the recommendations require revising the ETDM Interim Guidelines or Sociocultural Effects Evaluation Handbook.

Table 1. Task Group Recommendations for SCE Evaluations

Recommendations	Revision to ETDM Interim Guidelines	Revision to draft SCE Handbook
1. The SCE questions previously used in the Environmental Screening Tool to quantify potential Sociocultural Effects should be removed and used only as guidance for MPOs and CLCs to conduct SCE evaluations. These considerations or "prompts" should be called "SCE Evaluation Guidance" and should be written in a neutral format.	✔	✔
2. SCE Evaluations should be categorized into six SCE issues. These include social, economic, land use, mobility, aesthetic, and relocation effects. Title VI issues should be integrated into the appropriate SCE issues and evaluated as such. The Planning and Programming Summary Reports should reflect the selected degree of effect for the six SCE issues rather than one overall SCE evaluation.	✔	✔
3. There should be no process for phasing SCE Evaluations. MPOs and District CLCs should be expected to evaluate and provide commentary about potential Sociocultural Effects based on available information during the planning phase. Key analyses such as Comprehensive Plan Consistency and TitleVI adherence should be addressed before or during the Programming Screen phase.	✔	
4. The standardized evaluations listed in this report should be programmed within the Environmental Screening Tool (EST) to provide quantitative information for use in the evaluation of potential Sociocultural Effects. The existing analysis buffers, such as those used for the evaluation of potential effects on the natural environment, should be used in the interim. Analysis buffers that use defined community boundaries adjacent to proposed projects are desired.	✔	
5. The data sets described in Tables 2 and 3 of this report support desired standard evaluations for potential Sociocultural Effects. These data sets should be given priority within a work plan to collect data needed to implement the desired SCE standard evaluations. Until the data are available on the EST, the MPOs and CLCs should use data available "in-house" to perform SCE evaluations.	✔	
6. Community issues should be concisely documented in the EST. The results of public outreach efforts and SCE evaluation should be summarized in the EST so that this information is useful in future project phases. Scoping recommendations for focused analysis of potential Sociocultural Effects should also be documented in the EST.	✔	✔
7. Additional guidance as outlined in this report should be provided to MPOs and CLCs regarding the assignment of "Degree of Effect" for potential Sociocultural Effects. The Task Force identified Comprehensive Plan consistency and Title VI adherence as the only statutory requirements that would trigger a potential dispute.	✔	✔
8. Revisions to the Environmental Screening Tool are needed to support the functional and process recommendations described above.	✔	

SCE Evaluation Guidance

Currently, the EST includes a module to help guide the Community Liaison Coordinators through their evaluation of potential Sociocultural Effects. This module includes a series of questions that users answer and a summary degree of effect for sociocultural issues is automatically calculated in the EST. A "yes" implies a negative effect and a "no" implies an enhancement or minimum to none rating. Commentary provided by the CLCs and MPOs are pulled together for each issue forming a single response under SCE.

The questions were developed incorporating the metropolitan planning factors, federal guidelines and standard analysis techniques used by socio-economic practitioners. The questions are intended to provide a basis to address social, economic, land use, mobility, aesthetic and relocation issues.

The SCE Task Group concluded that the SCE questions currently used in the Environmental Screening Tool to quantify potential Sociocultural Effects should be removed from the Environmental Screening Tool. The Task Group recommended that these considerations or "prompts" should be used only as guidance for MPOs and CLCs to conduct SCE evaluations. The Task Group reviewed, edited, and structured the questions into a neutral format. A copy of the revised SCE Evaluation Guidance is included in the Appendix 3.

The team further recommended that the considerations be included in the *ETDM Interim Guidelines* as guidance for the CLCs as they address the six issues. A full explanation of the considerations and proven practices on obtaining information for the degree of effect determination will be included in the *Sociocultural Effects Evaluation Handbook.*

SCE Evaluation Issues

Within the current guidance for evaluating Sociocultural Effects in the ETDM Interim Guidelines, MPOs and District CLCs are responsible for assigning the *Degree of Effect* for and District CLCs should be expected to evaluate and provide commentary about potential Sociocultural Effects based on available information during the planning phase. Additional commentary and analyses should address unresolved SCE issues during the Programming Screen phase. This would include the identification of technical studies needed to address certain issues.

The Task Group agreed that certain SCE analyses that may require dispute resolution should be conducted no later than during the Programming Screen phase. The SCE evaluations that could determine if the project should proceed to further phases include the following:

- Consistency with the goals, objectives, and policies of Comprehensive Plans
- Title VI adherence

The Task Group suggested that performance measures are needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the MPOs and District CLCs for addressing Sociocultural Effects in the ETDM Process. For MPOs, the FHWA could conduct the performance review during the MPO Certification Process. The measures should evaluate the effectiveness of public outreach efforts and the evaluation of potential Sociocultural Effects. The specific performance measures will need to be developed. Best practices by District CLCs and MPOs should be shared throughout the state.

Standardized Evaluations

One of the primary objectives of the SCE Task Group was to evaluate currently available data sets and to develop useful standardized GIS analyses that could be performed using these data sets. The Task Group identified data sets currently available through the Florida Geographic Data Library that are related to the evaluation of Sociocultural Effects. These data sets were reviewed to determine the currency and completeness of the data and if the data was useful for a quantitative analysis. The results of this SCE evaluation and data needs assessment are included in Appendix 4.

The Task Group determined that demographic data from the 2000 US Census are the only data sets currently residing within the Florida Geographic Data Library that are complete, current, and useful for quantitative analysis of scoiocultural effects. The following standardized analyses were determined to be needed for assessing social effects such as changes in demographics, community cohesion, and Title VI issues:

- Total 2000 Population
- Total, percent, and density of Blacks
- Total, percent, and density of Hispanics
- Total, percent, and density of Asians
- Total, percent, and density of American Indians
- Total, percent, and density of all other minorities
- Population aged 65 or older
- Population with income-to-poverty ratio under 125 % of poverty status
- Total, percent, and density of population that do not speak English
- Total, percent, and density of population with disabilities
- Age distribution
- Household size

- Educational level of population aged 25 or older
- Vehicles per household
- Average household income

The Task Group agreed that the analysis buffers currently used for the evaluation of potential effects on the natural environment should also be used for Sociocultural Effects in the interim. These standard buffers in the Environmental Screening Tool include 100 feet, 200 feet, 500 feet, and one mile. Analysis buffers consisting of community boundaries adjacent to proposed projects are desirable, but community boundaries are currently not available. Therefore, community boundaries are one of the priority data needs identified by the Task Group.

The expected output for each of the standard analyses listed above includes a quantification of the data within the specified buffer and a map depicting this information.

Desired SCE Evaluations, Data Priorities and Work Plan

The Task Group reviewed and prioritized data sets needed to support desired standard evaluations of potential Sociocultural Effects. These data priorities and potential sources are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Data Priorities

Priority	Data	Source
1	Community Focal Points	See specific sources in Table 3.
2	Community Boundaries	Local Planning Agencies, MPOs
3	Future Land Use Map	Local Planning Agencies
4	Emergency Response Service Zones	State and County Emergency Response
5	Historic Structures	(Some data on FGDL)
6	Parks	Local Parks Department
7	Transit Routes/Service Areas	FTIS - FTA CD of transit routes
8	Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan Data Layers	MPOs
9	Population and Employment Forecasts	MPOs, Local Government Planning Agencies
10	Bridges	FDOT (some data on FGDL)
11	Work Force Development Data	State Department of Labor
12	ROW Lines	ROW Departments
13	Business Districts	Local Planning Agencies

Community Focal Points were identified by the Task Group as the highest priority data need. There are several types of community focal points that are useful for SCE evaluations. Therefore, the Task Group prioritized the types of community focal points that are most useful. These priorities and potential data sources are listed in Table 3. The scoring results of the Task Group for the priority data sets are included in the Appendix 5.

Table 3. Community Focal Point Data Priorities

Priority	Data	Source
1	Schools	School Boards
2	Medical/Health (Hospitals)	InfoUSA, Local Planning Agencies
3	Fire Departments	InfoUSA, Local Planning Agencies
4	Religious (Churches)	InfoUSA, Local Planning Agencies
5	Intermodal Facilities	MPOs
6	Cultural Centers	InfoUSA, Local Planning Agencies
7	Police Departments	InfoUSA, Local Planning Agencies
8	Parks	Local Parks Department
9	Community Centers	InfoUSA, Local Planning Agencies
10	Social Service Facilities	InfoUSA, Local Planning Agencies
11	Civic Centers	InfoUSA, Local Planning Agencies
12	Government Buildings	InfoUSA, Local Planning Agencies
13	Cemeteries	Department of State, Local Sources, USGS

The most reliable data sources for the above data may vary from community to community. The Task Group recommended that the data sets described above should be included in a Data Collection Work Plan. A programmatic approach to collecting this data and improving the statewide data sets available through the FGDL should be implemented. Standardization of data sets should be a goal. Until the data is available on the EST, the MPOs and CLCs should use data available “in-house” to perform SCE evaluations.

Documenting Sociocultural Effects in the EST

The SCE Task Group considered how the results of public outreach and SCE evaluations should be documented in the EST so that the information is useful in future project phases. The following method is proposed.

There should be a balance between public input and factual information about potential effects on a community. For each of the six SCE issues, the CLCs and MPOs should concisely summarize the key community issues identified by the public in the EST. This process would include conducting effective public outreach strategies to gain public input about effects of proposed projects to the affected community, reviewing and identifying the key issues identified by the community, and summarizing the key issues in the EST. Guidance for implementing effective public outreach strategies and documenting public input should be provided in the *Public Involvement Handbook*.

An independent evaluation of the potential Sociocultural Effects of a candidate project should also be conducted by the CLCs and MPOs to identify potential community issues not identified through the public outreach strategy. The data available in the Florida Geographic Data Library and other “in-house” information available to the CLCs and MPOs should support this analysis. This could include demographic information, community attitudes and desires, the affect on community focal points, and others. Guidance should be provided about how to conduct this evaluation in the *Sociocultural Effects Evaluation Handbook*.

Both the summary of key issues identified by public input and other community issues identified through the SCE evaluation should be the basis of assigning a degree of effect for each of the six SCE issues. This information should be the basis for scoping recommendations for focused analysis of potential Sociocultural Effects. These scoping recommendations should be documented in the EST by the CLC and MPOs.

Assigning Degree of Effect

The Task Group determined that additional guidance is necessary for assigning "degree of effect" for community resources in the Planning and Programming Summary Reports. Public reaction to proposed projects is not the only basis for assigning degree of effect. CLCs and MPOs should review demographic information, documented community attitudes and desires, the affect on community focal points, and other information to conduct an analysis of potential Sociocultural Effects. After considering the public input and the independent analysis of potential Sociocultural Effects, the MPO or District CLC should use their best professional judgment to assign a degree of effect.

The Task Force identified Comprehensive Plan consistency and Title VI adherence as the only statutory requirements that would trigger a potential dispute. Table 4 below provides additional guidance for MPOs and CLCs to assign a degree of effect on community resources.

Table 4. Degree of Effect on Community Resources

Degree of Effect	CLC / MPO Guidance
Potential Dispute	Project has potentially severe negative effect on the affected community. Project is not in compliance with local comprehensive plans, and/or affects Title VI compliance.
Substantial	Project has potentially substantial adverse effects on the affected community and faces substantial community opposition. Intensive community interaction with focused public involvement is required during project development to address community concerns. Project will need substantial mitigation to gain public acceptance.
Moderate	Project has adverse effect on some elements of the affected community. Moderate community opposition to the planned project. Public involvement is needed to seek alternatives more acceptable to the community. Moderate community involvement is required during project development. Some mitigation or minimization is needed to gain support from the community.
Minimum/None	Project has minimum adverse effect on elements of the affected community. Minimum community opposition to the planned project. Little or no mitigation is needed.
Enhanced	Project has positive effect on the community. Affected community supports the proposed project.

This guidance should be included in the *ETDM Interim Guidelines* as well as in the *Sociocultural Effects Evaluation Handbook.*

Revisions to EST Functionality

The Task Force identified the following revisions to the Environmental Screening Tool that are needed to support the recommendations described previously in this White Paper:

1. Divide the SCE evaluations into six issues: social, economic, land use, mobility, aesthetic, and relocation effects. Create separate issue maps for each category using data identified in the previous sections and in Appendix 4. Enable users to select projects and issues, view GIS analyses for the selected project by these issues, and enter commentary about project effects on these issues. To maintain consistency, the following existing issues in the EST will be reorganized within the six SCE issues:

   - Infrastructure
   - Demographics
   - Recreation
   - Land Use
   - Mobility
   - Communities
   - Noise
   - Safety

   The new organization will include revised formats for Planning Screen and Programming Screen Summary Reports that record a degree of effect for the six new SCE issues. The six SCE issues will be grouped under a header for Sociocultural Effects and others will be grouped under a header for Natural Resource Effects.

2. Include an input form to document MPO and District CLC commentary and scoping recommendations for each SCE issue, similar to the input form used to capture agency commentary for natural resources. Include a location to document “commitments and recommendations”.

3. Provide an input form that allows MPOs and District CLCs to enter information about desired project features that they may have gathered from any public involvement activities. These are recorded at the project level, not by issue. Examples of project features include landscaping, pedestrian islands, crosswalks, bicycle facilities, etc.

CONCLUSION

The SCE Task Group worked cooperatively to identify the recommendations presented in this report. The recommendations meet all of the objectives provided to the Task Group. The Task Group also developed useful products presented in the Appendices that can be used to implement the recommendations.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Task Group Agendas and Summaries

Appendix 2 ETDM / SCE Terms

Appendix 3 Revised SCE Evaluation Guidance

Appendix 4 SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment

Appendix 5 Data Priorities

ETDM PROCESS
SOCIOCULTURAL EFFECT EVALUATION TASK GROUP

Agenda
Meeting Date: August 13, 2003

I. Meeting Overview
- Task Group introductions
- Review objectives
- Review the meeting's agenda

II. Process to Achieve Objectives
- Review Handouts
  - Full FGDL database
  - SCE database
  - SCE Evaluation and Data Needs
- Define data availability, EST applicability, and ETDM Phase
- Prioritize SCE Evaluations
- Decide which combinations of data sets are meaningful for analysis

III. Issues Discussion

IV. Next Meeting
- Date and Location
- Topics
- Preparations
- SCE Questions Handout

Objective: The SCE Task Group is to evaluate currently available data sets and to develop useful standardized GIS analyses that can be performed using these data sets. These standardized analyses will provide graphic and tabular information related to the effect that a planned transportation project has on the affected community. The results of these standardized analyses will be used by FDOT and MPO planning personnel to evaluate Sociocultural Effects. That evaluation will be conducted using the methodology presented in the Florida Department of Transportation Handbook, "Sociocultural Effects Evaluation". The results of those evaluations will be input into the Environmental Screening Tool.

The SCE Task Group will then address the statewide data sets and analytical results needed in the ideal world to allow effective evaluation of Sociocultural Effects in future years.

SCE Task Workgroup Meeting

8/13/2003

Attendees:

George Ballo
Frank Kalpakis
Kathy Neill
Suraya Teeple
Louise Fragala
Sebrina David
George Hadley
Greg Burke
Pam Nielsen
Gwen Pipkin
Rusty Ennemoser
Ruth Roaza

Other Members:

Annette Lapkowski
Nancy Model
Susan Sadighi
Rich Clarendon
Lee Anne Jacobs
Dawn Bisplinghoff
George Sirianni

Meeting Summary:

George Ballo opened the meeting with introductions and an overview of the Task Workgroup objectives (provided in pre-meeting handouts). The Work Group will be meeting twice. At these meetings we will concentrate on developing useful standardized analyses for SCE, using the following process:

1. Review the current SCE questions to determine if are they useful
2. Identify data and analysis needs to address issues
3. Determine if the data are readily available
4. Decide which analyses are applicable to each ETDM stage
5. Prioritize evaluations for each ETDM stage
6. Define the output for the standard analyses

At this first meeting, we focused on quantifiable analyses that can be performed by the EST. At our next meeting, on September 3, we will prioritize the analyses and address the subjective, qualitative analyses.

Louise Fragala explained that the current SCE questions grew out of a need to present sociocultural issues in the environmental screening tool. The questions were developed using the planning factors, federal guidelines and standard analysis techniques used by socio-economic practitioners. The questions were re-written to add a positive/neutral spin to them and they provide a basis for issues that need to be addressed by the CLC or ETDM Coordinator conducting the Sociocultural Effects evaluations.

Frank Kalpakis led the Work Group through an assessment of data and analyses needs using the SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Matrix. The input provided by the Work Group will be entered into an updated matrix and distributed prior to the next meeting. Frank also stated that a goal of the Work Group is to produce a white paper that defines how SCE is accomplished within the ETDM Process, including the following:

- Recommendation for standard analyses of sociocultural effects
- Priority data needs for identified analyses
- Method for capturing subjective sociocultural effects evaluations in the Environmental Screening Tool
- Suggested revisions to applicable sections of the current ETDM Interim Guidelines

Action Items:

1. The Task Group opened a discussion of the following terms: population, community, neighborhood, and project. To provide clarity to these terms in the context the ETDM Process, draft definitions will be provided and discussed at our next meeting.
2. The current questions dealing with sociocultural effects were discussed. The Task Group decided that these should be rewritten to show neutrality. The questions have been restated in the revised *SCE Data Needs Assessment Results* table (attached). Please review the revised questions and forward any comments to George Ballo.
3. A *SCE Evaluation and Data Needs* chart was used as a facilitation tool at our last meeting. The Task Group provided input about data availability and sources, geographic extent of analyses, quantifiable vs. subjective analyses, and the expected output from standard analyses. This input was incorporated and reorganized into the attached *SCE Data Needs Assessment Results* table for review by the Task Group. Please review the table and provide comments at or before our next meeting on September 3.

Potential Topics for White Paper:

1. Remove the current SCE questions from the ETDM Interim Guidelines; include them in the Scoiocultural Effects Handbook for guidance to CLCs and MPOs
2. Data issue - accuracy of data (e.g., focal points, publicly owned recreational and conservation lands)
3. Provide ability to print high quality maps for public workshops
4. Provide list of data needs for GeoPlan to obtain from MPOs; work with MPOs and FDOT to obtain existing and future Zdata sets
5. What are established queries using FGDL data already in the tool?
6. Specify the follow-up actions that are used to deal with issues. These should be standard operations and techniques that are specified for community studies, similar to Volume 2 of the PD&E Manual, which specify the standards for natural resource technical studies.

ETDM PROCESS
SOCIOCULTURAL EFFECT EVALUATION TASK GROUP

Agenda
Meeting Date: September 3, 2003
Time: 8:30am to 4:00 pm
Location: Room 330, Rhyne Building
2740 Centerview Drive
Tallahassee, FL

I. Meeting Overview
- Review August 13 Meeting Summary
- Discuss today's agenda

II. August 13 Action Items
- Definitions for ETDM terms
- Discuss revised SCE questions
- Review SCE Data Needs Assessment Results table
- Prioritize standard analyses and needed data sets

III. Subjective Analyses
- Expected outputs from subjective analyses
- Assignment of Degree of Effect
- How captured in EST

IV. White Paper
- Key components
- Suggested revisions to ETDM Interim Guidelines
- Guidance for SCE Handbook
- Prepare outline
- Assignments and schedule

SCE Task Workgroup Meeting
9/3/2003

Attendees:

George Ballo
Dawn Bisplinghoff
Sabrina David
Louise Fragala
George Hadley
LeeAnn Jacobs
Frank Kalpakis
Annette Lapkowski
Nancy Model
Kathy Neill
Pam Nielsen
Gwen Pipkin
Ruth Roaza
Susan Sadighi
George Sirianni
Suraya Teeple

Other Members:

Greg Burke
Rich Clarendon
Rusty Ennemoser

Meeting Summary:

George Ballo opened the meeting with introductions and an overview of the Task Group's previous meeting on August 13, 2003.

The purpose of this meeting was to:

1. Define the following ETDM terms: project, candidate project, community, neighborhood and population

   Project: In the context of the ETDM Process, a proposed project is an improvement being considered for inclusion in a Cost-Feasible Long Range Transportation Plan or FIHS Plan. Candidate projects are often referred to as project needs included in a "Needs Assessment" or "Needs Plan".

   A project is a transportation improvement that is planned in a Cost-Feasible Long Range Transportation Plan or FIHS Plan, programmed in a Five Year Work Program or TIP, undergoing project development, or in the process of being implemented. There are several phases of a project as listed below:

   - Planning
   - Programming
   - Project Development
   - Design
   - Rights-of Way Acquisition
   - Construction

   Community: A community may be defined by geographic, manmade or natural boundaries with respect to both people and places. The people who comprise a community may share similar social, cultural, ethnic, economic, political or religious characteristics. The people may share common histories, economic profiles or political interests. They may attend the same schools, churches, or social clubs. These people may interact in social settings and share similar values.

Neighborhood: Neighborhoods are small geographic units typically bounded by main roadways, natural and manmade features (parks, wooded areas, waterbodies, etc). A neighborhood is a small group of people living in very close proximity to one another. Each neighborhood may have distinctive characteristics such as social, economic, cultural or religious features that distinguish one neighborhood from another.

Population: A population is a group of people or a number of persons that live in a geographically defined area or share particular demographic characteristics.

2. Review the revised SCE questions (prompts or considerations)
   - From this point forward, the SCE questions will be referred to as "prompts" (or considerations). The questions are meant to prompt thinking and may or may not be answerable until data is collected. The questions should be answered as early as they can and updated as more data becomes available.
   - The SCE prompts were reviewed and suggestions made for further guidance. The prompts will be finalized pending the completion of reviewing team comments.
   - Question 3.2 should be addressed under Secondary and Cumulative Effects.
   - The SCE issues will be broken out into six (6) separate categories, with the understanding that Title VI permeates throughout. Title VI is only an issue if you ignore it. Attention to considering Title VI during all phases.
   - Title VI issues should be integrated into the appropriate six categories
   - SCE Work Group members were asked to review the revised prompts (considerations) and forward any comments to G Ballo or F Kalpakis.

3. Review the SCE Data Needs Assessment Results table
   - Gwen Pipkin commented that it would be helpful to have a list of data layers that support SCE evaluations (list the data layer, what to look for and what can be written up).
   - SCE Task Group members were asked to review the SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment Results and forward any comments to G Ballo or F Kalpakis.

4. Prioritize standard analyses and needed data sets
   - SCE Task Group members reviewed the SCE Evaluation and Data Priorities and prioritized their top five data needs and top five community focal points.

5. Discuss expected outputs from subjective analyses
   - There should be a balance between subjective and quantitative analyses
   - Narrative commentary about public input and sociocultural effects is very important, maybe more than quantitative data

6. Discuss Degree of Effect – SCE Task Group members discussed the following topics:
   - "Professional judgement" should be used in determining degree of effect
   - Additional guidance necessary for assigning degree of effect and a more complete definition of each color (a red flag does not kill a project)
   - Clarification on red flags in programming – need to find legal aspects that cause red flags in programming
   - Documentation for degree of effect - when providing commentary, provide the basis for the commentary and the degree of effect

- Suggestion to develop a sample for each prompt (consideration) at the different phases

7. Review the White Paper key components and outline
   - White Paper due to Leroy Irwin September 23, 2003
   - Reflection of SCE Work Group actions and accomplishments

Action Items:

1. The Task Group was asked to review the following documents and return all comments/suggestions for revisions to George Ballo or Frank Kalpakis by Monday, September 8, 2003:
   - SCE Evaluation Questions (prompts or considerations);
   - SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment Results; and
   - Degree of Effect (further definition and guidance needed).
2. Frank Kalpakis will analyze/summarize the results of the SCE Task Group's data needs analysis (ranking) and e-mail the results to the Task Group members.
3. Frank Kalpakis will contact Nancy Model for further discussion regarding the data layers.
4. Dawn Bisplinghoff will research legal issues and potential red flags in programming.
5. G. Ballo, F Kalpakis and L Fragala will conference call to discuss the Task Group's comments and writing the White Paper.

White Paper:

- Draft circulated for review September 17, 2003 and returned to F Kalpakis on September 19, 2003
- Final due to Leroy Irwin September 23, 2003

ETDM / SCE TERMS

Project: In the context of the ETDM Process, a proposed project is an improvement being considered for inclusion in a Cost-Feasible Long Range Transportation Plan or FIHS Plan. Candidate projects are often referred to as project needs included in a "Needs Assessment" or "Needs Plan".

A project is a transportation improvement that is planned in a Cost-Feasible Long Range Transportation Plan or FIHS Plan, programmed in a Five Year Work Program or TIP, undergoing project development, or in the process of being implemented. There are several phases of a project as listed below:

- Planning
- Programming
- Project Development
- Design
- Rights-of Way Acquisition
- Construction

Population: A population is a group of people or a number of persons that live in a geographically defined area or share particular demographic characteristics.

Community: A community may be defined by geographic, manmade or natural boundaries with respect to both people and places. The people who comprise a community may share similar social, cultural, ethnic, economic, political or religious characteristics. The people may share common histories, economic profiles or political interests. They may attend the same schools, churches, or social clubs. These people may interact in social settings and share similar values.

Neighborhood: Neighborhoods are small geographic units typically bounded by main roadways, natural and manmade features (parks, wooded areas, waterbodies, etc). A neighborhood is a small group of people living in very close proximity to one another. Each neighborhood may have distinctive characteristics such as social, economic, cultural or religious features that distinguish one neighborhood from another.

REVISED SCE EVALUATION GUIDANCE

Social Effects - Changes in Demographics

1.1 Define demographics of the potentially affected population.
1.2 What displacements of population, if any, would be expected as a result of the project?
1.3 Would any increases or decreases in population be expected as a result of the project?
1.4 Would any displacement of minority populations be expected as a result of the project?
1.5 Are there any disproportionate effects on special populations?
1.6 Have minority populations previously been affected by other public projects in the area?

Social Effects - Community Cohesion

1.7 Would the project result in any barriers dividing an established neighborhood(s) or would it increase neighborhood interaction?
1.8 What changes, if any, in traffic patterns through an established neighborhood(s) would be expected as a result of the project?
1.9 Would any changes to social relationships and patterns be expected as a result of the project?
1.10 Would the project result in any loss, reduction or enhancement of connectivity to a community or neighborhood activity center(s)?
1.11 Would the project affect community cohesion?

Social Effects - Safety/Emergency Response

1.12 Would the project result in the creation of isolated areas?
1.13 Would any increase or decrease in emergency services response time (fire, police and EMS) be expected as a result of the project?
1.14 Does the project affect safe access to community facilities?

Social Effects - Compatibility With Community Goals and Issues

1.15 Would any changes in social value be expected as a result of the project?
1.16 Would the project be perceived as having a positive or negative effect on quality of life?
1.17 Have community leaders/residents had opportunities to provide input to the project decision-making process in the present or past?
1.18 Have previous projects in this area been compatible with or conflicted with the plans, goals and objectives of the community?
1.19 Is the proposed project consistent with the community vision?
1.20 Are transportation investments equitably serving all populations?

Economic Effects – Business and Employment

2.1 Would any changes to travel patterns be expected that would eliminate or enhance access to any businesses?
2.2 Would any increases or decreases in traffic through traffic-based business areas be expected?
2.3 Would any changes in travel patterns be expected that would result in a business/district being bypassed?
2.4 Would access for special needs patrons increase or decrease as a result of the project?
2.5 Would any increase or decrease in business visibility for traffic-based businesses be expected as a result of the project?
2.6 Would the loss of any businesses be expected as a result of the project?
2.7 Would any increases or reductions in employment opportunities in the local economy be expected as a result of the project?

Economic Effects – Business and Employment, Continued

2.8 Would regional employment opportunities be enhanced or diminished as a result of the project?
2.9 What is the effect of the project on military installations?

Economic Effects – Tax Base

2.10 Would any real property be removed from the tax roles as a result of the project?
2.11 Is it likely that taxable property values would increase or decline as a result of the project?
2.12 Would changes in business activities increase or decrease the tax base?

Land Use Effects – Land Use Patterns

3.1 Would the project result in a change in the character or aesthetics of the existing landscape?
3.2 Would the amount of recreation/open space be expected to increase or decrease as a result of the project?

Land Use Effects – Compatibility with Local Growth Management Plans

3.3 Would the project be compatible with local growth management policies?
3.4 Would the project be compatible with adopted land use plans?

Mobility Effects

4.1 Would access to public transportation facilities be increased or reduced as a result of the project?
4.2 Would pedestrian mobility be increased or decreased as a result of the project?
4.3 Would non-motorist access to business and service facilities be increased or reduced as a result of the project?
4.4 How does the project affect intermodal connectivity?
4.5 Would any change in connectivity between residential and non-residential areas be expected as a result of the project?
4.6 What are the expected changes to existing traffic patterns as a result of the project?
4.7 Would a change in any public parking areas be expected as a result of the project?
4.8 Would access for transportation disadvantaged populations be affected?

Aesthetics

5.1 Are there noise or vibration sensitive sites near the project?
5.2 Is the project likely to affect a vista or viewshed?
5.3 Does the project blend visually with the area?
5.4 Is the project adjacent to any community focal point?
5.5 Is the project likely to be perceived as being compatible and in character with the community's aesthetic values?
5.6 What feature(s), if any, of the project might be perceived by the community as inconsistent with the character of that community?

Relocation Effects

6.1 Would any displacement of residences/dwellings be expected as a result of the project?
6.2 Would any displacement of non-residential land uses be expected as a result of the project?
6.3 Do any potentially displaced non-residential uses have any unique or special characteristics that are not likely to be reestablished in the community?
6.4 Would any displacement of community or institutional facilities be expected as a result of the project?

SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment

Social Effects - Changes in Demographics

SCE Evaluation Guidance

The following considerations are included in the SCE Handbook to provide guidance in evaluating Sociocultural Effects:

1.1 Define demographics of the potentially affected population.
1.2 What displacements of population, if any, would be expected as a result of the project?
1.3 Would any increases or decreases in population be expected as a result of the project?
1.4 Would any displacement of minority populations be expected as a result of the project?
1.5 Are there any disproportionate effects on special populations?
1.6 Have minority populations previously been affected by other public projects in the area?

Data Assessment

Data Requirements			FGDL Data Evaluation		
Data Type	**Source**	**Status C = Currently in FGDL I = In Progress N = Needs to be Added**	**Currency**	**Scale**	**Completeness**
• Aerial photography	• FDOT Aerial Photographs	I			
• Parcel data	• Property Appraiser	I			
• ROW lines	• ROW Departments	N			
• Existing Land Use Map	• Local Planning Agency/ WMD	WMD – C Local - I	WMD - 1999	WMD – 1:24,000	WMD - Statewide, acquired from Aerial Photo interpretation
• Future Land Use Map	• Local Planning Agency	N			

• Demographic Information
  • Total 2000 Population
  • Total, percent, and density of Blacks
  • Total, percent, and density of Hispanics
  • Total, percent, and density of Asians
  • Total, percent, and density of American Indians
  • Total, percent, and density of all other minorities
  • Population aged 65 or older
  • Population with income-to-poverty ratio under 125 % of poverty status
  • Total, percent, and density of population that do not speak English
  • Total, percent, and density of population with disabilities
  • Age distribution
  • Household size
  • Educational level of population aged 25 or older
  • Vehicles per household
  • Average household income
	• US Census	C	1990, 2000	1:100,000	Statewide by block

• Forecasts – population and economic projections	• FDOT and MPOs (Regional Models)	N			

SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment

Standard Analysis Types

For each data type listed above, standard spatial statistics will be provided in the EST. These statistics generally indicate the numbers of features or land use types that occur within a specific distance from a project centerline.
Additional analyses requirements include:

- Census block with totals

Geographic Extent of Analysis

At this time, the analysis buffer distances include 100 feet, 200 feet, 500 feet and one mile.
The future analysis buffers will include the boundaries of the communities adjacent to candidate projects after the community boundaries are defined.

Expected GIS Output

Maps depicting demographic information shown above.

SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment

Social Effects - Community Cohesion

Evaluation Guidance

The following considerations are included in the SCE Handbook to provide guidance in evaluating Sociocultural Effects:

1.7 Would the project result in any barriers dividing an established neighborhood(s) or would it increase neighborhood interaction?
1.8 What changes, if any, in traffic patterns through an established neighborhood(s) would be expected as a result of the project?
1.9 Would any changes to social relationships and patterns be expected as a result of the project?
1.10 Would the project result in any loss, reduction or enhancement of connectivity to a community or neighborhood activity center(s)?
1.11 Would the project affect community cohesion?

Data Assessment

Data Requirements			FGDL Data Evaluation		
Data Type	**Source**	**Status C = Currently in FGDL I = In Progress N = Needs to be Added**	**Currency**	**Scale**	**Completeness**
• Community / Neighborhood Boundaries	• City/County Planning - Community Services	N			
• Population, demographics	• US Census	C	1990, 2000	1:100,000	Statewide by block
• Future Traffic Volumes	• MPO/FDOT Travel Demand Models	Non-EST analysis			
• Current Traffic Volumes	• MPO/FDOT Travel Demand Models	Non-EST analysis			
• Public Input	• MPO/FDOT Public Involvement	Qualitative			
• Community Focal Points (schools, civic centers, religious, parks, medical/health, cultural) • Points of interest (post offices, libraries, intermodal facilities, hospitals)	• InfoUSA • School Board • Property Appraiser • AAA • City Directories • Visitors Bureau • Department of State	C, but needs to be supplemented and verified	Varies	Varies	These features exist from a number of sources in FGDL points of interest layer, but completeness and accuracy are questionable.

Standard Analysis Types

For each data type listed above, standard spatial statistics will be provided in the EST. These statistics generally indicate the numbers of features that occur within a specific distance from a project centerline.
Additional analyses requirements include:

- Name and type of community focal points and points of interests

Geographic Extent of Analysis

At this time, the analysis buffer distances include 100 feet, 200 feet, 500 feet and one mile.
The future analysis buffers will include the boundaries of the communities adjacent to candidate projects after the community boundaries are defined.

Expected GIS Output

Maps depicting communities, focal points, and demographic information.

SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment

Social Effects - Safety/Emergency Response

Evaluation Guidance

The following considerations are included in the SCE Handbook to provide guidance in evaluating Sociocultural Effects:

1.12 Would the project result in the creation of isolated areas?
1.13 Would any increase or decrease in emergency services response time (fire, police and EMS) be expected as a result of the project?
1.14 Does the project affect safe access to community facilities?

Data Assessment

Data Requirements			FGDL Data Evaluation		
Data Type	Source	Status C = Currently in FGDL I = In Progress N = Needs to be Added	Currency	Scale	Completeness
• Public Input	• MPO/FDOT Public Involvement	Qualitative			
• Fire Departments	• Local Public Safety Departments • County Emergency Response	N			
• Hospitals	• InfoUSA • AAA • County Emergency Response • City Directories	C, needs to be verified	Varies	Varies	These features exist from a number of sources in FGDL points of interest layer, but completeness and accuracy are questionable.
• Police Departments	• Police Departments	N			
• Existing and Future Lanes	• FDOT ITS Group	EST input by MPO/FDOT			
• Emergency Response Service Zones	• County Emergency Response • State Emergency Response	N			
• Schools	• School Districts	C, needs to be verified	Varies	Varies	These features exist from a number of sources in FGDL points of interest layer, but completeness and accuracy are questionable.

Standard Analysis Types

For each data type listed above, standard spatial statistics will be provided in the EST. These statistics generally indicate the numbers of features that occur within a specific distance from a project centerline.
Additional analyses requirements include:

- List of emergency response facilities
- Nearest hospital, police, fire department
- List of schools

Geographic Extent of Analysis

At this time, the analysis buffer distances include 100 feet, 200 feet, 500 feet and one mile.
The future analysis buffers will include the boundaries of the communities adjacent to candidate projects after the community boundaries are defined.

Expected GIS Output

Maps depicting communities, focal points, and demographic information.

SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment

Social Effects - Compatibility With Community Goals and Issues

Evaluation Guidance

The following considerations are included in the SCE Handbook to provide guidance in evaluating Sociocultural Effects:

1.15 Would any changes in social value be expected as a result of the project?
1.16 Would the project be perceived as having a positive or negative effect on quality of life?
1.17 Have community leaders/residents had opportunities to provide input to the project decision-making process in the present or past?
1.18 Have previous projects in this area been compatible with or conflicted with the plans, goals and objectives of the community?
1.19 Is the proposed project consistent with the community vision?
1.20 Are transportation investments equitably serving all populations?

Data Assessment

Data Requirements			FGDL Data Evaluation		
Data Type	Source	Status C = Currently in FGDL I = In Progress N = Needs to be Added	Currency	Scale	Completeness
• Demographics	• US Census	C	1990, 2000	1:100,000	Statewide by block
• Goals, Objectives and Policies	• Local Comprehensive Plans • MPO Long Range Plans • Community Plans	Qualitative			
• Public Input • Values, attitudes, desires	• Civic Associations • Past Public Involvement Activities • Public Input • Community Plans	Qualitative			

Standard Analysis Types

For each data type listed above, standard spatial statistics will be provided in the EST. These statistics generally indicate the numbers of features that occur within a specific distance from a project centerline.
Additional analyses requirements include:

- Overlay community with project buffers

Geographic Extent of Analysis

At this time, the analysis buffer distances include 100 feet, 200 feet, 500 feet and one mile.
The future analysis buffers will include the boundaries of the communities adjacent to candidate projects after the community boundaries are defined.

Expected GIS Output

Maps depicting demographic information.

SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment

Economic Effects – Business and Employment

Evaluation Guidance

The following considerations are included in the SCE Handbook to provide guidance in evaluating Sociocultural Effects:

2.1 Would any changes to travel patterns be expected that would eliminate or enhance access to any businesses?
2.2 Would any increases or decreases in traffic through traffic-based business areas be expected?
2.3 Would any changes in travel patterns be expected that would result in a business/district being bypassed?
2.4 Would access for special needs patrons increase or decrease as a result of the project?
2.5 Would any increase or decrease in business visibility for traffic-based businesses be expected as a result of the project?
2.6 Would the loss of any businesses be expected as a result of the project?
2.7 Would any increases or reductions in employment opportunities in the local economy be expected as a result of the project?
2.8 Would regional employment opportunities be enhanced or diminished as a result of the project?
2.9 What is the effect of the project on military installations?

Data Assessment

Data Requirements			FGDL Data Evaluation		
Data Type	Source	Status C = Currently in FGDL I = In Progress N = Needs to be Added	Currency	Scale	Completeness
• Existing Land Use Map (Enterprise zones and Area Type	• Local Planning Agency • Local Jurisdictions • DOR • WMDs	WMD – C Local – I	WMD – 1999	WMD – 1:24,000	WMD – Statewide, acquired from Aerial Photo interpretation
• Future Land Use Map	• Local Planning Agency • Local Jurisdictions • RPCs	N			
• Businesses Districts	• Chambers of Commerce/MPO	N			
• Traffic Studies • Future Traffic Projections	• Travel Demand Models	Non-EST analysis			
• Public Transportation	• Local Transit Authority/MPO	N			
• Transit Development Plan Data layers	• Local Transit Authority/MPO	N			
• Transit Service Areas	• Local Transit Authority/MPO	N			
• Sidewalks	• FDOT/Local Transportation	FDOT – C Local - N	FDOT – Monthly (RCI)	FDOT – 1:24,000	FDOT – RCI, roadways are complete but other features and descriptive information are highly variable
• Bicycle Lanes	• FDOT/Local Transportation	FDOT – C Local - N	FDOT – Monthly (RCI)	FDOT – 1:24,000	FDOT – RCI, roadways are complete but other features and descriptive information are highly variable
• Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plans Data Layers	• MPO	N			
• Social Service Facilities	• Social Services	N			
• Work Force Development Data	• InfoUSA	N			
• Typical Sections	• Project Sponsor	N			
• Aerial photography	• FDOT Aerial Photographs	I			
• Parcel data	• Property Appraiser	I			
• ROW lines	• ROW Departments	N			

Standard Analysis Types

For each data type listed above, standard spatial statistics will be provided in the EST. These statistics generally indicate the numbers of features or land use types that occur within a specific distance from a project centerline.
Additional analyses requirements include:

- Location of business districts and type
- Query Land Use Land Codes (LULC) and parcels

SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment

Geographic Extent of Analysis

At this time, the analysis buffer distances include 100 feet, 200 feet, 500 feet and one mile.
The future analysis buffers will include the boundaries of the communities adjacent to candidate projects after the community boundaries are defined.

Expected GIS Output

Maps of the data layers shown and maps of businesses by type.

SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment

Economic Effects – Tax Base

Evaluation Guidance

The following considerations are included in the SCE Handbook to provide guidance in evaluating Sociocultural Effects:

2.10 Would any real property be removed from the tax roles as a result of the project?
2.11 Is it likely that taxable property values would increase or decline as a result of the project?
2.12 Would changes in business activities increase or decrease the tax base?

Data Assessment

Data Requirements			FGDL Data Evaluation		
Data Type	Source	Status C = Currently in FGDL I = In Progress N = Needs to be Added	Currency	Scale	Completeness
• Aerial photography	• FDOT Aerial Photographs	I			
• Parcel data	• Property Appraiser	I			
• Property values	• Property Appraiser • DOR	I			
• ROW lines	• ROW Departments	N			

Standard Analysis Types

For each data type listed above, standard spatial statistics will be provided in the EST. These statistics generally indicate the numbers of features that occur within a specific distance from a project centerline.
Additional analyses requirements include:

- None identified.

Geographic Extent of Analysis

At this time, the analysis buffer distances include 100 feet, 200 feet, 500 feet and one mile.
The future analysis buffers will include the boundaries of the communities adjacent to candidate projects after the community boundaries are defined.

Expected GIS Output

Maps of the data layers shown and maps of businesses by type.

SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment

Land Use Effects – Land Use Patterns

Evaluation Guidance

The following considerations are included in the SCE Handbook to provide guidance in evaluating Sociocultural Effects:

3.1 Would the project result in a change in the character or aesthetics of the existing landscape?
3.2 Would the amount of recreation/open space be expected to increase or decrease as a result of the project?

Data Assessment

Data Requirements			FGDL Data Evaluation		
Data Type	Source	Status C = Currently in FGDL I = In Progress N = Needs to be Added	Currency	Scale	Completeness
• Future Land Use Plan	• Local Planning Agencies	N			
• Goals, Objectives, Policies	• Comprehensive Plans • Local Planning Agencies	Qualitative			

Standard Analysis Types

For each data type listed above, standard spatial statistics will be provided in the EST. These statistics generally indicate the land use types that occur within a specific distance from a project centerline.
Additional analyses requirements include:

- None identified.

Geographic Extent of Analysis

At this time, the analysis buffer distances include 100 feet, 200 feet, 500 feet and one mile.
The future analysis buffers will include the boundaries of the communities adjacent to candidate projects after the community boundaries are defined.

Expected GIS Output

Maps of existing and future land use.

SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment

Land Use Effects – Compatibility with Local Growth Management Plans

Evaluation Guidance

The following considerations are included in the SCE Handbook to provide guidance in evaluating Sociocultural Effects:

3.3 Would the project be compatible with local growth management policies?
3.4 Would the project be compatible with adopted land use plans?

Data Assessment

Data Requirements			FGDL Data Evaluation		
Data Type	Source	Status C = Currently in FGDL I = In Progress N = Needs to be Added	Currency	Scale	Completeness
• Goals, Objectives, Policies • Community goals	• Comprehensive Plans	Qualitative			
• Public Input	• FDOT/MPO Public Involvement	Qualitative			

Standard Analysis Types

- None identified.

Geographic Extent of Analysis

At this time, the analysis buffer distances include 100 feet, 200 feet, 500 feet and one mile.
The future analysis buffers will include the boundaries of the communities adjacent to candidate projects after the community boundaries are defined.

Expected GIS Output

None.

SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment

Mobility Effects

Evaluation Guidance

The following considerations are included in the SCE Handbook to provide guidance in evaluating Sociocultural Effects:

4.1 Would access to public transportation facilities be increased or reduced as a result of the project?
4.2 Would pedestrian mobility be increased or decreased as a result of the project?
4.3 Would non-motorist access to business and service facilities be increased or reduced as a result of the project?
4.4 How does the project affect intermodal connectivity?
4.5 Would any change in connectivity between residential and non-residential areas be expected as a result of the project?
4.6 What are the expected changes to existing traffic patterns as a result of the project?
4.7 Would a change in any public parking areas be expected as a result of the project?
4.8 Would access for transportation disadvantaged populations be affected?

Data Assessment

Data Requirements			FGDL Data Evaluation		
Data Type	Source	Status C = Currently in FGDL I = In Progress N = Needs to be Added	Currency	Scale	Completeness
• Transit routes • Existing and Future Lanes • Sidewalk facilities • Bicycle facilities • Rural Areas • TDP • Intermodal facilities • On-street parking	• Local Transit Agency • Project sponsor • MPO • Local Jurisdictions • InfoUSA	N			
• RCI	• FDOT	C	Monthly	1:24,000	Roadway facilities are complete, but descriptive information is highly variable
• Existing Land Use Map • Future Land Use Map	• Local Jurisdictions • Comprehensive Plans	I			
• Community Focal Points	• Local Jurisdictions • Public Involvement	C, needs to be verified	Varies	Varies	These features exist from a number of sources in FGDL points of interest layer, but completeness and accuracy are questionable.

Standard Analysis Types

For each data type listed above, standard spatial statistics will be provided in the EST. These statistics generally indicate the numbers of features or land use types that occur within a specific distance from a project centerline.
Additional analyses requirements include:

- Map only
- List intermodal facilities (bus stops, RV stations, airport)

Geographic Extent of Analysis

At this time, the analysis buffer distances include 100 feet, 200 feet, 500 feet and one mile.
The future analysis buffers will include the boundaries of the communities adjacent to candidate projects after the community boundaries are defined.

Expected GIS Output

Maps showing communities and focal points, transit routes, sidewalk and bicycle facilities, intermodal facilities.

SCE Evaluation and Data Needs Assessment

Aesthetics

Evaluation Guidance

The following considerations are included in the SCE Handbook to provide guidance in evaluating Sociocultural Effects:

5.1 Are there noise or vibration sensitive sites near the project?
5.2 Is the project likely to affect a vista or viewshed?
5.3 Does the project blend visually with the area?
5.4 Is the project adjacent to any community focal point?
5.5 Is the project likely to be perceived as being compatible and in character with the community's aesthetic values?
5.6 What feature(s), if any, of the project might be perceived by the community as inconsistent with the character of that community?

Data Assessment

Data Requirements			FGDL Data Evaluation		
Data Type	Source	Status C = Currently in FGDL I = In Progress N = Needs to be Added	Currency	Scale	Completeness
• Public Input	• FDOT/MPO Public Involvement	Qualitative			
• Noise Study	• FDOT	Non-EST analysis			
• Noise ordinances	• Local Agencies	Qualitative			
• Noise sensitive sites	• Local Agencies • Public Input	N			
• Residential areas, parks, recreation areas, preserves hospitals	• Local Agencies • State Agencies	State – C Local - N	State – varies	State – varies	State – Residential areas from 1999 FLUCCS, scale 1:24,000, statewide; parks, recreational areas and preserves from state plans and some WMDs are in 1999 FNAI managed areas and are statewide at 1:24,000; many local areas are missing
• Bridges	• FDOT • MPOs	FDOT – C MPO – N	FDOT – RCI, monthly	1:24,000	FDOT – descriptive information is not complete
• Historic Structures	• SHPO • Local historic societies	SHPO – C Local - N	SHPO, biweekly	1:24,000	SHPO – only includes sites reported to SHPO, no systematic inventory is available
• Community focal points	• MPOs • Local Agencies • Public Input	C, but needs to be supplemented and verified	Varies	Varies	These features exist from a number of sources in FGDL points of interest layer, but completeness and accuracy are questionable.

Standard Analysis Types

For each data type listed above, standard spatial statistics will be provided in the EST. These statistics generally indicate the numbers of features that occur within a specific distance from a project centerline.
Additional analyses requirements include:

- List noise sensitive facilities

Geographic Extent of Analysis

At this time, the analysis buffer distances include 100 feet, 200 feet, 500 feet and one mile.
The future analysis buffers will include the boundaries of the communities adjacent to candidate projects after the community boundaries are defined.

Expected GIS Output

Maps depicting noise sensitive sites and community focal points.

Relocation Effects

Evaluation Guidance

The following considerations are included in the SCE Handbook to provide guidance in evaluating Sociocultural Effects:

6.1 Would any displacement of residences/dwellings be expected as a result of the project?
6.2 Would any displacement of non-residential land uses be expected as a result of the project?
6.3 Do any potentially displaced non-residential uses have any unique or special characteristics that are not likely to be reestablished in the community?
6.4 Would any displacement of community or institutional facilities be expected as a result of the project?

Data Assessment

Data Requirements			FGDL Data Evaluation		
Data Type	Source	Status C = Currently in FGDL I = In Progress N = Needs to be Added	Currency	Scale	Completeness
• Aerial photography	• FDOT Aerial Photographs	I			
• Parcel data	• Property Appraiser	I			
• ROW lines	• ROW Departments	N			
• Schools	• School Districts	N			Some schools are in the system from various sources, but have not been verified
• Community boundaries	• Public Involvement	N			
• Parks	• Parks Departments	State – C Local N	State – varies	State - 1:24,000	State Parks – FNAI managed areas, might be better sources at FDEP, local areas are not complete

Standard Analysis Types

For each data type listed above, standard spatial statistics will be provided in the EST. These statistics generally indicate the numbers of features that occur within a specific distance from a project centerline.
Additional analyses requirements include:

- Number of businesses – parcel data
- Number of residences – parcel data
- Publicly owned recreation, wildlife and water fowl refuges

Geographic Extent of Analysis

At this time, the analysis buffer distances include 100 feet, 200 feet, 500 feet and one mile.
The future analysis buffers will include the boundaries of the communities adjacent to candidate projects after the community boundaries are defined.

Expected GIS Output

Maps of the data layers shown above and maps of businesses by type.

SCE Task Group Data Prioritization Results

Data Types	Total Votes	1	2	3	4	5	Total Score
Focal Points	10	7	2	0	1	0	45
Community/Neighborhood Boundaries	8	3	2	2	1	0	31
Future Land Use Map	6	0	2	2	1	1	17
Emergency Response Service Zones	3	0	2	0	0	1	9
Historic Structures	4	0	1	0	2	1	9
Parks	3	0	1	1	1	0	9
Transit Routes/Service Areas	5	0	0	0	3	2	8
Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan Data Layers	3	0	0	2	0	1	7
Forecasts	3	0	0	2	0	1	7
Bridges	1	0	0	1	0	0	3
Work Force Development Data	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
ROW Lines	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
Business Districts	1	0	0	0	0	1	1

SCE Task Group Data Prioritization Results for Focal Points

Focal Points	Total Votes	1	2	3	4	5	Total Score
Schools	10	8	1	1	0	0	47
Medical/Health (Hospitals)	8	0	2	3	1	2	21
Fire Departments	8	1	1	0	4	2	19
Religious (Churches)	7	0	1	2	1	3	15
Intermodal Facilities	3	0	2	1	0	0	11
Cultural Centers	3	0	1	2	0	0	10
Police Departments	5	0	0	1	2	2	9
Parks	2	0	2	0	0	0	8
Community Centers	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
Social Service Facilities	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Civic Centers	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Government Buildings	1	0	0	0	0	1	1