

**1. How many positions are we funding within the agencies and what items qualify as reimbursable expenses?**

**ETDM Agency Funded Staffing**

AGENCY	Proposed(1) Staffing per Agreement	Actual (2) Staffing	Type of Agency Staffing(3)
DCA	1	1	Consult
DEP	1.5	0	NONE
FDACS	0	0	NONE
FFWCC	2	1	Consult
NMFS	2	2	OPS
NWFWMD	1.5	1.5	STAFF
SFWMD	6	0.5	STAFF
SHPO	3	3	OPS
SJRWMD	4	2.5	STAFF
SRWMD	2	2	OPS
SWFWMD	3.5	3.5	Combo
USCG	0	0	NONE
USCOE	3.5	3.5	STAFF
USEPA	2	2	STAFF
USFS	1	1	Combo
USFWS	3	3	STAFF
NPS	0	0	NONE
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>26.5</b>	

**Table footnotes:**

(1) The maximum number of FTE positions the agency agreements provided for

(2) The actual number of positions the agency is currently using to support this process

(3) The type of staffing used to complete the work. NONE = the agency is completing the work without the need for additional positions. Consult = Consultants, Staff = In-House Staff, OPS = Agency used OPS hires, Combo = There is a work mix between Staff, Consultants, and/or OPS

**NOTE: All expenses must be directly attributable to a DOT Project either within the context of an ETDM Screening or down line in future phases or to a specific ETDM program activity. Expenses that qualify as a reimbursable include Salaries, Overhead, Training, Meetings, Travel, and Equipment.**

## 2. How much are we spending on ETDM Outside the Agency?

AGENCY	Sum of Encumbrances FY03/04-FY07/08	Spent
DCA	\$584,123.00	\$ 444,123.45
DEP	\$800,000.00	\$ -
FDACS	\$52,500.00	\$ 2,998.98
FFWCC	\$1,036,696.00	\$ 491,951.02
NMFS	\$1,099,419.00	\$ 788,378.89
NWFWMD	\$892,373.00	\$ 408,761.66
SFWMD	\$2,400,000.00	\$ -
SHPO	\$1,043,850.00	\$ 431,544.60
SJRWMD	\$2,400,000.00	\$ 57,510.58
SRWMD	\$528,550.00	\$ 321,160.35
SWFWMD	\$2,532,500.00	\$ 993,753.68
USCG	\$0.00	\$ -
USCOE	\$1,054,000.00	\$ 340,427.34
USEPA	\$1,190,009.00	\$ 700,247.33
USFS	\$109,913.00	\$ -
USFWS	\$1,570,422.00	\$1,154,848.54
NPS	\$93,000.00	\$ -
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$17,387,355.00</b>	<b>\$6,135,706.42</b>

## 3. How do we know we are getting what we paid for and how are the Agencies reporting their time spent on ETDM?

### Agency Invoices and Status Reports

Activities performed by the agency Environmental Technical Advisory Team (ETAT) members during a given period are included in monthly or quarterly invoices and accompanying status reports (see examples in accompanying reports). The invoices and status reports include a detailed account of ETDM project reviews, comments provided as part of the reviews, staff hours, expenditures and additional “off-line” activities such as meetings, training events and field reviews to support the invoice billing amounts. This information is provided for each ETDM project and, as of recently, includes an hourly estimate of time spent on each project. Off-line activities will also be accounted for in hourly increments.

### EST Agency Participation Reports and Summaries of Agency Reviews

Currently, several reports are periodically generated to evaluate agency participation in the ETDM process. These reports (examples provided) include:

- Agency Review Matrix (quarterly)
- Agency Participation Report (quarterly)
- Agency Feedback Report (bi-annually)

These reports allow District and Central Office staff to assess the level of participation and evaluate the performance of each agency in their review of projects screened in the ETDM process. They are generated using information contained within the Environmental Screening Tool (EST) and typically present detailed information regarding agency activities in the ETDM process including:

- number of project review notifications received
- number of projects reviewed
- agency comments and responses provided
- responses by issue/environmental resource
- timeframe of response

The results of these reports are available to District staff and may be used internally to initiate conversations with the underperforming agencies to determine how best to improve participation in the ETDM process.

### **Performance Management System**

In accordance with SAFETEA-LU, a performance management system has been developed to measure the efficiency of the ETDM system. This system collects project review and scheduling information from the EST, along with District and Agency feedback from Online Surveys. The information collected is used to assess the performance of the ETDM system and to determine where programmatic problems and issues may exist for future enhancement. Results of this assessment are provided back to the District ETDM Coordinators and ETAT Members. The performance measures address the quality of project review and summary data, consistency with response deadlines and project schedules for PD&E projects.

### **Environmental Technical Advisory Team (ETAT) Participation**

Each District has assembled an ETAT which consists of environmental and community planning, regulatory, and resource agency staff within their jurisdiction that participate in the ETDM process. Most District schedule ETAT meetings at regular intervals and provide a forum for FDOT and the participating agencies to discuss proposed and active ETDM projects and to communicate and resolve issues regarding the ETDM process. Agency participation in the ETAT meetings is recorded through attendance records and meeting minutes.

### **Meetings/Communications with Districts**

Meetings and follow-up phone calls between District staff and agency representatives often occur on an on-going basis to resolve ETDM planning and programming screening issues, as well as ongoing PD&E study concerns. Additionally, agency staff may conduct field trips and research activities to support the findings and recommendations provided to the Districts in the ETDM screening and PD&E processes. Discussions regarding permit applications for non-ETDM projects may be necessary. These

meetings are considered “off-line activities,” and are not specifically recorded through the EST. However, most of these off-line activities should be reflected in the “off-line activity” section of the agency invoice. The quality of communication and over-all level of participation of each agency are evaluated by the Districts in the Annual District Surveys.

#### **4. How involved have the Districts been with agency agreements and invoicing?**

##### **Agreements**

At the beginning of the ETDM program, the District ETDM Coordinator served as the conduit for agreement reviews and comments. When the original agreements were being developed all agreements were posted on a web site, mutually accessible to FDOT Districts and each ETAT agency. The agreements were coordinated with each agency and FDOT District until mutually determined acceptable for signature. Based on Executive Committee discussions over the last 6 months, all agreements are being reviewed during 2008 using District and CEMO teams, with District representatives appointed by the District Secretaries. Based on those reviews and subsequent conversation with the agencies, agreements will be revised as necessary.

##### **Invoicing**

In the past FDOT District’s were not involved in invoice review. Information on how an ETAT agency has been conducting business, from a District perspective, has always been shared with CEMO at the bi-annual ETDM Coordinator’s meeting or through EST coordination or by individual District calls seeking help with obtaining an agency’s assistance and involvement in a project. A new on-line invoicing process has recently been put in place, which allows simultaneous review by District and Central office. In the near term, the District ETDM Coordinators will be trained on the ETDM On-line Invoicing Program and will be asked to review and approve agency invoices for those agency operating within their jurisdiction.

#### **5. How many projects are in an active screening today?**

- At this very second (February 25, 2008), statewide, there are **7 projects in an active screening.**
  - 5 Programming Screening Projects
  - 2 Planning Screening Project
- We average about 120-130 Project screenings statewide annually

## 6. How many projects have been screened so far?

Oct 2004-Feb 2008								TOTAL
<b>Total Number of Projects That Have Completed Screening Events:</b>								318
<b>Total Number of Completed Screening Events:</b>								332
<u>District</u>	<u>D1</u>	<u>D2</u>	<u>D3</u>	<u>D4</u>	<u>D5</u>	<u>D6</u>	<u>D7</u>	<u>TP</u>
<b>Total</b>	61	44	52	72	35	17	46	12
Note: Counts refer to the number of <b>completed</b> screening events.								

## Additional Information

These are additional ETDM program expenses over and above those spent on funding the agencies.

<b>ETDM Costs by Fiscal Year</b>				
<b>FY</b>	<b>Process/Program</b>	<b>Technology</b>	<b>FGDL*</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
7/00-6/01	\$ 550,030.00	\$ -		\$ 550,030.00
7/01-6/02	\$ 406,778.00	\$ 313,837.00	\$ 380,250.00	\$ 1,100,865.00
7/02-6/03	\$ 559,330.00	\$ 201,581.00	\$ 413,250.00	\$ 1,174,161.00
7/03-6/04	\$ 672,838.65	\$ 423,746.69	\$ 434,250.00	\$ 1,530,835.34
7/04-6/05	\$ 526,965.94	\$ 476,842.59	\$ 479,250.00	\$ 1,483,058.53
7/05-6/06	\$ 522,257.56	\$ 683,374.05	\$ 503,250.00	\$ 1,708,881.61
7/06-6/07	\$ 488,065.27	\$ 693,955.93	\$ 528,750.00	\$ 1,710,771.20
7/07-1/08	\$ 302,129.43	\$ 449,517.70	\$ 323,750.00	\$ 1,075,397.13
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$4,028,394.85</b>	<b>\$3,242,854.96</b>	<b>\$3,062,750.00</b>	<b>\$10,333,999.81</b>

The following is an excerpt from a report submitted to the Executive Board in July 2007 detailing the District responses identifying project screening benefits realized from engaging in the ETDM process. The Districts are actively updating these numbers right now with a due date of March 14, 2008. Based on initial conversations with the Districts, we expect the benefit dollars to increase substantially.

## Estimated ETDM Benefits Realized (since Oct 2004 implementation- July 2007)

District	Total ETDM Projects Now in PD&E or Later		Total Alternatives Dropped		Total Projects w/ Reduced Scope	Estimated Cost Savings (Est Dollars) <sup>(1)</sup>	Estimated Time Savings (Months)	# of Projects Showing an ETDM Benefit	Specific Examples of Savings (See Examples Below)
	8	1	3	1					
District 1					1	\$6,100,000	166	7	1,2,8,11,13,17, 18
District 2					1	\$35,000	0	1	10
District 3	1	1	9		2	\$2,001,100	72	3	5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16
District 4	14	1	3		2	\$4,100,000	178	9	1,3,5,8,10, 17, 18
District 5	17	3	2		2	\$1,261,000	11	13	1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13
District 6	2				2	\$210,000	18	2	3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15
District 7	5	2	4		1	\$1,457,731	15	9	2, 4, 8, 11, 13, 18
Turnpike**						\$0	0	6	5, 9, 13
<b>Totals</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>\$15,164,831</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>50</b>	

**Total Estimated Cost Savings to Date**      **\$15,164,831**      Updated as of July 12, 2007 - Districts are updating now - Due Date March 14 2008

**Total Estimated Savings in Years to Date**      **38.33**

\*\*NOTE\*\* Districts were asked to provide these numbers. The instructions were to provide conservative estimates that they felt comfortable with. Depending on the district responding, the Cost Savings Estimates MAY or MAY NOT have a direct correlation to the Estimated Time Savings  
 \*Several projects have been screened more than once (planning and programming) and most projects are still in the pipeline and haven't moved to later phases  
 \*\* Turnpike Projects are screened within the geographic district they are in and therefore, they are subtracted from the Totals Below

(1) Average Costs applied from the following TRB Report - **August 2006 - Right-of-Way and Environmental Mitigation Costs - Investment Needs Assessment Requested by American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASTTC)** - **The Florida Department of Transportation Planning and Design Cost Estimate per Project by NEPA Process**