

AGENDA

Tuesday, May 16, 2006

- 1:00 PM - 1:30 PM Registration**
- 1:30 PM - 1:45 PM Welcome and Introductions (Lennon Moore)**
- District 5 Update**
- Growth Management (Lennon Moore)
 - ETDM Grandfathering / SAFETEA-LU (Letitia Neal)
 - Project Diary Overview (Allen Ibaugh)
 - Data Inventory (Allen Ibaugh)
 - EST Update (Ruth Roaza)
- Spotlight on the MPOs (Susan Sadighi)**
- MPO Roles and Responsibilities
 - What is your role in the ETDM process?
 - What is the LRTP Process?
 - How Do Projects Originate?
- 3:15 PM - 3:30 PM BREAK**
- 3:30 PM 4:15 PM Summary Reports (Letitia Neal)**
- John Young Parkway Widening
 - Black Branch Creek Bridge Replacement
 - Sharpes Ferry Bridge Replacement
- 4:15 PM 5:00 PM ETAT Update to Review Issues/Concerns/Suggestions of ETAT Members – Is everyone meeting expectations regarding comments and summary reports?**
- 5:00 PM END OF DAY ONE**

Wednesday, May 17, 2006

- 8:00 AM - 9:30 AM Reconnect / Introduction to Project Presentations (Letitia Neal)**
- Project Updates & New Developments
 - I-95 from SR 50 to US 92 (Kent Black, Tom Roberts)
 - US 17/92 from Shepard Rd to Lake Mary Blvd (Lynne Marie Whately)
 - A1A from 28th St S to 23rd St N (Howard Newman)
 - SR 40 from end of 4 lanes to US 17 (David Graeber)
 - US 192 from CR 532/Nova Rd to US 441 (Chad Luedtke)
- 9:30 AM - 9:45 AM BREAK**
- 9:45 AM - 11:00 AM Project Breakout Sessions – How could the process be improved or enhanced?**
- Natural Issues
 - Sociocultural
- 11:00 AM - 11:45 AM Facilitated Group Discussion to Review Breakout Sessions**
- 11:45 AM - Noon Meeting Closing**
- NOON END OF DAY TWO**

I. Attendees

See attached ETAT Meeting Contact List

II. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of this meeting included the following:

- Review the transportation planning process to better understand how projects originate
- Review expectations for recent Programming Screen projects
- Solicit input from ETAT and MPOs regarding the ETDM process, goals, and responsibilities
- Refine the ETDM process to better integrate FDOT, Agency, and MPO processes for more productive coordination

III. Overview of District Five

Lennon Moore, Intermodal Systems Development Manager, and Letitia Neal, ETDM Coordinator, provided an overview of FDOT District Five, including discussion of the following:

- FDOT District Five re-organization
- FDOT District Five Work Program
- Growth Management
- District 5 ETDM Projects
- ETDM Grandfathering/SAFETEA-LU

IV. District 5 Project Diary Update / Data Inventory

Allen Ibaugh discussed the District 5 Project Diary update that includes automated updates and accessibility to the Environmental Management Office's file folders for Project Development and Environmental studies. ETAT members with appropriate credentials can log in and download information related to contract, scope, public involvement, environmental and engineering data.

Allen also announced that District Five has just kicked off an effort to identify data resources both external and internal to the Department in order to identify data gaps, usability, sharing requirements, availability, and key contact information. This task will be ongoing over the coming months and result in a final data matrix identifying the issues mentioned above.

V. EST Update

Ruth Roaza provided an update of the EST and gave an overview of an ETAT review. Suggestions made by ETAT members to enhance the EST include:

- Provide the ability to apply the same comments/degree of effect to multiple alternatives for a project without having to retype everything
- Provide the ability to save the configuration of preferred buffer distances and data sets on the GIS Analysis Report, and users should be able to save the configuration as a default, but modify it for specific projects as needed.

VI. Spotlight on the MPOs

Susan Sadighi (FDOT) introduced representatives from the following District 5 MPOs: Volusia County MPO, METROPLAN Orlando, Brevard MPO, Ocala/Marion County TPO and Lake-Sumter County MPO. Louise Fragala facilitated a panel discussion amongst MPO representatives and FDOT-MPO Liaisons. The MPO representatives were asked to provide the following:

- Define the MPO's roles and responsibilities
- Identify the MPO's role in the ETDM process
- Explain the Long Range Transportation Planning (LRTP) Process
- Explain where projects originate

During the MPO panel discussion, several ETAT members raised questions concerning the release date of future project screenings and requested that careful coordination occur between the MPOs and FDOT so that the ETAT members do not become inundated with projects to be screened at the same time.

Additional discussion ensued with requests to define the extent of the review needed and types of comments submitted by ETAT members for MPO projects. Mike Neidhart, Volusia County MPO, indicated that he is looking for fatal flaws and general comments from the ETAT members.

VII. Meeting Presentations

The following PowerPoint presentations were presented during the meeting:

DAY ONE

- FDOT District 5 ETDM Summary Reports presented by Letitia Neal, ETDM Coordinator
 - John Young Parkway (from US 192 to Pleasant Hill Rd)
 - Black Branch Creek Bridge on US 1 (Flagler County)
 - Sharpes Ferry Bridge (Marion County)

DAY TWO

- I-95 from SR 50 to US 92 presented by Kent Black and Paul Sebert
- US 17/92 from Shepard Rd to Lake Mary Blvd presented by Lynne Marie Whately and Kevin Moss
- A1A from 28th St S to 23rd St N presented by Howard Newman
- SR 40 from end of 4 lanes to US 17 presented by David Graeber
- US 192 from CR 532/Nova Rd to US 441 presented by Chad Luedtke

VIII. General Discussion

After reviewing the presentations on Days 1 and 2, Louise Fragala facilitated discussion to identify potential areas for improvement. In addition, ETAT members were asked questions to identify additional information needed and the appropriate format for completing evaluations. ETAT members were also asked if the information presented in the project presentations was the right information to assist them in the evaluation process.

The following comments were received as a result of this discussion and comments written on the meeting evaluation forms:

Comments specific to District 5 projects and the ETDM process:

- Provide as much as detail as possible in the Project Description (Purpose & Need, Project Description Summary & Public Comments), including the project setting (heavy urban area, rural area or conservation) and all possible alternatives to ensure that the proposed action is clear.
- Include the effects of a project on the transportation disadvantaged and public comments regarding the project.
- If additional Right-of-Way is not required for a project, note this in the Project Description Summary so ETAT members can tailor comments and include resources very sensitive within the area of potential effect.
- Continue to provide current project pictures, including close-ups that show more detail (i.e., bridge photos) and studies. There are never too many pictures.
- Provide guidance as to what is expected during the Planning and Programming screenings.
- For bridge projects, provide construction dates, bridge types, and plans for building/replacing a bridge.
- Sherry Anderson (FDOS) cautioned that although bridge replacements may be excluded from NEPA, but they are not excluded from the Section 106 process and it is beneficial for SHPO to review prior to permitting because they may be historic. SHPO would like to be involved in bridge discussions.
- SHPO does review water management district permits adding a 2-4 week turnaround time and SHPO may request additional information that could create delays.
- After ETAT comments are submitted, provide feedback to the commenting agency to clarify ambiguities/provide additional information and avoid assumptions.
- Land use and growth development should be integrated into the transportation planning process to identify potential indirect and cumulative effects (i.e., DRIs).
- As projects move out of Programming and into PD&E, the ETAT members should continue to stay involved – the District 5 Project Diary is an excellent tool to continue ETAT involvement and should be used by all the Districts.
- FDOT should resend the e-mail/tutorial explaining how to access the Project Diary for 17/92 pond site locations.
- Several requests were made to receive project presentations prior to the project release date for ETAT review or as projects are released.
- More communication is needed to prevent misunderstandings regarding project information and agency comments.

- Meetings via a web casts or e-connex to discuss projects with FDOT, consultants, and ETAT members should be conducted prior to releasing new projects or as a project is released to provide an opportunity for those available to view and discuss project specifics.
- Schedule field visits so available ETAT members can view first hand and discuss potential effects, areas of concern, etc.
- Provide clearer definitions regarding pond siting locations and identify the preferred location(s).
- With regards to permitting, the Saint Johns River Water Management District does need all of the project details and cannot speed up the permitting process without receiving everything asked for.
- The role of the comprehensive plans in the ETDM process should be reinforced – particularly with new agency persons. Areas of special interest within DCA should also be understood and incorporated within ETDM. As an example, Areas of Critical State Concern such as the Keys and the Green Swamp Area.
- Is there an awareness of whether ETAT representatives look at other ETAT comments in helping to form their comments?
- The MPO's role in ETDM is gradually becoming clearer; provide additional guidance/training as to the roles of the MPO ETDM Coordinator and CLC.
- Jeff Shrum, Ocala/Marion TPO, commented that project descriptions should become clearer as projects are input by the MPOs and encouraged ETAT members to contact the MPOs on project specifics.
- Provide the benefits or performance measures of the ETDM process to the MPOs so they can justify their efforts/cost to the Executive Directors, Boards, and/or elected officials.
- Mike Neidhart, Volusia County MPO, asked how the “What-If” projects and non-state roads will be handled.
- Questions were raised over the methodology to be used in scheduling future project release dates as the MPOs become more involved in the ETDM process and identify LRTP projects for review. A suggestion was made to phase projects into the EST as it is very difficult to complete a review when they are “dumped” at the same time. Perhaps advance notification as to when a project will be uploaded will be helpful.
- Currently there is rarely any information on the public's view of the project included in the EST. It is very important this information is included. While a formal public involvement meeting may not have been done yet, the general public sentiment is already known. The MPOs were encouraged to assist in finding records of project-specific public comment for use in the EST.
- Any environmental impacts, political constraints, or other issues known by locals are helpful.
- It is important to include a link on the EST to the Project Diary for the pond site information that enables ETAT members to log on to view information and prevent the public from seeing the drafts.
- At some point, the PD&E Manual should be updated to reflect this process.

- Is it possible to receive notification via the EST when a project moves into PD&E and new documents are available in the Project Diary for comment? If so, can the EST display a window so the ETAT member can provide comments in one location? In this way, ETAT member comments during the PD&E and Design are found in one place.
- The process for providing comments to the applicable project manager is difficult because there are several “Project Managers.” Letitia Neal suggested sending comments to her and copying the FDOT project manager(s) and consultant project manager(s) as well. Consultant project manager contact information should be included on the Project Diary.
- When the need for ETAT comments exists, provide a comment due date (i.e., as is the case for 17/92).
- The level of detail for planning and programming screen comments should be made clear to ETAT members. More important for the Planning Screen LRTP projects. MPOs should provide guidance and feedback once they start inputting projects into the EST.
- Provide a list of projects to be released in the next year.

Comments specific to the meeting format/location:

- Good meeting – very well planned. Good interchange of ideas, concepts, processes and ways to identify and solve problems to minimize impacts to wildlife and habitat resources on road projects.
- This meeting was very helpful in understanding the overall process.
- Very helpful meeting / excellent hotel and good location.

IX. Closing

Letitia Neal closed the meeting by confirming the District’s commitment to improving communication and providing opportunities for field visits and alternative meetings.