

etdm

Efficient Transportation Decision Making

2013 Surveys

Preliminary Results

April 9, 2014

Introduction

- Reporting Period: 1/1/2010 – 12/31/2013
- Due: 2/7/2014
- All Districts and Turnpike responded
- 18 ETAT agencies responded
- 2 agencies did not respond:
 - FTA
 - NPS
- Most responses ever

Ratings

Excellent	Very Good	Good
Very Beneficial	Beneficial	Neutral
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral
Completely Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral
Very Well	Well	Neutral
5	4	3
4.5 - 5.00	3.5 - 4.49	2.5 - 3.49

Fair	Poor	N/A
Somewhat Beneficial	Not Beneficial	N/A
Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
Somewhat Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	N/A
Somewhat	Not Well	N/A
2	1	0
1.5 - 2.49	Below 1.5	-

Agency and District Interaction

- District ratings of interaction with ETAT
 - Very Good (3.8)
- ETAT Agency ratings of interaction with Districts or Turnpike
 - Very Good (4.1)

Rating of Potential Benefits

District Responses

1. Increased awareness of environmental resources (4.63)
2. Strengthened interagency coordination and communication (4.38)
3. Increased protection of environmental resources (4.13)
4. Promoted better decision making for transportation projects (4.13)
5. Reduced interagency conflicts (4.00)
6. Established lasting efficiencies in the environmental review process (3.88)
7. Saved money and reduced project costs (3.75)
8. Increased public access to project information (3.50)
9. Improved project permitting (2.63)

Agency Responses

1. Strengthened interagency coordination and communication (4.56)
2. Promoted better decision making for transportation projects (4.38)
3. Increased public access to project information (4.36)
4. Established lasting efficiencies in the environmental review process (4.31)
5. Increased awareness of environmental resources (4.31)
6. Reduced interagency conflicts (4.27)
7. Saved money and reduced project costs (4.14)
8. Improved project permitting (4.07)
9. Increased protection of environmental resources (3.88)

Training

Class	Average Rating
Project Input Utilities	4.58
Introduction to the EST	4.48
PD&E Manual	4.45
Introduction to ETDM	4.43
Sociocultural Effects	4.38
Project Management Tools	4.36
Map Editor Tools	4.36
Map Viewer	4.23
Introduction to the New EST Base Maps	4.12
Feature-Level GIS Analysis	4.07
ETDM Calendar	4.00
Project Tracker	3.93
Florida Geographic Data Library (FGDL) using ArcGIS 10	3.91
Overall Average	4.26

Manual and Handbooks

<u>Document</u>	<u>Average Rating</u>
Sociocultural Effects Handbook	3.88
PD&E Manual	3.85
Funded Positions Reference Manual	3.80
Public Involvement Handbook	3.75
ETDM Manual	3.70
ETDM Agency Feedback Reports	3.69
Environmental Screening Tool Handbook	3.68
Cultural Resource Management Handbook	3.50
Overall Average	3.74

Support

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Average Rating</u>
The Help Desk is friendly and courteous	4.96
The Help Desk responds quickly to any issues raised	4.96
CEMO provides good assistance and customer service	4.82
The Help Desk consistently solves my issues	4.79
Overall Average	4.88

Ratings of Agency Performance

Question #	Topic	Average Rating
3	Communication	3.94
4	Working relationship	3.82
5	Problem solving	3.84
6	Comments and recommendations	3.68
7	Quality of information	3.87
8	Overall performance	3.88

Average Ratings about Agencies

• NMFS	4.44	• NRCS	3.73
• SHPO	4.28	• DEO	3.66
• SWFWMD	4.26	• NFWWMD	3.58
• USACOE	4.23	• USEPA	3.51
• SFWMD	4.17	• SJRWMD	3.50
• FFWCC	4.09	• FTA	3.28
• USFWS	4.04	• FDACS	3.18
• FHWA	3.91	• NPS	3.17
• FDEP	3.85	• USFS	3.13
• USCG	3.83	• SRWMD	3.00

Ratings of District Performance

<u>Question #</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Average Rating</u>
3	Communication	4.27
4	Working relationship	4.22
5	Problem solving	4.26
6	Comments and recommendations	4.16
7	Quality of information	4.07
8	Overall performance	4.13

Average Ratings about Districts

- District One 4.22
- District Two 4.29
- District Three 4.11
- District Four 4.27
- District Five 4.22
- District Six 4.21
- District Seven 4.13
- Turnpike 4.01

Requests about EST Data

- Add listed fish species occurrences
- Note NWI are only approximations of wetlands locations
- Include all local parks in statewide public lands layer (in progress)
- Update or remove outdated data (in progress)

Suggestions for GIS Analysis

- Calculate demographic information within buffer distances (in progress)
- Calculate Prime Farmland within crop land (in progress)
- Identify water way crossings (in progress)
- Remove duplication of data under multiple issues (adding option to list unique analyses)

Potential Enhancements to the EST

- List projects needing review when reviewer logs in
- Allow agencies to select required technical study and permits (in progress)
- Separate the AN Package and the Programming Screen (in progress)
- Add a process to monitor incomplete Summary Reports (in progress)

Potential Enhancements to the EST

(Continued)

- Better quality maps for use in reports or presentations
- Show the number of days left for the various milestones (in progress)
- Quality maps out of AOI with buffer shown.
- Reduce size and improve format of AN package
- Link to SWFWMD's Floodplain Map Viewer
- Make more user friendly mapping tools

Recommendations - Process

- Inform ETAT of upcoming project reviews (statewide)
- Provide earlier notices about changes
- When USCG indicates “No Involvement” during Planning Screen, they do not need notified of Programming Screen
- More face-to-face communication
- Reinstate annual statewide meetings

Comments - Accomplishments

- Recent changes to the GIS Analysis report have improved efficiency
- Access to agency resources helps streamline projects
- ETDM has increased efficiency of project reviews
- EST helps with reviews to minor projects and assessing quality of consultant responses to environmental issues
- On-line videos are helpful
- PEDs have improved quality of comments
- FGDL resources are satisfactory for the purposes of ETDM screenings

Where do we go from here?

- Provide detailed reports
- Prioritize recommendations
- Share best practices
- Continue working on priority improvements