

MAINE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

8/04 * ME

**Early Decision-Making in Transportation-Related Community-Impact Assessment:
A Florida Model**

George Ballo, Louise Fragala, Ken Hardin, Allen Ibaugh, Leroy Irwin, Frank Kalpakis

Moderator: ...you all had a great yesterday and a good time last night, wherever you went. I know the group that went to Freeport were not very talkative, and were really quiet coming back. They were pretty tired and shopped out, I think. So that we can start on time and go to Peek's Island and have lobster, chicken, steak or vegetarian this afternoon, it's 8.00 by my watch, at least. I'm going to introduce George Ballo. Then he's going to take it from there.

Speaker: No?

Moderator: I guess we have to wait a second for George. I couldn't see his chair from here.

Speaker: [inaudible]

Moderator: Does everybody have a blue folder? If not, you have a second to go over and get one. They're as you walk in the door. Did y'all pick one up? That way I think the presentations will be a little easier for you to follow.

Speaker: [inaudible / crossing / laughter]

Moderator: I didn't know you were there.

Speaker: Most people can't see me. I'm a little short.

Moderator: George Ballo has a Master's Degree in anthropology from the University of South Florida in Tampa, Florida, and over 20 years of experience in the field of cultural resource management. He currently administers the policy and procedure aspects of the cultural resource management, public involvement, social-cultural effects evaluation in Native American coordination programs for the Florida Department of Transportation. He is also the contract manager for the private consultants who assist the Department in the development and implementation of these programs. George's personal interests include the study of psychology and mythology.

Please welcome George.

George Ballo: Thank you. Thank you.

Audience: [applause]

George Ballo: Thank you. If anybody ever reaches the point that they can't hear me, just wave. Leroy Irwin has told me for 18 years, "George, as you talk, your voice gets lower and lower and lower." So if you see any problems like that, just go ahead and throw something at me.

Thank you for that wonderful introduction. We are all from Florida, and the title of our presentation today is, "Early Decision Making in Transportation Related Community Impact Assessment: A Florida Model." While it's a Florida model, I want to stress that a lot of what we have to say has general application to any place and anywhere you're doing community impact assessment. I also want to note that we in Florida typically refer to

community impact assessment -- we use CIA a lot -- but we mostly call it social-cultural effects, to bring it under the NEPA umbrella and what have you. You'll hear some of that in the history that's going to be given by Leroy Irwin.

It's really a pleasure for us to be invited here to speak at this conference. It was a real joy to get that phone call from Maine asking us to come up and make a presentation. I want to deeply thank everyone for having us up here. I especially want to thank [Jackie Gumah] and [Judy Lindsey], the organizers of this, and [Cheryl Harlen], also -- the organizers of these sessions. I want to give special thanks to [Trish Thompson], our A/V coordinator. Also, Hank, whom I'm told is "Hank the unpronounceable," in terms of his last name, who handles the audio. I really do want to thank them for their participation.

I especially want to thank Judy and Jackie for their patience and their obvious training in anger-management techniques as they dealt with us over the past few months. You have six people from different parts of Florida all calling you at the same time, saying, "What was I supposed to send you again?" They're very, very kind to us. So we're really happy to be here.

The session itself is going to be a general discussion. We all cross-cut each other, to some degree. The session's going to address the historical perspective of CIA in Florida. That will be Mr. Leroy Irwin. The SCE evaluation process is going to be Frank and me. I'll do the introduction to that, and Frank will continue. The collection organization and analysis of community data -- that's going to be Allen Ibaugh of Space Imaging -- and Louise Fragala is going to come in on that, too, from Pat Fragala & Associates. She'll also be speaking on community outreach. Finally and most importantly, this is one of the things in the small section I have in the central environmental management office, which also has the excellent help of Rusty [Anemozer] and Roy Jackson. We're going to go ahead and talk about the integration of archaeological and historical resources in the social-cultural effects evaluation process. That's going to be with Mr. Ken [Hardin], the president of Janus Research. When I do their bibliographies later, I'll do a little bit more detail.

One of the first things that I'd like to do is make sure that everybody has a handout package. There should be a website page inside. As I go through my presentation, I'm going to try to direct you to a few of those publications that are in there. The other speakers will also be addressing them to a much greater degree than I, but I'll at least try to introduce them, so you get an idea of what we're talking about. But this is your handout package.

Without further ado, I really have to say this is important. You're probably not going to expect this, but it had to be done. Before I introduce our first speaker, I want to give you some idea of the extraordinary measures -- the extraordinary efforts we expended in preparing for this session.

I took it upon myself -- this is really special. I had to figure out which one of us looked the most normal. I sent out our straightforward, no-nonsense Allen Ibaugh as a reporter, into the field. Yes. Actual field work. I needn't say any more. I get a chill.

He left his air-conditioned office and actually went out into the field. First of all to track down a solid definition of CIA, firsthand. To really see what it is. To get out there and report on something and bring us back some information. Second, I wanted him to go find some key CIA contacts. Interview them for their perspective and expertise -- especially in data repository development. Getting your data all together and documented, and community outreach. I thought that was the next-most important thing. We all know public involvement is just most-important.

So what you'll see next is a series of on-the-scene reports by Mr. Ibaugh on what he found. I can only do this a little bit at a time, because the hotel insurance won't cover us showing this all at once. So we really have to let you have this just a little bit at a time.

Here we go.

[video begins]

Allen Ibaugh: Hi. I'm Allen Ibaugh, reporting live from Orland, Florida, in the wake of Hurricane Charlie. I'm here to tell you that when nature blows away your normal transportation routes, it's important to have certain CIA tools in place. Community Impact Assessment is... Hey. Who are you guys?

Voices: We're CIA. [in unison]

Voice: We're here to protect you, sir.

Allen Ibaugh: I'm not talking about that CIA.

Voice: You're undercover. We've got it, sir.

Allen Ibaugh: No, I'm not. I'm talking about Community Impact Assessment, here.

Voice: Good cover.

Voice: We've got your back, sir.

Allen Ibaugh: Okay, okay! Cover me, then. Just stay in the background, eh? At any rate, we'll be interviewing some key CIA experts. So stay tuned.

[video ends]

George Ballo: Okay. That's the first introduction of all we want to do, right now. We'll proceed and as the show goes on, you're going to see what happened as Allen tried to do his fieldwork.

I'm now going to introduce our first speaker for the day. This gentleman is a 1963 graduate of the University of Florida, with a degree in agriculture, majoring in botany. He is retired now from the Florida Department of Transportation, as of February 2004, after 33 years of service. I'm going to say a lot about him, because this is a very special man, and I worked for him for 18 years. He's responsible for most of the environmental programs that we have in our state.

He's a retired manager of the Central Environmental Management Office where he directly administered the Department's environmental management program, overseeing the Department involvement in project development processes, NEPA documentation, environmental permitting, community resource management, ecological resource management, noise, air, water quality analysis, development of innovative technology -- which you'll certainly see in the ETDM process. In the ETDM process it's such a major effort that it's actually at this time changing the way that Florida does business.

He has demonstrated a commitment to integrating human and natural environmental considerations into the daily operation of the Department, and that has not been an easy job. We heard some talk of this in the opening remarks yesterday. He started out before "environment" was a word anybody could spell, and now he's essentially got it on everybody's lips down there. He certainly is the guiding force behind the CIA or SCE program that we have today. He too, the lead in establishing the Department's response. To FHWA's interest in public involvement, community impact assessment and environmental justice.

He has received a number of awards for his work -- all important. But perhaps the most notable being a 1999 Federal Highway Administration Environmental Excellence Award for Environmental Leadership.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's my great pleasure to introduce Mr. Leroy Irwin.

Audience: [applause]

Leroy Irwin: Thank you, George. He always embellishes on this stuff too much. It's my pleasure to be here. They're very concerned about when I get started talking -- I don't know when to shut up, sometimes. I've always been very excited about the programs that we've had in Florida. This is an opportunity to come back and share this with you. It's very important to me. It's kind of the culmination of a career for me.

I hope in 30 minutes, I can share with you the journey that we have been on in Florida for the last 8 years. That's when we started talking about the CIA. We had a member of our staff who participated in the development of the "purple book," as it's commonly referred to. That was some of the beginning of what we were doing. As we moved along, we started talking about CIA and how it can be part of our program.

From the very beginning, we've not tried to single out CIA. What we wanted to do was to integrate CIA into the NEPA process. That's just one of the aspects of NEPA -- not something that's separate. So how would we integrate that?

Back when Federal Highway came out with the purple book, we wanted an emphasis by the DOT on the communities' neighborhood, individuals in the transportation decision-making process. How do you integrate that? We had a rather sophisticated -- what I thought -- documented, process of assessing the environmental impacts in the state of Florida. But most of that was geared toward the natural environment. We gave lip service to the social and cultural environment.

A little thing came out about 8 years ago called Environmental Justice. When Federal Highway started sending out their white papers on how to do EJ, there were concerns like, "No feasible and prudent alternative," in those white papers. You know where that language comes from and what that's caused us over the last 40 years or whatever it is -- on Section 4F.

We saw that same language coming about in the aspect of EJ. You can note these. I saw that. I said, "Well we don't need to do that." But we did not know how well we were doing the job on the community side or the people's side in the environment in Florida.

So we assembled a work taskforce. That's when I met Louise Fragala. She was a facilitator in those days. We hired her as a facilitator, to come together. I charged the task group to take a look at what the real requirements were by law. What is required? As you know, there's a whole multitude of laws that address this issue. But what's required, and how good of a job are we doing in Florida to address these issues?

I was really pleased when I got here and saw this. We have three people who 8 years ago worked together with us on that working group, to evaluate that. Jeff Slaughter over here was with a consultant that volunteered his time to come and work with us. Brenda Craig, whom we invited to come down from Federal Highway in Washington to work with us on this. And I've known this guy for years -- Hersch O'Connor. I've known Herschel longer than probably anybody else in this room. Herschel volunteered his time as a consultant to assist us in evaluating where we were in CIA.

We had this report. We assembled this group on August 15th, 1996. That is almost 8 years ago -- a little over 8 years ago. They looked at me when I told them I wanted the report in like two months or a month -- something

like that. They met five times in two-day periods. They went through and looked at everything that we did. They came up with a final report in May of 1997. That was a little bit longer than a couple of months.

The worked on that report and they had recommendations. There were four general categories of recommendations that they looked at. One had to do with community impact assessment. The other had to do with community participation or public involvement. Then how we partner with others to do the work. Once we do all that, what training is necessary for the Department to move forward?

It was three tiers the report came in. There were guiding principals and policy initiatives that needed to be taken care of in the state. There was organizational and program adjustments that we needed to do. Was our organization set up correctly in the Department? Third tier was procedural enhancements. That's probably where most of our effort came from that's been going on. Procedural enhancements, as well as the organization. CIA was not the most popular issue to be talking about in the DOT.

If you would, in your blue folder handout there is a timeline. You can kind of follow along with what we're talking about. I think it's a tri-fold document. If you have that in front of you, you can kind of follow along with what we're doing. There are other papers there that have the history there, as well.

The recommendations that came out of this working group in this report were to promote openness and inclusiveness. Promote comprehensive and balanced approach to problem-solving. That word, "Balanced approach" is in there. It's very important to have a blanchd approach.

Promote collaborative problem-solving. Historically, we had problems out there that we didn't want to take responsibility for. But working together with others, you can solve community problems. That was kind of what we wanted to look at, as we moved forward with that.

Promote reasonable mitigation for community impacts. Context-sensitive solutions. Establish a commitment-compliance program. I've heard somebody else say, "You know we make commitments, but we don't always follow through on the compliance of doing those things." So we established that program.

Then to solicit community participation. To establish a continuous public involvement program. Not just hold public hearings in the project development phase, but have a continuous program of public involvement. From some folks I heard the concept, "Concept to concrete." But, a public involvement program.

Partnering and coordination. Promote partnering with local governments. Metropolitan planning organizations and resource agencies. Working together as partners rather than individuals trying to do different things. Identifying community problems and working together to solve those things.

Promote networking with local agencies and citizens. Establish a process for improved coordination and identifying and addressing community value issues. We've been hearing that in the last few days. But identifying is one of the biggest issues -- identifying those community issues. What are the values of a community? Those have not been historically incorporated in the transportation planning or programs.

Then after we did all this, we needed to train our people. I use the words, "Train our people." But who are, "our people?" Who are involved in transportation? Not just the DOT employees. We have metropolitan planning organizations and you have local governments. You have to do some training for all of that. We did not have that, so we had to establish a broad training curriculum for training courses, and establish some community outreach programs.

We established a community impact research program. We've done a lot of research into how to do these types of things. We established a working relationship with the University of South Florida. What's that group?

Audience: CUTR.

Leroy Irwin: CUTR. Center for Urban Transportation research. We worked with them in doing some research for us. Then, on top of all of that, we said we needed to establish a task team within FDOT, to implement the CIA team recommendations. How do we do that?

With that, we did establish that team -- that task team. It was a cross-functional task team within the department that I headed, personally, to take a look at all of our operating procedures. Our handbooks, our manuals, our design manuals -- everything we had in the Department. From planning all the way through construction. Review those documents and programs, and make recommendations of how they needed to be changed, to incorporate the concepts of what we were talking about.

You have in front of you the Florida Implementation Program. Is that what you have rolled out in front of you - - what's up here? We'd like to point out one thing to you. Midway, you'll see a little blue-purple box, there. It says, "CIA becomes the socio-cultural effects evaluation." I want to tell you a little bit about why we made that change, at that point.

Something that bothered us in Florida tremendously was that Title 6 and EJ were becoming synonymous with CIA. CIA to our understanding was much, much more than Title 6 and EJ. We had the philosophy that if you did a good socio-cultural effects evaluation, you only had a Title 6 or an EJ issue if you had an impact and ignored it. Some of our upper management in the Department were resisting some of this Title 6 and EJ implementation stuff that was going on. It was coming to the point that we were going to lose the progress that we had made under CIA. So we moved to the term, "Socio-Cultural Effects Evaluation," which, to me was is better-based in NEPA than in the words, "Community Impact," or "Environmental Justice." If you do a good impact evaluation on the Socio-Cultural Effects, you don't have to worry about those other two. That's the approach we've had. From that point on, we changed. Instead of using the term, "CIA," we used the term, "Socio-Cultural Effects." As we move along a little bit you'll see some of the other things that took place to enhance that change.

One of the things along that same time that we were running into was, we were a decentralized agency in the state of Florida. We have 8 districts that we work with. Our job in the central office was to implement and train these people in the districts to do this. We were getting some resistance to doing, "CIA." "We're not going to do it unless our upper management and secretary tells us to do it." I've heard that terminology.

At that point, we needed a policy statement. In you state, when you have a policy statement, then it becomes the issue that, "We will do it." There's no question of "whether" you do it, but maybe "how" you do it. But you will do it.

We developed a policy statement, and it was adopted. I'm not going to read all of that, but you see that this was a policy statement. It was adopted by executive committee and became basically that CIA is a part of the Florida Department of Transportation's analysis programs. With that in the works, then it becomes our job as the environmental folks in the Department to develop those programs, and implementation strategies for the Department of Transportation -- which we have done.

Then along came the term, "Environmental Streamlining," a few years later. We again started looking at how they do it, and streamlined what we already had in Florida. I'm not going to read all these things. But these are the objectives that came out of that Section T21 that moved us into what is commonly referred to as, "ETDM." That's an acronym, I know, and we didn't start out to start an acronym. That came about when we had a summit meeting in Tallahassee in February of 2000. I used a terminology in that meeting of, "We needed to create a

more-efficient transportation decision-making process." From there came later on the coining of the term "ETDM," and it's just caught on.

If you'll look at these objectives that we have there, those are some of the same objectives that we had in doing CIA work, when we first started. "Integration" is a key word. Integrating. We've tried as well with the CIA to integrate that into our NEPA process that we had in place. At that time, our NEPA process was called another acronym -- PD&E. Project Development and Environment. We had a very extensive manual we'd developed over the years to do that. At this time, we started looking at how we'd do a more-efficient, streamlined process of integrating.

This is a very simplified version of the problem we had. You had the mobility planning that took place. FDOT and the MPOs did that planning. That's the long-range transportation plans and stuff of that nature. That planning input was not conveyed to project development. You just got your reports, you submitted them, got approvals, and then you pulled a project out of that when you wanted to do project development.

Then a project went into our five-year work program. Sometimes those projects came with a lot of baggage -- environmental baggage and community baggage -- but they were in there. Once it goes into the five-year plan from an MPO, it's part of the plan and the TIP, and it becomes the FDOT's responsibility to try to deliver that project.

There and then, there was a five-year gap in there between when the planning was done -- or even longer -- 'til you started doing NEPA work. Then you have the PD&E process, which was our Project Development and Eco process design. Then we got the environmental permits for just before you go to construction. That has the late agency involvement. I'm sure you've had those activities occur.

Keep in mind here what we wanted to do, though. We were trying to balance and integrate the socio-cultural along with the birds-and-the-bees part of it. There's always been an imbalance. You don't have to get a permit to impact people. You know that? You don't have to fill out a permit and go and make applications with an agency to impact the people. But if you have an endangered species out there, you've got to go through and get a permit. If you go to a field wetlands, you've got to go get a permit. But you don't have to get one for people. That's why the emphasis was more on nature.

We wanted to bring a balance to that. The ETDM process, very simplified, is having a needs statement and a long-range transportation, and cost-feasible plans that go with it. It goes into our five-year work program with project development and design. We don't necessarily have a five-year hiatus in there.

What we've implemented in here is a planning screen -- that's done at the planning stage. It considers the natural and the human environment. We have a programming screen. This is another environmental screening that goes in before it goes into the DOT's five-year work program. Out of that, we go into design. We have NEPA approvals in there and earlier permits. We're looking at getting permits in the NEPA phase -- not in the design phase.

The expected benefits from this include earlier understanding of the needs of the project. I'm sure all of you had the question for the need for the project as you've gone through NEPA. Our goal is to have this determination made at the planning phase. Not down at the permitting phase, anyway. Continual project record through the lifecycle of the project. We start keeping a project record back at the planning phases, when the MPOs are doing the planning and so forth. Early identification and avoidance and minimization options come forward at that time.

Obtain permits at the same time as the final environmental documents. That's sometimes years in advance of when we're getting them, today. Expected reduction in late project challenges and litigation. Most of the project challenges we get are in the approval phase.

Focused project scopes by not [needing to prove] the negative. In other words, the scopes of the project at the study level are based upon the coordination of stuff that's gone on before. What we mean by "not proving the negative..." How many times do you go out and study something to prove that you don't have an issues?

We're going to identify those things back in the planning to determine whether we have an issue, there. If there's not an issue, we're not going to study it, any more. We think we'll have much-better defined scopes of work can be done and money saved, as well.

Key to what we're talking about today is the balance and considerations of communities with natural environments and mobility. Balancing the community with a natural environment. That's something we've never had.

It provide early and continuous public input or involvement. One of the goals we've had is to try to move. I think we've been successful with this. Moving people. Getting involved at the planning phase. We were told when we started this, "Well people just won't come out to a long-range transportation plan. They won't get involved." But we're finding that not to be true, though it takes an effort to do that.

Providing public access to comprehensive information. We're doing this through the web process. People can go to the web and find information that they've never been able to see in the public. Allows early identification of community-expressed needs. Lots of ways to do that. Allows integration of agency and community perspectives. There again, sometimes the agency perspective is not necessarily the community's perspective -- so we kind of bring some of those together.

Documents the commitments made to the community. We've lost so many times a commitment that may have been made back in planning. It never gets into project development. It never goes on into the process. It documents that and has a tracking system along with it.

One of the things we're hoping will come with this is a good balancing of the socio-cultural aspects, along with the natural environmental aspects of projects. Florida is one of the fastest-growing states in the nation. I always remember a little small 4-square mile community in South Florida. When the mayor got mad at me one time, he said, "Do you know we have 17 languages spoken in our little city?" That's a cultural issue that's repeated over and over.

We have the Hispanics. We're fast getting a larger Hispanic population. South Florida is almost totally Hispanic, now. That brings on a different culture. We have a large Haitian population in Florida. That brings on a different culture. We have the traditional Afro-American issues. That brings on a different culture. How do you meld all these things together and incorporate transportation?

We think we're being successful. I think as our next people come on to present, you'll see that what we're doing is not just impacting Florida DOT. It's impacting local governments -- our metropolitan planning organizations which we number I think 26, now in the state. They do our planning. We had resistance from those folks, but it's happening.

We have MPOs as they go about doing their own long-range transportation plan updates. They're out, now gathering socio-cultural data to help us and them make good, informed decisions. It hasn't been an easy journey, and it's going to continue.

When we had our meeting of our group back 5-6 years ago -- the group that was implemented in the Department -- we set a goal at that time. We said it would take us 5 years to bring about a cultural change only within DOT. We are pretty well on-schedule.

Now what through us in the loop here is we did not anticipate in that 5 years that we would be implementing a totally new project development process called ETDM. We had to back up in this process and integrate socio-cultural into ETDM. That's not been an easy task. We thought we knew what we wanted to do.

It's an emerging thing that's happening. What's exciting to me is when I go out and hear from MPOs that are gathering the data. The big issue is something I think we're facing and tackling, right now. We've been very good over the years at gathering data, but what do you do with that data after you gather it? The guys that come on behind us and the lady that comes on behind us are going to tell you a little bit about what you do with the multitude of data that you have. Yes, there is a wealth of data available. You just have to know how to use it.

George?

Audience: [applause]

George Ballo: I thought Allen was going to show a large 8 x 10 glossy of himself. I'm going to kind of pick up where Leroy had left off. I have a fat folder here. As I give my introduction, I'd like to have you look at the handouts that are in your folders. If anybody doesn't have a blue folder with the handouts in it, please just take a few seconds and go get them now.

This handout's especially important, too. I'm going to mention two things, right away. It has a list of some of the documents that you'll hear about, here. They're all listed on our website page. Eventually, everything we say here today -- I know that it's going to be put in several places on the web -- but we will also put our presentations on the Central Environmental Management Office website at the FDOT.

Frank Kalpakis and I are going to talk about the socio-cultural effects process. I'm going to pick up where Leroy left off, as we moved into ETDM. I wanted to continue Leroy's historical development a little bit. After we developed the ETDM process to a certain extent, we had ETDM process training. Then in August 2003, Leroy called me into his office. It was obvious from this training and the questions that were asked -- both written and verbal -- that there was more clarity needed in how to approach socio-cultural effects evaluations. There was not quite the understand we'd like to have both on a technical basis and on a perceptual basis with how to approach socio-cultural effects.

He called me in in August of 2003 and asked me to form a task group. He then told me I had to have it done in two months. One of the things I know I thought to myself was, "The first thing you never do is say no to Leroy." So what could I do after that?

What I did was go out and bring 17 people together that are smarter than I am. This is, I think, a good solution to the problem. Especially with the speed in which we had to act. Of course, some people would argue that could walk out into the parking lot of DOT and find 17 people smarter than I am -- but I made a special effort here to find very, very, very special people.

We wanted a broad representation. For anybody who's looking at socio-cultural effects or CIA -- and I'll use the terms interchangeably, because that's what we're here about today... You really want a broad perspective. Your community outreach and your public involvement starts at home. When you get your groups together to discuss these things, bring everybody in.

We had representation from the MPOs. We had representation from Federal Highway. Representation from the Department. We had district community liaison coordinators. These would be kind of our CIA or socio-cultural effects people. Although, problems were there. These duties were sometimes split between many people. Sometimes somebody would have half a job of "this" and half their task is "that".

The public information people would say, "Wait a minute. I should be doing that." And what have you. We brought in policy-planning people, people from the Florida interstate highway system, and certain people from our office.

You can see our relationship with consultants at the Department. We have some consultants on the panel, but they simply come under DOT. Two of them are sitting here today -- Louise Fragala and Frank Kalpakis. One other wonderful person I want to mention that was on this panel is Leigh Ann Jacobs of Federal Highway. Leigh Ann... What can you say about Leigh Ann? Not only is she one of the nicest people that you'd want to meet, but she was instrumental in initiating the entire program at the Department. For that, we're deeply grateful to her. She's now moved on to Federal Highway. This was community outreach at its best, and Leigh Ann provided a wealth of information to us. She was a very good guiding force at those meetings.

What were our goals? We realized we had these difficulties that had been sent into us on forms, and everything else. We knew what we had to do. We had to find a way to define common terms. Handbook time. Inside your handbook, take a look. There's a glossary. That'll be helpful to you in the future as other people are going to address these issues more so than I. It'll just be helpful for you in understanding what we're saying.

We had to define the analysis considerations. What were we going to do in a socio-cultural effects analysis? How were we going to approach it? How were we going to simplify it for people? How were we going to make them understand it? What kind of training would it provide?

Then we had to determine, "Hey. If we want to ask these questions and answer these questions that are pretty standard, what are our data needs going to be? What do we need to know, to say what we know, or to make a decision?"

Leroy was absolutely right. As we speak on a little further, it's great to collect data -- but if you don't have a template to process it or a strategy by which to make a decision, you don't have anything. We wanted to define the desired SCE analysis, also.

We wanted to define what kind of graphical and tabular input we'd put out. Would we put out maps, charts, graphs and all sorts of things? How were we going to present this in reports? What were we going to let people see to let them know that we considered what was important to them?

Finally, we wanted to improve the environmental screening tool. This is a special tool that's a technological wonder. It combines a lot of GIS data layers for us to do our work. The community with its socio-cultural effects section of this tool, actually brings 107 databases together. It prepackages them in different ways for us so that we can get a very quick view of an area as we look at it.

We went into all kinds of discussions. Through the two months, we came up with a number of agreements and recommendations. I want to state that we made sure all of these were what you might call, "unanimous."

[tape turn]

...the 17 people turned into about 50 or 60 or 70, because they all went back to their various organizations and sent all this information to other folks. We started getting comments from people we'd never heard of in

relatively high positions, so we also dealt with that. In October of 2003, we finished the white paper. This was to show us where we were going to go as we headed toward the interim guideline.

The recommendations of the white paper -- some of them you're quite used to. You're going to see in your handouts that we decided to divide the socio-cultural effects evaluation issues into six areas. Typical. Social, economic, land-use, mobility, aesthetics and relocation. We decided to develop -- and some of these had been previously developed -- to standardize considerations or questions. To form a mental template for people to ask themselves about each of these issues. You ask yourself the question and you answer it. Then you're going to go on later and actually look at the degree of effect that you're going to have. We wanted to standardize our evaluations, we wanted to establish our data priorities. Which data was most important for us to have to make the decision about what was happening to a community? The number of schools we were affecting. The number of fishing holes we were affecting. For Frank and me, the answer would be the latter. We had to really decide what we were going to do, in terms of priorities.

We had to provide guidance for the assignment of the degree of effect. Jeff and I were talking about this last night. Once we did all this thinking, and once you get your quantitative and quantitative data in, if you don't make a decision about it, it's not worth much. We went on to decide what would be the degree of effect, and we recommended enhancements to the environmental screening tool.

I just wanted to go through a few of these slides. You'll find these also in some of your handouts. Again, I don't need to read all this. We all know the six main areas that we deal with. We're looking at, under "Social," the "Quality of Life, Community Cohesion, Community Goals, Community Visioning, Economics, The Effects on Business, Regional Employment, Changes in Traffic Patterns, Changes in Tax Base..." Land use, the consistency with the future land-use plan. That will bump you into secondary and cumulative impacts. Effects on open-space and sprawl. Mobility. Accessibility for everyone, including the disadvantaged. Connectivity. Aesthetics, noise, vibration, [inaudible] adjacent to community -- a focal point which I'll explain shortly. And relocation, of course -- business -- local and public facilities.

One of the things I want to mention in here is we realized we had to overlay or integrate cultural resources. Archaeological and historical resources, and Native American coordination. You might not only be dealing with buildings in an economic business district, but it might be a historic district. Your community cohesion might not only be from people sharing a particular lifestyle with certain similar beliefs in a particular area -- but also because they have lived there for 200 years, and their families are all in close proximity, and they have a historic investment in the district. We're going to find that the cultural aspects of this in terms of archaeology and history are very important.

I mentioned we wanted to look at the SCE coordinations, and I'll ask you to go ahead. This is one of the handouts. They'll all be mentioned more than once, but take a really quick look at this handout, first. I especially want to pay attention to what we're looking at, here. You can see we started making a very nice table for people to use as tools to get this accomplished. We have the SCE Considerations. You're familiar with these questions. I think we have some 54 or 56 of them. We have the data sources you can use. The census data. A lot of quantitative type data. A lot of GIS data. It doesn't all have to be. We have other sources of data. Community contacts, public involvement. Social services agencies.

Public involvement plays a tremendous part all through this. We also showed them key analyses. There, we wanted to say, "Listen." This would be better-addressed or addressed again in more detail by other speakers -- "Here's a way you can think." If you take number 1 -- an effected population -- the demographics... Ask yourself -- develop familiarity. Identify the demographic characteristics. Develop familiarity with the community. Do some public involvement. Promote environmental justice objectives. Go out and look at your community. See what the demographics are. Also, use the quantitative data that you have to do that. This of

course comes through our environmental screening tool, but it doesn't have to. You can have these data layers on your own, both locally and regionally. If not, you can collect them through public involvement.

I talked about data priorities. This is one of the large ones. You're going to find things we use, here. This table, I'd like you to go to now. I really want to make sure I introduce these for everybody else. This is your data entities attributes and classification tables. It sounds very formidable. What it basically does is...

Data entity is almost anything out there in the known universe. When we established our priorities, we had community focal points, community boundaries. Future land use. Information. Emergency response on information. Parks. Transit routes and a half dozen others. Bridges. Things that we felt were most important to address, first.

Your community focal point is a super type. Your school is like a community focal point. Your school is a data entity. As you go into the attribute, it would be like school name, address, education level. Data classification carries on education level, there. What type of school?

This is a very good form for telling folks what kind of information they should try to gather as they go through schools, medical or health facilities, fire departments, religious institutions, intermodal facilities, cultural centers, police departments. This large appendices... We were trying to give a mindset.

Some of the biggest questions we had were from folks that were having trouble in a way thinking about what they should ask or what they should do. Besides having technological trouble with the GIS environmental screening tool, which can be addressed by training and the environmental screening tool handbook, people simply didn't know what to ask. It's as simple as, "You're putting a road through a city. There are four hospitals along the way," and they go, "So what does that mean? What should I ask about that? How much of an impact is that?"

We also provided them not only -- if you remember -- with all the different data they can use, but the questions. The standard questions or queries they could ask -- the considerations. We also wanted to come up with a degree of effect. I'm not going to read the whole thing, but this is another thing that I discussed with an individual yesterday. This is to help them make a decision about how they might consider passing two hospitals and four schools, or one park and one school. This is also in your handout, so please refer to it.

I'll just mention, too, "Minimum to None." Project has minimum adverse effects on the community. Elements of the effect to community -- minimum community opposition to the planned project. Little or no mitigation is needed. Then you can see in, "Substantial," where we have substantial adverse effects. Faces substantial community opposition. You're going to have to really do a lot of heavy public involvement to get your point and your project across. You'll need substantial mitigation to gain public acceptance. We do try to provide an answer, and this of course is noted in our environmental screening tool. You can simply note it in your reports or documents. Documentation is one thing we want to keep all the way through this.

We're getting to the close, here. We came to one of the last things that we really wanted to pull together for people -- data sources. I want to refer you to our socio-cultural data sources chart. You can see that it says, "Socio-Cultural Data Sources," right on it. You can see we're using an example here of schools. One of our priorities. You have the potential data sources running across the top. It tells you what you should do. You see public involvement is not left out, including site visits. This gives you an idea of where you can go to get information, and what's available on all these things to make decisions about the entity that you're looking at.

Some of the information on these is in the environmental screening tools. Some is not on there, yet, and you have to get that elsewhere. We also, of course, are following the previous chart. Some of the information that you need on these things is optional. Some is more imperative.

Our final chart for you in your handout that will be discussed by others is the FDOT Socio-Cultural Data Sources. This will tell you some of the basic data sources we're using. Whether they're optional, whether they're available or not. Whether they're in our environmental screening tool. As I say, you don't need an environmental screening tool to do this.

We had this done by April 2004. So it basically took us about 8 months from start to finish to bring together this way of approaching socio-cultural effects. It included how you use qualitative data, how you use quantitative data, what kind of questions you ask yourself about it, what kind of degree of effect you assigned, and how you documented it.

With that, I'm moving into the handing over of the presentation to Frank. Frank -- I've got to do your biography first.

[inaudible / crossing]

George Ballo: Is this the guy from the district?

Speaker: No. Thibodaux. [concurrence]

George Ballo: Frank Kalpakis is a project manager at URS Corporation's Tampa office. He's worked for 16 years in both the private and public sectors. He has a Master's degree in urban and regional planning, with a minor in fishing from the University of New Orleans. His knowledge of the federal, state and local planning processes was instrumental to the FDOT's Central Environmental Management Office, as they developed the environmental transportation decision-making process. Frank was very important to us in EDTM, and continues to be, as you'll see now. He works primarily with local and state planning agencies, focusing on integrated, comprehensive planning services.

Frank Kalpakis: Thibodaux. Yes. [inaudible / crossing / laughter]

Thank you, George. Before I get started, let me just tell you how much I've enjoyed my stay up here. I actually brought my wife and kids Thursday, and I just kind of tooled around the area to get a feel for Maine. This is my first time up here. Everybody told me to go to Bahh Hahhbahh. So we made the journey up there. What a great experience! We spent two days there.

It occurred to me on my way up there that probably one of the bigger challenges that you have up here is balancing the tourism traffic and needs with some of the other community and economic considerations. That appears to be a challenge, here. Then we spent some time down in downtown Portland. What a wonderful place! And what a great job I think that this community has done to make that a vibrant town. It really balances community economic goals, pedestrian mobility with vehicular mobility. Great traffic-calming devices. I love those stones in the street. You really can't go more than 2 mph on those things. I'm trying to figure out we could do that in Tampa. Bring some of those stones down. I don't know if it would go with the character of our city, but maybe we need to build bigger bricks or something. We're having a great time, here. I have to unfortunately leave tomorrow.

I want to talk a little bit about the socio-cultural effects evaluation process, and really focus toward the end of my presentation on what you do with the data that we collect. Also, how we're integrating or created this environmental screening tool. It's a communication mechanism and just makes it a little easier and more efficient to conduct these evaluations. It brings a lot of information together for you.

You look at the five steps that I've outlined here, and this could really be applied to any type of resource evaluation. Whether it's in natural resources, cultural resources, or social resources. You go through the same process. Understanding the issues, defining your study area, collecting and organizing your data, and then performing your analysis and coming up with recommendations.

I think the difference between a natural resource effects evaluation and a socio-cultural effects evaluation is that we have a really good asset. That's people. Environmental scientists can't really talk to the animals or the plants to understand how they feel about different things. But we have people that actually give us very good information.

Public involvement is an integral part of this process. We really need, I think, to be social scientists. To really perform these evaluations to stimulate public involvement. To show some of the effects that could occur to their neighborhood. They're just ordinary people, and they have their lives and they go about it. They're concerned about different things, but really don't study this stuff much. We're more reactionary types, by nature.

We're all reactionary. We see something and, "Oh, boy. What does this mean to me?" So public involvement is very critical, but it's just a component of socio-cultural effects evaluation. As social scientists, we really need to conduct evaluations.

First is an understanding of the issues. As Leroy mentioned, what we've tried to do in the ETDM process is merge these planning and project development phases that we have. The MPOs and the counties and local governments go out and do all this long-range planning to develop a plan that's consistent with their community vision and goals. Rarely does that information get conveyed to project development. An advance notification comes out, and the resource agencies are notified that, "Hey, we've got a project that we're going to do." You run into problems with purpose and need statements.

Really, the purpose and need. We ought to know why we're building a project before we include it in a long-range plan. In the ETDM process, we're trying to move some of that early. To understand why we're building this project. What does it mean? Is it really that important to us, and why is it important to us? It shouldn't just be based on a travel-demand model. It's important, but it's a tool to make a decision. There are many other reasons to build a project. I can think of one -- hurricane evacuation. That comes to mind. There are many other needs. Freight mobility. Community desires. The community wants transportation systems that support their lifestyle. There are many reasons to build a project.

When you start looking at this, we should also look at building on previous public commentary. Previous outreach efforts. What the ETDM process does is document and keep a history of previous public involvement and public concerns and issues about projects. When we do move to project development, then we realize some of the past -- about what the public has been saying -- what the public desires, in terms of a transportation support system.

These are some of the SCE issues that George described. I guess what's important here in the ETDM process is that we've decided by separating these things out and focusing on analyses for each one of these, it really allows you to identify what the key issues are for the community. Are they economic? Or is it just land-use issues? It really helps you to focus in on the real issues. There's got to be balance, here.

Economic issues often compete with social priorities. There's always some balance there. Many times the public wants to minimize traffic volumes, for example -- but a business may not. Visibility and accessibility is important to economic interests, but for social quality-of-life issues, it may not be.

We need to come up with solutions that try to achieve both of those goals. Like downtown, I think was perfect. The traffic calming -- it's like a "pedestrian first" downtown. People stop for pedestrians here. It's unbelievable. The traffic still manages to get around. It's not a big deal if they have to wait 5-10 seconds to let the pedestrian cross the road. You need to balance those types of things out.

When we're defining the study area -- Eileen pointed this out in her presentation -- we shouldn't just look at the buffer around the corridor, as it relates to affected communities. We need to identify what those affected communities are. Many times, it's not just the communities adjacent to the roadway or the transportation project in question. Many times transportation project can affect a community that's a little bit away from the transportation project. We need to look at that. We need to use existing conditions and data. Demographic information is very helpful. Just a personal knowledge of the area. You should never do a project without going out there and just getting a feel for the area. Get a feel for what the community is like before you begin an evaluation. It's so important.

I do that everywhere I go. I love to do it. I just like to. In two hours, I thought my wife Jane and I got a pretty good handle of Portland. I was like, "Man, this is a pretty cool city." We just got to learn so much in just two hours. We should do the same thing when we begin a transportation study. Go out and get a feel for the area. "What is this area like?"

Collecting, assessing and organizing data. Allen's going to talk a little bit about this, and some of the innovative things that he's doing down in Florida. But first, we should look at data availability. The data sources chart or the data entities classifications and attributes chart in your package was put together to define what... Many people reviewed this document and said, "This is the important community data that we need to conduct our evaluations." It's all-inclusive, I would call it. But before you begin your evaluations, we should determine what the priority data is. What's going to be most useful in conducting our evaluations? It may be different from community to community. But that guide gives you a pretty good handle on what data can support those types of evaluations.

You should determine what's available. The census data is readily available. All your demographic information is available. We have an environmental screening tool, but it's available to you through other GIS data layers.

Community characteristics -- a lot of that information -- community focal points and other information is readily available. We should rely on that, first. Evaluate that data. The comprehensive. What's the currency of the data and accuracy of the data? Then determine if you need to do any additional data collection.

Unless you have unlimited budgets, I think it's very important to prioritize what data should be used in an SCE evaluation. It can be costly to collect some of this.

Speaker: What is your feeling on using other peoples' data? Like AAA or...?

Frank Kalpakis: I think AAA has very good data, actually. Every map that I've ever looked at always has an error on it. If you study it long enough, you can find an error. But AAA is a very reliable data source. They seem to really compile and do their homework in collecting data that could be useful in SCE evaluation.

Organizing this data. Community characteristics inventory. Preparing your initial community boundaries. Use demographic information. Use other available information to do this, to determine the initial boundaries. It's very important to bring this to the community and get their input on this. The community typically knows what their community is. Using that public input, that data -- the public data -- will help you determine what your community boundaries are, by which we want to organize our data. Using that information -- getting technical reviews from other local planners -- could help define your communities for different projects.

In Florida, the MPOs are really embracing this -- early in the planning process. We're defining our communities and organizing data about those communities in the MPO areas, for example, so that when we have projects, we have data ready to conduct socio-cultural effects evaluations.

Preparing community fact sheets -- I'll give you some examples of that, but this is the type of data that are typically included in a community characteristics inventory. It could include more, if you like, but it should include this type of information. The community description, the demographics and information about that community -- including in the last bullet here, the perceptions, desires and vision for the community. What are the desires and attitudes of that community? These are examples of community fact sheets. It's just useful information for the public and a better way to understand characteristics about that community in conducting an evaluation.

Performing the analysis. I spent a little time on this. I think it would be easier as I go through some of these issues... I think this is a very useful handout, this Socio-Cultural Effects Evaluation Consideration that George pointed to. The key analyses part, I think, may be useful to you as you conduct Socio-Cultural effects evaluations. In other words, "What do we do with this data?" Here are the considerations, on the left side. They apply to each of the issues, and the types of evaluations and things you should look for. These are the types of things that would apply to any of the issues. The relationship between the project and community life. Secondary facts. Induced development and such.

Most of these types of analyses, we've always done in developing community plans. It's a higher level of awareness that's come to these transportation projects. We're applying some of the same concepts that we've used in developing community plans now to transportation projects. I think that's absolutely going to help us, in the long run. It's all about balancing and integrating transportation, land use, social, economic considerations.

Changes in demographics. I'm going to refer to 1.1 SCE considerations. We should look at this demographic information. Are there any special areas that we should include in our public outreach? We should be inclusionary in our planning and in our decision-making. We want to identify those areas, so that we're not excluding anyone from opportunity to participate. Demographic information can help you structure your public outreach -- absolutely. The type of outreach you should conduct. Louise will touch on that a little bit.

Community cohesion. Question 1.7. You know, I can go on and on, and I don't have enough time to get through this. There are many different issues that should be considered, as an example. Will the project result in any barriers dividing an existing neighborhood? Or would it increase neighborhood interaction?

Some of the things you want to look at are these. But also, lack of sidewalks and crosswalks. Vertical impediments. What do limited-access roads do to a community? You have to think about that. Social effects. Question 1.12. Would the project result in the creation of isolated areas? Is there a presence of infrastructure or natural features that would impede movement to and from the area?

Emergency service. Safety. Are we providing pedestrian refuge for multilane facilities, so that pedestrians can cross the street? Are there any other types of safety issues that should be addressed? How does the pedestrian feel, walking along the roadway. Is there some type of barrier between the pedestrian and the traffic? Lighting? Many of the things that we all know about. But we should really include that early in our planning process, because it can influence the type of design features that should be a part of the project. If they're identified early, it's more likely that they will be implemented.

Consistent with community goals and issues -- this is, of course, very important. The transportation system that we develop should support what the community wants to be. What do they desire? Does it support their lifestyle?

Economic effects. Again, we need to balance economic considerations with social and land-use considerations. There are going to be places where we do want traffic. Maybe not high-speed traffic, but we want to control and manage that traffic. Traffic is good for economics.

Land-use patterns. We need to be consistent with the community vision. I've always been an advocate of community-based planning. The community knows what they want. It's a struggle to get them together, sometimes. Everybody's busy. Developing a plan and understanding their visions is so important in deciding what transportation system should support that.

Mobility effects. Looking at demographic information for public transportation services. What is the transportation-disadvantaged population? What needs and improvements are needed in that area? I'm going to go through some of these quickly, because I want to spend a little bit of time on the environmental screening tool at the end. Aesthetic effects. Landscaping, streetscaping, public... I like to look at a project from property line to property line, as the public realm. It shouldn't just be the roadway. It should be from property line to property line. What do we do between there, between those lines, that is going to make this community better and achieve our mobility goals? Do we have room for sidewalks? Lighting? Public or...? All kinds of things should be considered.

Relocation effects. Are we impacting historical dwellings? Or just residential and commercial dwellings? Then, recommending ways to resolve issues. Some of these bullets, you're saying, "Wow -- we're doing another study?" But in the ETDM process, the intent is to identify some of these issues really early -- even before we get to the project development. If there's a significant issue, for example, like public opposition to a project, then maybe there's a need to focus on what that opposition is before we go into project development.

The voiced in my head. I was the only one that heard that?

Speaker: Yes.

Frank Kalpakis: Not again! Anyway, the design features -- what type of design features should be included in the transportation project.

Visualization is a great tool. I just have a couple slides -- we do a whole lot of this, now. It's just a great tool in public outreach to help the public understand. And even actually develop what they want. We've actually used this to go to a public meeting, and actually just create what they want, within a public forum. It's just a good tool to achieve a public understanding of what the project will do.

Eileen pointed out yesterday that we can't make all the trees flowery and pretty all the time, because that's really not how it's going to look. You can't go overboard on some of these, and some of them do. Everybody wants it to be perfect -- but it's not going to sunny every day. But it's a great tool to achieve the understanding that you want the public to have.

I'm running a little over. I'm going to spend the last part of my presentation talking about the environmental screening tool, which is really the technology, communication and analysis tool to support the ETDM process. It's an interactive, web-based application. It integrates data from multiple sources. The Florida [GEO] plan data library at the University of Florida is the data clearinghouse for the ETDM process and the environmental screening tool. I don't know how many data layers they have, but it's unreal -- this data library that they have. Florida is data-rich. We have a wealth of environmental data; we're lacking the community data. But now the [Geo] plan is out collecting a lot of that information, and the MPOs and the DOT districts are out collecting a lot of that information. So we're continuously building our data support tools and our data library.

One of the real assets to this process is that we're using this data. As the analyst goes out into the field and conducts his evaluation, we're constantly improving our data. The wetlands, for example. They go out and do a study and they'll do a wetlands inventory. Is that what they call it? Yes...

[tape ends]

[tape begins]

...really on their GIS data lab. We're updating that data as we know more about wetlands and environmental issues and community data.

There are standard analyses that are conducted or performed. These were agency-prescribed. They're getting automated analyses to support their evaluations. It stores and reports results. This is important -- it maintains project record -- so you have a history of the project, stored in a database. This is how it works...

In Florida, the MPOs and the DOTs are responsible for entering project data into the environmental screening tool. This is the project description, the line work and also for entering community characteristics information into the Florida Geographic Data Library.

The resource agencies also provide their information about the resources that they're responsible for protecting and managing to the Florida Geographic Data Library, as well. All this gets entered into the environmental screening tool. This data upload is on an ongoing basis. We're constantly improving the data library that we're using for our evaluations.

A standard GIS analysis is performed, within an agency-prescribed buffer. I think it's a 100-200-500-half mile or mile buffer. It quantifies information. For example, how many acres of wetlands do I have within a certain area? Within a buffer distance of the project? And what is the quality of those wetlands? All of these analyses were defined by the actual agencies that are performing analyses.

From a community point of view, what is the percent of low-density residential? Low-density, medium-density and high-density? There are many other analyses. I just asked our GIS guy to give me an example, and this is the one he put up there. There are many other demographic analyses where the community focal point's within the buffer area.

What we want is an enhancement to the tool will be more than a buffer area -- it'll be a community-based analysis. That would capture the communities adjacent and those other affected communities, and give you information about those communities.

That information is used by the analysts. In Florida, it's the community liaison coordinators conducting these reviews, and the MPOs, to provide commentary. They're looking at the data within the environmental screening tool; the quantitative analysis. They're also using other information that they have at hand -- and their personal knowledge and expertise. Their personal knowledge about the area to provides commentary about the potential effects to the social, economic, land-use, mobility, aesthetic and relocation issues.

That commentary is captured in this screen. They log onto it with a user name and password and provide this commentary. They're looking at quantitative information, and providing comments about the potential effects.

They're assigning a degree of effect that George spoke about, briefly. Is it substantial? Moderate? Minimal? Then the basis for that degree of effect -- very important. Why is it moderate? Why is it a substantial effect? What is the effect?

This summary report captures all of the projects, for example, within a geographic region. It's an MPO area or a county or a district. It provides the analysts a quick view of what the potential effects are to the different projects. There are two projects here, but you can imagine if you were reviewing 20 projects in the area, you could quickly see where the substantial effects are for different issues about that project.

This will help, I think, long-range planning. It'll help them in the priority process to understand some of the environmental. We're finally not giving lip service to environmental analyses in the long-range plan development process. We're actually getting expert commentary from practitioners about environmental effects and community effects that'll help them make better decisions. This is transferred right into project development, so we're not losing that information. We're building and focusing our analyses in project development on the key issues.

In closing, the benefits of SCE evaluation -- particularly in the way spoken of by Leroy and George -- and the EDTM process that they developed -- really improve decision-making. It enhances project design. We're understanding what the true mobility needs are, and the project features that need to be included in transportation solutions. It promotes partnering for more effective uses of funding. It includes traditionally underserved. It's inclusionary planning, and it promotes equal and open access to information.

The public. I didn't mention this, but the public has access to all of this information through the web. It's a great tool to get public commentary about potential effects in their community. Thank you.

Audience: [applause]

George Ballo: We're going to be saving our questions 'til the end of the show, with a little interactive dialogues between us. I think this morning we've seen a lot about the historical perspective and the way we've gotten through the white paper and the socio-cultural effects guidelines, to get us where we are now -- to what Frank just discussed.

This afternoon, we're going to hear an awful lot more about the importance of the data, and its manipulation -- what it can show. Well, the next section, actually. Community outreach and, of course, archaeological and historical resources, along with other perspectives. Let's take just short of a half-hour break, so we can make up just a few minutes, and be back maybe 8 or 9 after 10. Come back and 10.

Thank you for your anger management! We'll be back at 10.

Last thing -- Ask Mr. Hardin when we speak about "community." We're dealing with the Seminole, Florida and the Seminole of Oklahoma. So our community actually stretches about 1,500 miles in some cases. You might ask him about that this afternoon.

[break and return to session]

George Ballo: I want to ask a favor, if it's possible. If anybody in the back would like to move to the front, where you can either see or hear better, please feel free. We have plenty of space up here in the front for those of you in the back.

Either that, or we're going to shorten the room. In five minutes, the walls are going to start coming this way.

Speakers: It was a good try, George. It was the old college try.

George Ballo: I'm going to introduce the three speakers for our next segment all at the same time, because they're going to do a little interaction between themselves, and we don't want to interrupt that. First of all, I'd

like to introduce Mr. Allen Ibaugh of Space Imaging. He's the urban and regional solutions manager, working with Space Imaging in Orland, Florida. He's got a Master's in geography and urban and regional planning. Allen is currently involved with various socio-cultural effects in community-impact assessment GIS projects throughout the state, involving MPOs, districts and other organizations.

Mr. Ibaugh's Space Imaging team generates community GIS data, utilizes existing GIS data, and utilizes imaging from the space imagings like [inaudible] satellite, to extract transportation features and to illustrate current land-use concerns. Allen is really a technical specialist, and we're very happy to have him here. You can get the complete biographies in the biography sheet. I'm just hitting the highlights on these folks.

Louise Fragala is another speaker. She's president of Powell Fragala and Associates, a full-service community planning and public involvement headquartered in Lakeland, Florida. She's directing and assisting in the development, implementation and training of socio-cultural effects evaluation for FDOT's Central Environment Management Office -- which is us. Powell Fragala & Associates and Ms. Fragala have been helping Florida maintain its cutting edge, its leading edge in socio-cultural effects / CIA since 1999. She and her husband founded Powell Fragala & Associates, and she concentrates her efforts on marketing in all areas of consensus-building and community involvement.

Louise has earned a lot of awards. She has earned statewide and national recognition for innovations and designing and implementing successful, instructional seminars and community consensus-building, public involvement and cross-cultural awareness. She was the principal author of FDOT's Public Involvement Handbook, and of course our training program. We all work very closely together. Like I say -- we are DOT. We are consultants and they are us.

I want to end with Ms. Fragala is a renowned group facilitator and a certified conflict resolution mediator. That might really come in handy, should any altercation break out between the panel members.

Let me get to Mr. Hardin. Ken Hardin is president of Janus Research. I've known this man long enough for both of us to be classified on the National Register of Historic Places, and he won't like me saying that. We're youngsters. We're very young buildings.

Speaker: Yes, and I'm younger than you.

George Ballo: Yes. You are! And I need a fresh coat of paint, too! He has an MA in anthropology from the University of South Florida. He's a 23-year veteran of cultural resource management. He was project manager of one of the largest Section 106 studies undertaken in Florida -- that's the Tampa Interstate Study. That's an amazing study that he'll be finishing with, today. Really, through that project and others, he's helped to establish a new precedent for mitigation of adverse effects. Mr. Hardin's firm is really into innovative mitigation techniques. I can tell you that from personal experience.

Recently, he has assisted FHWA and the Department in the efficient transportation decision-making process, and in developing Native American consultation policy and procedure. This is where we've all worked together with various tribes from here to Oklahoma. That's why I made the comment that our sense of community can extend across half the country. That being said, I'd like to introduce Mr. Allen Ibaugh.

Audience: [applause]

Allen Ibaugh: Thanks, George. I just want to start by saying that my name is Allen Ibaugh, and I am a techno geek. If this is Techno Geeks Anonymous, then this will work out well.

You can ask Louise -- I'm into the tools and the toys, and I really enjoy geographic information systems and web-based systems and getting the use out of automated systems the best way we can. As you know, those systems are worth nothing without good data. So today I'm going to talk about data and data collection, and bringing that information in.

To start off, George sent me out in the field again to check with some of the leading guys who were doing community data repositories, and collecting community information. There was a key professor that he wanted me to interview about developing community data repositories. I'll show you a brief video on that.

[video starts]

Voice: I'm expecting Nicholas Needlemeier any second, now. His data repository has become a legend -- an ultimate model for other communities. Needlemeier has meticulously collected and organized 1,000 separate community...

Voice: Hey, hey! I'm Nicholas Needlemeier! What are you guys doing? This isn't staying in the background! [inaudible] you've destroyed my life's work! What's wrong with you?

Voice: Please, don't get hysterical, sir. We have the situation under control.

Voice: This is not staying in the background!

Voice: I'm Nicholas Needlemeier.

Voice: As you can see, Nicholas Needlemeier has a very extensive data... Hey! Hey, what did you do with Needlemeier?

Voice: Classified, sir.

Voice: Where is he?

[video ends]

Allen Ibaugh: As you can see, I don't know what happened to Needlemeier. He disappeared on us. That's what happens in some of these data collections efforts, and understanding what community impact assessment is. I'm going to go through a few things here about data, and what it can be. It can be confusing. It can be inaccurate -- too little too late, or overwhelming. But actually, we can fix those four things by putting together some other things I'm going to talk about, here.

First of all, we can put together definitions and terminology that we can all agree upon. We can have that in place to bring our data sets into. We can also go through verification processes to bring that data and information together. Then also, put together data management systems to make this information less overwhelming. We'll go through some examples of that, as well. We'll hopefully turn it into useful data -- that's really what we're trying to do.

This is just showing you an example of what we put together in Florida for socio-cultural effects. The data terminology. Just showing the community example, here. Just giving you some information about, "Okay. These are the data terms that we're working under."

Then to get to the heart of CIA and what the data can do for us, we had to ask a couple of key questions. That is, "What should be considered when collecting data about the community?" and also, "What data is needed to assess community impacts?"

To look at those couple of questions, we did a case study. That's what I'm going to go through next. It's a case study of collecting information and utilizing that information to look at developing community data such as community boundary information, focal points, and that sort of thing.

We'll start off with a quantitative analysis. That's really looking at the existing datasets that are out there. As Frank mentioned earlier, we have a Florida Geographic Data Library that has a lot of information in it. Obviously, census data. Property appraiser's offices. Planning departments. These are just some of the different areas of information and places we can go to get geographic and table-based information.

In certain cases, if the data's not available, or if it's not available in a format where we can use it -- such as in a GIS -- then we had to go out and create new datasets by geocoding, address information -- going out and collecting focal points like schools and churches. That sort of information. To get that back into our database. That was really the first step in this analysis.

What we did in our next step in the analysis was to look at characteristics. In this case, we're looking at Highlands County, Florida. We started looking at characteristics, just to get a feel or idea of what was going on out there. There are several steps in the process that I'm going to go through, here. This is just the first step -- to get some information -- to get an idea of what the demographics are, and how the economics look in Highlands County.

This case is just a simple geographic analysis, using GIS. We look at the age -- age 65 and over -- that are greater than the county average. We get some thematic mapping showing up -- the blocks in those areas. Then we looked at some other information, such as age less than 39. Again, comparing it to the county average. Just to give us some ideas. Here we're trying to identify communities with common characteristics.

Another one -- rented households greater than the county average. Owned households. So we're getting some more information, here. Hispanic population greater than the county average. So, some more. You know, with the census and the information that's out there, there are lots of different variables we could go through to look at and try to put together a community fact sheet or a community characteristics inventory. These are just some other ones -- African-American population.

You're going to find that we have to refine our analysis a little bit, because some of the counties are very urban and some of them are very rural. In this case, Highlands County is a fairly rural county. So you can see with these grey areas that we removed areas with low population density, because it's really skewing the figures when we're using our GIS analysis as to what we were coming out with. Based on that information, and having characteristics that define the communities, we came up with what we call Initial Community Boundaries. Obviously, these are absolutely not correct; they need to be refined and verified. It's just a way for us to get an idea of what's happening out in Highlands County.

For the first step, in terms of geographic boundaries, we have to stay with census block, in this case, or block-group level data for the demographic information. You try to use those same classifications, so that we can bring a common base of geographic data to look at each of these issues.

So we did the quantitative. This gives us an idea; it's something to start from. Then we have to go into a qualitative assessment. We can take these maps and go back out into the field, in this case, to talk to key community leaders. This is what Louise will talk about in a little bit. You talk to the citizens to define the community that they live in -- with such things as, "Sense of place, the aesthetics, and quality-of-life issues."

Then to bring that information in, as well. Also, going out in the field -- windshield survey. Trying to put together some visualization of each of these communities that we've defined.

In this case study that we were doing, we came up with 47 initial community boundaries. After the windshield survey, two communities merged, four communities split and two were deleted. That's just based on a windshield survey, now. Again, there's a lot to the process. This is only the second step of getting that information together. It's definitely not completed, yet. We come up with revised community boundaries, at that point.

You've seen this throughout our presentation -- going through the different SCE issues. Looking at social and economic land use. We're talking about each of the communities and putting those boundaries together. Then going back out into the field and talking to key community leaders -- getting those lists together and verifying our information. In terms of data verification, this is the third thing that we did. We went out and looked at the GIS data that we had and tried to verify that GIS data. We had what were called [ARDPAD] applications. These are map-based applications that you have in a handheld. They even have forms that you can specify when you go out in the field, and collect that information. You can get down to each school and its location. You can get the longitude and latitude and coordinates, and some information about that school. You can bring it back and compare it to the GIS data that you started with -- which you may have gotten off of a website or something like that.

In this case, we checked the data from in the field versus what we had in the Geographic Data Library. This is where Frank was mentioned that now they're going back out and recollecting some of this community information. We found discrepancies between the two, so the field verification helped us to say, "Hey, look. This point's off based on the geography that we got from the Geographic Data Library. We need to fix that."

I'm trying to drive home the point that just because you've downloaded the data from a website where there's all this information available now -- you can get it from all the place -- it's still not going to go beyond field verification. Especially with as much data that's required for community inventory. There's just a lot of information out there that you need to gather. It takes time, and there's a process behind it. But you have to get out in the field.

Where can we get this data? These are some of the things that I've been mentioning. This is a slide we'd shown earlier, as well, but it gives us information about the different areas we can go. We can go to the property appraisers' offices, local government, the census bureau, FHWA -- there are lots of places to go for data. One of the richest areas for data collection is public involvement, and collecting data by going out to the community and getting the information on what they feel are key characteristics to their neighborhoods.

With that, George again asked me to go out in the field to interview Louise Fragala, to talk about community outreach and some of those different programs. There we go, one more time.

[video starts]

Voice: Are we on? Is this thing on? We're here today to interview Louise Fragala about Community Outreach and its key relationship to the CIA process. I don't know where she is. She said she was going to be here.

What are you guys doing here? Oh, my God!

[ominous music; intermittent growls]

I guess Louise won't be making it today.

Voice: Allen. Allen! [inaudible] public? Beware [inaudible]

Audience: [amused]

Voice: [inaudible] Data collection isn't worth anything if the community doesn't buy in to what you're saying. [inaudible] you take the data and data fact sheets and take it back to the community. You say, "This is what we know about you, now. But we need to know what we don't know." [inaudible] We need to know what information we've missed. Is the [pool] on the wrong side of the road? Is it near your church? Are you a member of the Jewish population that walks to your synagogue, and we've somehow decided to put a facility there and you can't walk?" [inaudible] community.

We decided to look at a really scientific way of doing [inaudible] they find us first. Right? [inaudible]

[tape turn]

...[inaudible] if we could just get involved earlier, we'll identify those issues. And hopefully make our project look better than it did before, and try to get the right people involved.

[inaudible] identification. One of the best techniques we have [inaudible] the elected officials, the city, the planning department [inaudible]. That's why having the tools -- if you've got the tool [inaudible] helpful, because you've got a whole bunch of [inaudible]. Florida, that we [inaudible] projects. Those are [inaudible] There are a whole bunch of other projects in Florida, and [inaudible] criteria.

So we have to look at smaller projects -- local projects -- and try to initiate the process [inaudible] What we found out was [inaudible] when you think about it, [inaudible] should be expanded, and if so, where? [inaudible] come to you. Where do you wish it would happen? How do you want [inaudible]? We ask a lot of personal questions. [inaudible] We make sure all of our answers are pertinent to [inaudible] You can find out how many people really want to [inaudible] or how many people are concerned about safety [inaudible]

What we want to know in this focus group is [inaudible] efficiency, and say, "Look, Allen. You're right. Those are the [inaudible]" We call them [inaudible]

Then finally, [inaudible] we tried to [inaudible] groups at workshops. A small group -- a focus group or [inaudible] illiterate population, and we worked with [inaudible] organization. We worked with the school [inaudible] so that they could [inaudible]

Finally, we got the surveys all compiled and [inaudible] community fact sheet, and we put them all out for large public groups [blank space]

...projects that were non-ETDM. We also developed a way so the local governments would help us in these rural counties. The FDOT is responsible for all of the data collection in the non-MPO counties. In Florida, that's 33 counties. A lot of them are rural or emerging rural. So Allen designed some custom tools to help those people help us collect the information, access the information, and get it organized in a way so that it could be uploaded into the EST. This is what Frank's talking about -- the enhancement -- and how we eventually are going to get much better data and much more local data.

Allen, tell then what you designed?

Allen Ibaugh: Great. Thanks, Louise. I'm going to go through some of these tools that we have developed. One of them is for public notification, if we're bringing the folks together at the workshops. Just getting some

tools to make it easier to do mail outs and to do mail merges, and that sort of thing. This will just give you a couple of the counties that we have created this for. [inaudible] mailing label. This is the website. You should have copies of this out there.

I'm just going to go through a few slides that show the functionality of it. This is a web-based system. It's ARC IMS, if you're familiar with the GIS technology. You can go into the particulra database -- in this case, it's zoom-in. You can select and overlay your imagery, to look at the different parcel databases, but you can also select those parcels that you're interested in. It'll automatically, just on that selection, build mailing labels for the addresses that you selected.

You can make your own buffer if you want to. You can select it any way you want. It has about every A Avery label program type you could dream of. Each county and each municipality uses something a little bit different, so they need to have those different Avery labels available to them. It's just an easy way to get mailing labels.

Again, this goes back to data verification. These are owner addresses, in many cases. You have to verify that data. In a lot of cases, they have the actual homeowner there, at that address, as well. It's not just the business owner address. Some counties do and some don't have the extra relational database. It will bring in, for instance, in a condo or an apartment complex, all of those different owner addresses, as well.

Speaker: [inaudible]

Allen Ibaugh: You've got to look at all that stuff. Again, a community notification tool we put together in this case. This is where we wanted to get more selective on how we developed our mailing label list. We could select any contact, any community. We could be very specific. Schools and places of worship. Property owners, employers, et cetera.

That allows us to pick a community and then highlight, through checkboxes -- again, it's an all web-based system in this case. We can select a community, select the folks that we want to mail to, and it'll also allow you to put this out to Excel. I'm showing you this as PDFs that you can print right off. You can print it out to Excel, too, to do mail merging and that sort of thing. Then what happens is you checkmark those -- the church, the community center -- and again, you come up with that mailing label list. In this case, in a PDF format. Just tools to make it quick and easy to get that information and get those mail outs completed.

Another one. Some other community, in this case. Frank showed a few of these earlier as some GIS data repository tools that have been developed. They actually bring together community characteristics inventories into some sort of format that's combined to be the same format, each time, so you have a standard to go through. Then when you look at each community, you know you're looking at the same type of information.

In this case, again, we can pick the community we're interested in. We select a community, here. It'll come up with this fact sheet. What we've done is created in the background the GIS layers. We've created and put into our data management system, in our data repository, the different demographic data, the parcel data, structures information... You just select the community and it, on the fly, generates these different fact sheets.

We had to do this. If we were going to do it manually just for Palm Beach County alone. We came up with over 100 communities in Palm Beach County. Think about creating a fact sheet for every one. It's going to take forever to do this -- so we wanted an automated way to pull that information together.

Louise Fragala: Plus, Al -- before you go out -- you ask the MPO, the DOT district -- you ask, "What information is pertinent to this community?" So that community profile may be different in that county than it is in another county, depending on what characteristics are more valuable to that community -- and have a

higher interest to the MPO or the DOT. So they change. This tool makes it possible for us to customize each of those community profile fact sheets.

Allen Ibaugh: Yes. I would say each county that we've done this in has had a different fact sheet, to some extent. I mean the basics are there, but it has some different information for each.

Then we also put together a web tool to just help start thinking about purpose and need statements. This is very general. It's not your complete purpose and needs statement -- so the engineers don't have to be worried that this is going to have to answer all the purpose and needs. That's not the purpose at all.

The idea here is to just go through a series of questions, to get you some information that you would look at. You're looking at such things as, "How many travel lanes? What is the storm water facility type?" All this different type of information. Medians. The land-use information. A person who's familiar with the project could go through and fill out this survey through the web, and it would come up with that very general purpose and needs statement. You'd have to go back in and obviously put more information into it. We put this into a Word Document format, so it's editable. Only the personnel who should have access to it have access to it, through user name and password. They can generate these.

Louise Fragala: In doing so much work with the MPOs, and the districts, Frank has found out that the agencies often don't understand what our purpose and needs are. So you end up going back and making it a little more people-friendly -- a little more informative -- give it a little more flavor than a traditional purpose and needs statement that you get at project development. The agency folks have to understand, "Why do we need to build this project?" If they don't understand it from the purpose and need and the community doesn't understand it, we've got a problem before we even go out. So this is a very critical piece to do at planning, because we don't generally do it at planning. Frank's been trying to teach those MPOs how to do it, and he's had quite a challenge.

Allen Ibaugh: The last tool I'll show you is one that helps us track. It could be any project. In this case, we're tracking ETDM projects. Those projects they'd been talking about earlier, that went through environmental screening -- through the planning phase and the programming phase of those different processes.

This tool allows us to look at each project, so we can put that project information in there. In this case, we're looking at a project in Brevard. We can track dates. For instance, when are all the reviews supposed to happen by the Department of Natural Resources and all the others? The Bureau of Land Management and all the folks that are supposed to do their different reviews. We can give them a timeline, so they know, "Okay. This project they're looking at is going through a planning screening. Can we track each task that we're going through, so we can have a meeting with the MPO? And when was it completed?" It's really just a data management tool. It's a management tool for your interaction related to each project. You can upload pictures and you name it. You can do all kinds of stuff, here. You can save that record and go back -- so you have a database that tracks everything that's happened. It's sort of what Louise would call a project diary. It's the start of that, for each of the roadway projects you're looking at.

I don't know if you have anything else, but that's all for me.

Louise Fragala: No, but Allen, thank you very much. You guys need to give Allen a hand, because we don't let him talk, too often.

Audience: [applause]

Louise Fragala: We've done a lot of rehearsal for this. He mostly hides behind the computer.

We'd like to bring Ken up. It seems to me that in historical and cultural resources, if we need all this community data, haven't you as a cultural and historic resource specialist been collecting the history of communities all along? Isn't that somewhere? Wouldn't it be helpful for me to know about that community?

Ken Hardin: Thanks, Louise. Not every time, but many times when history or cultural resources are involved in projects, they can interact in a very powerful way. I'm also delighted to see on the program that tomorrow is unusually easy. Like George, I'm one of the lone cultural resource people in meetings like this. But I see tomorrow, there are some cultural resource people, and I look forward to that. Then before I start, too, George wants me to talk about the historic bridge book. You can get some of that from George.

You guys particularly in this group can, I think, empathize with me here. Two weeks ago, I was asked to speak at the Paramour town hall meeting. [Holden] Paramour is an African-American, low-income, inner-city community in Orlando that has taken a lot of hits. Two big transportation projects cross-cut or divide that community. I was asked to actually talk on behalf of the DOT at this town hall meeting. About 300 people at night. The other people before me were the power company talking about how to help the power bill and, insulate homes. Pretty soon that discussion got into, "How come there's not better lighting in our community? How come there's unsafe wiring in our houses?" Then the next speaker even got a crispier reception. That was the housing authority talking about their new housing plans. It was kind of a little too late. And the volume! We've all sat there and been like, "Oh, why am I here?" You know? "Why am I here?" I was going to come up next and talk about a DOT project. Oh, gosh.

I was lucky enough, though, to be able to say to this community, "I'm here for us to talk about your history." You could feel the room change. You could feel the whole dynamic of that room change. One of the things in the time allotted me, is to quickly talk about what culture resource managers have in their toolkit and have used before. Also, the kind of unique perspective or feeling a community has itself, when you start to value its history -- how that can have a value-added aspect to your projects.

Quickly, you guys probably know this. Cultural resource people do. You're professionals. We found out that many times, we're the first or the only people on the ground, traditionally... Particularly in the past, before so much focus was on CIA and communities. We sometimes were the only people that went house-to-house and talked to people about how they valued their communities.

As anthropologists, we have a view of how to look at something from the outside -- the edict view. We also value, and have forever -- for centuries, the communities. An [EMA] view. It's called the community's understanding. That's always been an important aspect of our work. That's recognized in the law. Section 106 has two important elements. Consultation of the kind of thing we've been doing for years requires that we consult with parties in our effort to avoid, minimize or mitigate for adverse effects to historic properties.

It also is recognized within the National Historic Preservation Act, in the National Register. One aspect of the criteria of eligibility for an archaeological site or for a single house or for an historic district or for an inner-city low-income minority historic district that's going to be divided further by a highway, is to understand the value that those community members themselves feel about their own resources. What we feel when we go and look outside and say, "Wow. That's a really great historic structure. You guys must really appreciate that." Many times, they'll say, "Oh, no, no. That was built by somebody outside the community. What we really like is the founder's home that's over here." We wouldn't know that. You couldn't recognize that from the outside. That house would look like 100 other houses without that input from the communities. In years past, we've kind of been used to doing that.

Another great thing you heard about and we'll talk about briefly is the great opportunity we've had to do Native American consultation. Several years ago, it was a recommendation, and now it's a requirement in Section 106 consultation that we work with the affected parties, but required for Native Americans. Those federally-

recognized tribes that have an interest in Florida now have to be consulted on projects of which they might have an interest. George Ballo and George Hadley and Federal Highway and I did what our own Native American friends called "Took a lot of arrows in our shirts," in the initial stages of developing a dialogue. Now we have an incredible, wonderful climate in the state, where before there was a lot of conflict and there was a lot of misunderstanding. There's not a whole lot of time to go into that, but maybe later we'll have a chance to come and take questions about that.

We look at the same kinds of things traditionally that you do. When we're looking at a community, we're trying to look at a historic district. We'll often times develop the same kind of datasets that I hear you guys talk about at meetings. We try to integrate them into the socio-cultural effects handbook. There's a picture there of Eatonville -- another African-American community in Orlando. As you know, Eatonville is Zora Neale Hurston's famous community -- the first incorporated African-American community in Florida.

This is like a no-brainer. This is something that I'm going to talk about as two projects, today where we use this cultural resource committee. You might call it a public advisory committee or something very similar. This was something that actually started in 1990, for a very controversial project in Tampa. I want to talk about two big, big projects in Florida that we've used this on. I4, Orlando. Again -- an interstate improvement project. And the I4-I75 improvement project in Tampa. It kind of represents, I think, some things. The cultural resource committee on these two projects were really set up to resolve effects-historic resources. But they ended up taking the lead in many other kinds of community impact that you might not have imagined. Actually, our Tampa interstate we'll get to last, because we have a video on that. Leroy insisted that early on we establish a very precise group of everybody that might be involved. I guess he had the vision to realize we'd need people 15 years down the road -- and that's where we are.

We have a group that's been meeting for 15 years! As people come and go, as managers come and go, as federal highway people come and go, as DOT people come and go -- it's the locals and it's those people that make their local community commitment to understanding the project help the resolution of effects and help develop the particular solution -- and then implement that solution. Those are the ones that stay and keep the consistency, there.

The first one we'll talk about is our cultural resource committee for the I4 job. At a point more recently, we knew we had some experience on TIS. So we had a kind of real understanding. We went into the project realizing it was going to be controversial. We realized we were going to have adverse effects to two historic districts -- one, low-income minorities and the other easily middle-class, with a lot of local political connections and clout. It was very interesting to work with these groups together and in the same forum. That's an idea of the kinds of participants we had in this group.

You heard me talk about Holden Paramour. A lot of hits are very close to the urban center and very close to the popular now-high land values of Church Street Station and tourist areas, with everybody outside the community having very definite ideas about what that community should do. A lot of speculation and very little ability within that community for people to make decisions about their own future. Then as you can see here, just intersected by lots and lots of transportation projects. In fact, one little part of that community is isolated, as you can see, within the East-West Expressway and the I4 Interstate.

So we did our normal thing. We did the things that we have to do under Section 106. We have to identify National Register Eligible Properties within our area of potential effect. Even to develop. Where is the historic district? Where is that located? To develop. How do we actually value that, per the National Register? Then, for our committee and our local understanding, and even developing what is on the National Register. Starting to get the neighborhood concerns. Some were very obvious; some were not so obvious.

One of the great things we've seen in other African-American communities is the importance of the church -- beyond what you might think. Maybe this isn't an historic building, but that's an historic church site. The congregation can remember having a church here since 1880, and still having consistent congregational members. Even though they've moved out of the community; even though the church was burnt down and rebuilt. The residents still identify with that church, and still come back into that community every Sunday morning.

Even trying to develop some mitigation. Even though we were fortunate to minimize the actual taking of right-of-way within that community, we were still able under Section 106, under the law, to utilize that to start to address and work on some mitigation that might improve or in essence "redo" some past cumulative effects.

[tape ends]

[new tape begins]

We often do this, but we found ourselves having to be the broker -- having to work between two groups -- and being the kind of independent go-between. Once we were identified as just being a salesman for the DOT, we'd lose credibility in that neighborhood. So it's kind of great that we're something else -- we're cultural resource people. We talk about their history. That gives us a kind of "in," sometimes, in a very magical way, with the community.

We'll just talk about some resolution, here. It was really important that they saw their whole historic district and their whole core was being demolished. People were coming in... speculators... and tearing down their historic resources -- particularly in the commercial core. If we could help them develop and get tax credits, or make it economically worth somebody's while to not tear down these buildings, but to adapt to and reuse these buildings, then they thought they might have a chance. This was something we were able to offer them, to nominate a central business district, and then work with a whole lot of things. Getting tax credits, both local and federal, to be able to encourage the adaptive reuse or preservation of these historic resources, instead of just demolishing them.

Louise Fragala: Ken, that was about some project in Orlando. I thought you were going to talk to us about Tampa.

Ken Hardin: Thank you for that segue. The Tampa interstate study started out with us just being plopped. In 1989 we had a master plan just plopped on us. That master plan had two blocks on either side of the I4 and I75 interstate that goes through three historic districts and a national historic landmark. This was in 1989. I don't remember how things were done, but in Florida, we just had to look at the right-of-way, then. Things were so narrowly constricted and done in such a vacuum that early on, we had a client in the DOT that didn't even want to hear about historic districts. They opposed the nominating of the National Historic Landmark -- this is Ybor City. That [district landmark] didn't oppose that designation, and we had the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Advisory Council of Historic Preservation that said, "We would build this project over this dead body." That's how we started! And it was so much fun!

Then we had Leroy, who said, "Wait a minute. We're going to start talking, and we're going to talk long and hard. We're going to listen to everybody and value their opinion -- and furthermore, educate people." One of the things that the advisory council came down and said and we've taken to hear is, "You have an obligation not only to consult with the effected parties, and not only to understand the values of their own resources so you know whether you're going to adversely affect them or not. But you have an obligation to educate those affected parties to their rights, under Section 106."

That was a good thing, because we were able under the [road reg] of training or educating the affected public, under Section 106. We also used that as an opportunity to train the DOT, to train our federal highway folks, to train our [SHIPPO] folks that themselves were unsure or unaware of the exact aspects of Section 106.

We're actually going to show a little bit of this project. Now we have "Concepts to Concrete." Now we have this project that's actually built. Part of it is actually built.

[video begins]

Voice: The most difficult move was pulling 310 tons of masonry out of an 8-foot hole. The entire structure was relocated in one piece, making this move of the entire structure... was relocated...

[video stops]

Ken Hardin: We're going to rewind this video.

Speaker: We do do a number of things backwards in Florida.

Audience: [laughter]

Speaker: Contact me if you want to learn more about that.

[Video begins again]

Voice: Neighborhoods. Every city has them. Wonderful old buildings that remind us of our heritage. Abandoned neighborhoods. Every city has them. Boarded up buildings that remind us of our past. In a century-old community in Tampa, the cultural district of Ybor City has seen the resurgence of this historically-rich neighborhood. People are moving back into homes full of history, and contributing to the rebirth of a community that is centrally located to cultural activities.

Community activists, preservationists and dedicated individuals are leading the way in the revitalization of historic communities. But there's a new partner in preservation. Over the past decade, the Florida Department of Transportation has partnered with local, state and federal agencies to help preserve the history of Tampa's cigar-manufacturing past.

Voice: I think the most challenging part of this project has been the fact that we needed to get a mindset that made people feel comfortable about returning to living in Ybor City. The interstate obviously did divide the community. It kind of separated the north side from the south side, almost making them two ends of the world.

Voice: How were they going to improve an existing transportation facility through a national historic landmark and a National Register Historic District, and also obey federal law? There's a real challenge there about how to serve the community and improve transportation, and how to recognize and protect the important history of this area.

Voice: Besides providing safe and efficient transportation, the DOT has become a good neighbor, a prominent partner in the preservation of history.

Voice: From my perspective, it was creating a method of getting the work done. The DOT and the State of Florida has never done anything like this before. There weren't contracts available or a method of contracting out the work.

Voice: The dirty work is completed prior to the relocation and rehabilitation of the structures. From the outside, people see a boarded-up building. Inside, tedious hours are spent measuring theory dimension, taking peak samples. Checking for structural deficiencies and cataloguing the condition of historic features.

Voice: We sited the buildings. We wanted to site them as they had always been historically -- which is historically close together. I talked to the fire marshal and determined that the minimum distance from the property line was to be just over 3 feet. We were able to site the buildings so that they have the same appearance from the street as they did, historically.

Voice: Large-format photography is used to document the structures. This special camera rectifies perspectives and produces archival black-and-white photographs.

Voice: Part of our job -- an interesting one -- was to document not only the exterior of these buildings prior to being moved, but also the interior of these buildings. That has left a record of each one of these houses -- whether they were moved or salvaged. We have a permanent record that's housed in the Library of Congress.

Voice: The FDOT has relocated 33 historic buildings in the Ybor City area. In the year 2000, the first house was moved from midnight to 4 AM. Neighbors were fascinated with the move, but it proved to be less disruptive to move the remaining buildings during the day. Each move had obstacles to overcome. Narrow streets, interstate fencing and low-line utilities were some of the challenges. But the most-difficult move was puling 310 tons of masonry out of an 8-foot hole. The entire structure was relocated in one piece, making this move delicate and time-consuming.

Due to excessive weight and soil conditions, a portable metal plate pad had to skillfully navigated every inch of the way. The most widely-publicized move occurred on the coldest day of 2002. The first house leased to the Ybor City State Museum rolled by the historic Cigar Factory, the new housing development, and on to an adjacent lot... To become part of a recreation of a typical historic Tampa streetscape.

The community and DOT partners were out in full support. Tampa Councilwoman Mary Alvarez -- long-time supporter of the project and others, celebrated another successful historic moment.

Attention to detail is critical for a quality rehabilitation project.

Voice: With the homes here, we're trying to save as much as we can. That's the number 1 goal. The contractors are aware of that. "Save as much as we can." Regarding beam board -- a lot of it is like -- you don't see beams that are rotted until you start poking away at it. We're going in there with epoxy, where if it's under 60 percent, we're repairing. If it's over that, we're making a call and poking that to see if it makes sense to repair it with epoxy. The casing over here is not the typical $\frac{3}{4}$ casing people go back with. They've gone back with a true 1-inch cypress casing on there, or $\frac{1}{4}$ round on the deck, here. As well as underneath the sill. That's true 1-inch stock. Normally, people nowadays will go to the Big Buck stores and use $\frac{3}{4}$. This is specially-milled.

All the buildings are similar, but slightly different. They're different in regards to their front columns and interior finishes. A lot of the buildings here have original china cabinets. Our light fixtures -- wherever we had an original light fixtures -- they're being saved. Our bathroom sinks and bathroom tubs -- kitchen sinks -- they're all being kept and put back into the homes.

Voice: A bring alley, utilizing salvaged bricks from a local roadway project, provide safe and convenient rear access to rehabilitated homes.

Voice: We had to come up with a method of bidding it and coming up with the brick. So it was a tradeoff with the city. We were going to use the brick that later was supposed to go to the city to build the alleyway, now. This was also something new to us. Typically, we don't build brick alleyways.

Voice: As a nation, we have sought after the new and innovative. Yet, we are realizing the importance of our heritage. We have begun to put more value on those things that inherently represent our past. The Florida Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration and the City of Tampa are proud to be contributing partners in the preservation of our history.

Voice: Just the sheer number of houses that are being redone and the fact that they're in such a concentrated area -- we've already seen such improvements in property values around here. A lot of houses are going up for sale. They're being snatched up left and right. Prior to coming here, this neighborhood had pretty much flat lined.

Voice: We've partnered with DOT, and actually I think that's one of the things we should be the proudest of -- to see municipalities come together and make a project become a success.

Voice: People were just astounded what could be done with people working together.

Voice: The effectiveness of how we have worked together and the outcome of this could have even a positive effect on the rest of the country.

[end of video]

Ken Hardin: The City Council only recently was getting a little long on the tooth. This was a good friend of mine that used to be the radical outsider for City Council -- now she's chairman of City Council. She was talking to me recently. Now that there's all this great recognition of TIS, and now that everybody's moving houses and spending millions of dollars out there, she said, "How's it feel, Ken, to be on a project so successful that has so many fathers?"

I said, "You know it feels really good. It feels like all those who worked the 60 meetings that we had -- all those millions of decisions and changes that have come along unanticipated -- it really can make it all worthwhile."

Louise, if we want to wrap it all up -- I think you had some other questions.

Speaker: I've got some more.

Louise Fragala: It's George's turn.

George Ballo: We've got a couple more things to do.

Ken Hardin: Okay. Louise, do you want to come back to some of this later?

Louise Fragala: We'll come back later. Yes. George is going to ask questions, now.

George Ballo: All I wanted to do...

Ken Hardin: Go ahead. We'll come back to this.

George Ballo: I didn't want to interfere with the interaction. I'd like Leroy Irwin to say a few words about the Tampa Interstate. That's what I was doing next. You keep throwing me off the stage. This is 18 years.

Leroy Irwin: Since I'm the history buff around here, I want to give you a little bit more history on this Tampa Interstate study than Ken has given you. It was a very large project in Florida, as you can imagine. It was a reconstruction of the Tampa Interstate System. The Tampa Interstate was built, I think, back in the 1960s. It was one of the first one built. It divided the Ybor City, which was the historical district.

We did a lot of things on that project, as we were developing it. We have names for it today that we didn't call them in those days. They did a master plan for the reconstruction of it. As part of that master plan, they developed what they call "design guidelines." Today, we'd probably call that context-sensitive solutions.

At the time this study was going on, when we were doing the actual NEPA study, it was in the late 1980s before Ken got involved with it. That was when the National Historic Landmark district for Ybor City was first being considered. I remember going down to Tampa to participate in a meeting that the National Park Service was holding in the designation. It's very interesting.

I don't know if you were there or not at that meeting, Ken. But if you want to see a way of holding a public meeting where you don't want any input from the public -- that was the best way to do it. They didn't have any interest in what anybody had to say about the designation of that as a historic landmark district. It was "done deal," as far as they were concerned.

We had our district folks -- as I said, we were decentralized. They were working on developing the design guidelines and so forth for this project. I remember going to Washington DC to a meeting that the National Park Service was going to have on the designation, with one of our district folks. Primarily, I went along to keep him out of trouble. He was going to Washington to object to the designation as a national historic landmark district. That was the attitude that we had within our district office in DOT about this project at that time.

Well, we went on and completed our environmental documentation with a 106 consultation. At that time, and it may still well be -- you said the largest 106 consultation in Florida. At that time, it was the largest 106 consultation in the nation that went on. We came up with a multipage memorandum of agreement. It said what we were going to be doing for mitigation in the landmark district. Later on, that thing came back to be testing about what was to be done. But we did that.

As we moved forward in trying to design the projects, that's when the cultural resource committee that Ken was talking about came on board. He was hired as a consultant to do this. He didn't tell you about going into the backyards of these houses and excavating pretty sites and stuff of that nature. There's a tremendous amount of work that went on.

[It comes back]. We did a lot of socio-cultural work before it was called that. Community work. Ybor City was really an inner-city ghetto, if you want to call it that, at that time. You saw a lot of house [built up]. They were crack houses. That's what we were working with. We had opposition from a lot of different groups. The CRS committee that Ken talked about was bringing these people together to really talk about it. You saw some of the end results of that.

This CRS committee had to face issues later on if Environmental Justice came up as an issue. The houses that we were taking were low-income housing. A lot of issues were brought up on this, but we worked through those, and we have a very successful project that is under construction, today.

Thank you, George, for that.

George Ballo: Thanks, Leroy. We've been asked to talk about some of the lessons, too. I'm glad you gave a little history of that.

Louise Fragala: Ken, one of the questions I think everybody in this room is probably wondering is, "How does the Section 106 consultation process and Ybor City and the preservation of these homes -- what implications does it have for us as socio-analysts?" And, "How are the processes similar, and why do we need to be paying attention to the history you've had -- and Leroy's history -- about this study? Why is this study relevant to us?"

Ken Hardin: Well, that's a good question. It's not always going to be. You're not always in every situation going to. I started by saying, "Cultural resource issues or Section 106 issues are not going to be important in every case." But it seems like when they are, they're going to maybe be the most-important issue in a case. When you're in an historic, inner-city, low-income, minority historic district, particularly. It's my experience that that becomes the major driving consideration in a lot of these projects. Every solution is going to be the same.

We talked about Orlando. That was a solution that was very different from Tampa. Historic Preservation people don't usually or always advocate moving and rehabilitating historic structures. But we had a situation in a deteriorating, dangerous neighborhood that had already suffered a lot of loss of historic fabric. So it made sense. In fact, that was the request of the community. To move and basically rebuild their community in a historic way. That was something that the National Park Service liked. That was something that the City liked. So that was a solution. We knew we were given the master plan. To figure out a way of increasing mobility -- but to also do it in a way that would not only meet Section 106 requirements to minimize harm, but also [inaudible] to the community itself [inaudible]

In that respect, we were open and not rigid -- even as the Historic Preservation was probably saying -- "Oh, my gosh -- you don't want to do that. You don't want to move historic houses if you don't want to. That's your last resort." So even though we worked on a situation that was a last resort, it ended up in the end with everybody agreeing to it, because it was a solution that was formed that way and not imposed from on high.

Louise Fragala: There are very few real-life examples in Florida of a total socio-cultural effects historical cultural resource evaluation that's on the ground, that you can go see and drive there and see. We really built it; it's really there.

Ken Hardin: That's right.

Louise Fragala: George was going to ask some questions. Then you and I will come back later and we'll finish up with our last section.

Ken Hardin: Okay.

Louise Fragala: George, did you want to open? I know several people have questions.

George Ballo: I just want to move this into the last section to open up [inaudible]

Speaker: Before we do that -- I'm sorry George -- if we want to talk about urban design guidelines... There is a little bit more. We can just [delay] in our timing. Urban design guidelines. And you were asking about what some of the impacts were. We have some bricks-and-mortar, too. I don't know if we have time to show a little bit more.

Louise Fragala: We're going to finish with that.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Yes. We'll come back to it.

George Ballo: I just wanted to do a couple of things here. Especially while we have the panel. One of the things I wanted to mention, Ken mentioned. We have in Florida just created the Historic Bridges of Florida. That's a revision of the Florida Bridge Book.

Obviously, this is another brainchild going all the way back to 1990 or 1980-something from Mr. Irwin. When we started with Dr. King in Texas, and we finally revised the book, now. This is an absolutely beautiful book. Several of the consultants here worked on it. I'd like to remind folks, the reason why in the integration of cultural resources, bridges don't only cross rivers or streams or what have you -- or highways. They connect people and communities. They're historical in their own right, and important to the development of the area. They're artistic in their own right.

I spent a lot of time trying to explain to certain groups of people who couldn't see those facets of what a bridge meant, and yet built them, themselves. I'd really like to point out to you that on our little handout sheet, we're going to be adding things like, "The Bridge Book," to our website list. Call Mr. Roy Jackson on that website list. Or his [inaudible], if you would like some copies of this bridge book. I've ordered enough, and I'd like you to have some.

What I'd like to do at this time -- we have Mr. Irwin here to just wrap up a little bit. We have such experts here. We have Leroy from a historical perspective and an entire environmental perspective over the past 33 years. Frank in planning. We have a man that's an absolute technical specialist that can talk about anything. We have Louise with community outreach and public involvement, and socio-cultural effects and dispute resolution and everything else she does. And Ken Hardin, who's about as knowledgeable of archaeological and historical resources. We can tell you some stories about Native American coordination.

Do you all have some questions for these panelists? You can ask them to me and I'll direct them, or ask the panelists themselves. Their names are on the front of the table. Do you have some questions that you'd like to ask them at all?

Speaker: I have a couple questions. First, tell me how much that cost to move all those houses and rehabilitate them.

Speaker: \$20m.

Speaker: Were those part of the project costs?

Speaker: Yes. We think they had to've been. It's hard. There are aspects of mitigation; there are aspects of right-of-way, acquisition [inaudible]. So it's kind of hard to get [inaudible] figure on that. But there were more than 35 historic structures moved and rehabilitated. There were a [inaudible] the remainder of structures that could not be moved. There was acquisition of property, of course, outside of the right-of-way.

Louise Fragala: Ken, wait a minute. You can tell us which microphones to use. We're adaptable. Okay.

Speaker: We found today that probably a good estimate is about \$20m on cultural resource issues or on design enhancements related to Section 106 or cultural resources. That committee is very important, as you can imagine, to implement to make some decisions 10 years ago or write an MOA 10 years ago and try to predict how things are going to go -- that's incredibly difficult. You have to develop change into that. Then you have

to have people, so that when you make the 10,000 little adjustments and the little decisions that are there and can back you up on that... That's a big challenge.

Speaker: Those are part of the project costs?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Secondly, my understanding is that you work with a lot of out-of-state tribes. I was curious. Do you have specific agreements in place with how you're going to consult with those tribes?

Speaker: Yes. I can tell you a lot about that. We first started back in 1998 and 1999. Then Ken and I and George Hadley from Federal Highway spoke with the keeper of the treasurer's meeting in Oklahoma in 2000. We're currently working with the tribes, now. We're very close to signing a memorandum of understanding with the Seminole and Miccosukee of Florida. I've been invited in November to the Seminole of Oklahoma, who are also going to invite the Muskogee Creek of Oklahoma to attend that meeting. Not only to talk about an MOU.

Our MOU was divided into two parts. One part was trying to get them to agree to follow the Section 106 process. That's what's caused a tremendous amount of the delay. For the most part, they don't want to sign another treaty saying that they're going to obey any kind of law. We have the Miccosukee in Florida that are trying to -- and the Seminole -- but especially the Miccosukee tribe of Florida -- is trying to remove all state and federal influence from its reservations and what have you. Not take money from anybody. Not have any law apply except sovereign nation Indian law.

We found that while we became -- in all honesty, to a certain extent -- friends with these people... I think there's only 10 percent left. If you're friends with any Native American, except for very special people, probably in the middle of the night, they say to themselves, "Geeze, we'd like these folks to go home back to Czechoslovakia where George came from," and back to England and what have you.

But to a large extent, we've become friends with them. What they will be signing with us -- or what it looks like they'll sign with us -- is to sign onto the ETDM process. I spoke with one of the tribes, and I said, "My God, Leroy -- we'll have to get them all computers." I asked him what he had, and the guy said, "I've got a Pentium 15, and it's 10 times more powerful than yours, with 500 MG of Megadram." I said, "All right."

We are visiting all the tribes. We're working on them with several projects. Snake Road, for instance, is with both the Seminole and the Miccosukee on their reservation. I'm on that committee with George Hadley of Federal Highway. Because we're improving the safety of that road, so many people as you expect -- from it's name... It's like a snake. This causes cars to run off into ditches, and people drown. So we're actually trying to help a number.

We also try to help the intersections. Believe it or not. Some tribes are very progressive. We're helping them with intersections and road improvements at casinos. Heritage tourism is becoming one of the issues we're dealing with. Also, Native American employment as monitors and technical advisors and as instructors.

The answer is yes, we will be. What we have now is in the absence of paper, which is fine with most of them. We've got a good working relationship. We call each other on the phone. They have my home phone number. We call each other at home. We're getting a lot of things done. But we will be signing. I've been asking on the side for at least some signatures, agreeing to participate in the ETDM process. They will become full members of the environmental technical advisory team. We'll be able to vote on that degree of effect list on our transportation project. Of course, we're very interested in their feelings on the Native American sites, sacred and cultural lands, treatment of human remains, traditional cultural properties. We're just in a tremendous

amount of talk. But also, development. All these tribes are interested in development. They're trying to pay for their future, and they would like to extricate themselves to a large extent from us.

Did that answer?

Speaker: Yes.

George Ballo: Probably more than you ever wanted to hear, and I'm sorry.

Louise Fragala: Any questions?

George Ballo: I'm excited about that. I'd like to mention one thing about what Ken said, also, in terms of when we're talking about the cost of the interstate project. We really have to remember that a lot of our socio-cultural effects analyses come out to... and Ken mentioned this, also. Avoidance, minimization, mitigation... We don't always have to go to... Some of the things we do will even enhance the project, as this did, also. The price is going to range, and what have you. Don't get the idea that if you really try to go out and find out what the people want that it's going to cost you \$20m or something. That's not necessarily the case.

Louise Fragala: We've got another question.

George Ballo: I just wanted to say that. Maybe \$2b. Like Bridge Alliance in St. Augustine.

Louise Fragala: One more question.

Speaker: There's a lot of mention of the 106 process. But since this is a transportation project, how does the 106 process in this case get into development and appropriate 4F statements for this mega transportation project that was undertaken?

George Ballo: Yes. 106 comes under because we're using federal money. Go ahead.

Leroy Irwin: On this particular project, it was a 106 consultation. But there was also a 4F document that was prepared that went along with the environmental documentation. We completed the 106 consultation and came up with a memorandum of agreement, prior to the completion of the Section 4F. That's what led us directly into the committee work. The committee work was done on the implementation of the memorandum of agreement.

Speaker: I think what I was trying to get to is the extent of the alternative analysis that went into this process. With that significant number of resources that was affected, and with that much of a cost for mitigation, how come avoidance alternatives weren't considered in the process?

Leroy Irwin: They were.

Speaker: Minimization alternatives.

Leroy Irwin: As we talked about earlier, the early master plan study was done for the interstate system before they did the NEPA documentation. Through that process, they looked at alternatives, and decided that there were no avoidance alternatives if we used the interstate system, itself. Short of relocating the entire interstate system through Tampa, there was no avoidance. If you did any improvements to the interstate in Tampa, you were going to be impacting these historical resources. That was kind of the way it came about.

They did the master plan -- which was what needed to be done. Then we were talking about an 8-10 lane facility going through here. It was a process that we went through; and it was not an easy task that we went

through. We developed a master plan, and a lot of folks learned a lot from this process -- including the Federal Highway Administration. We had some opposition from the Federal Highway folks on some of the design guidelines that we tried to do. Today, they would be out there encouraging us to do this. But back in those days... This was in the late 1970s or early 1980s that we were doing this, and they opposed some of the things that we wanted to do on the design guidelines, because it wasn't traditional to do things that way. It wasn't according to "the green book."

This was before the flexibility and design stuff came out.

George Ballo: That's right, Leroy. Remember, Section 106, we talked about training. Everyone learned -- from the Advisory Council on down, about Section 106. At first, it was, "Why do we have to do this? We have an approved master plan. Why do we have to do all the rest of this stuff?" Then once everyone bought in, finally, then Section 106 became, "How could we spend this money?" It allowed them. Then the education. Then you had to go to other parts of Federal Highway to get those structures people and all those people to realize that it was actually legal to do this, now. So you're right. That was part of it.

Leroy Irwin: This particular project -- we talked about Ybor City, here. There are two other historic districts involved that are not national landmark districts. As well as a number of individual properties that were historical that were involved. This is not just a short one. It's a total rebuilding of the Interstate 275, I75 and I4 through basically Hillsborough County and Tampa.

George Ballo: About a \$2b project.

Louise Fragala: Yes. We have one more question.

Speaker: As a one-be techno-geek, this is for Allen. I was not clear on your GIS data layers. Particularly how you were creating the mailing labels. As someone having to create mailing labels, it was extremely fascinating how you did that. Is this something you design? Or is it something that's available in the marketplace? You mentioned a website, and I looked through the stuff and I didn't see it.

Allen Ibaugh: Are there copies of the presentation, Louise?

Louise Fragala: Yes.

Allen Ibaugh: It should be in one of the copies of the presentation.

Speaker: I have that. Is that the one?

Louise Fragala: If you go to the Environmental Management Office, it'll give you information about the ETD in-process. Then you just have to drill down to ETDM process, and it'll take you to the [ST]. But Allen's website is not on here. It's CFGIS.org. Right down here. Can they go there and look at a module that gives them a mailing label?

Allen Ibaugh: That's for DRI. The other one -- I can go back and put it up here if you want me to. I'll put that link back up.

Louise Fragala: Other questions?

Speaker: [inaudible] presentations, themselves.

Louise Fragala: Brenda, you can probably be heard.

Brenda Craig: Yes. I was wanting to talk a little bit about the question you asked about, "How does this fit into CIA?" Community Impact Assessment. I see the socio-cultural effects as the current culture and the historical culture. I see it as totally the same -- that it's one process. I know that Federal Highway and others are seeing it as two separate processes, but I personally see it as the current culture versus the historic culture.

Leroy Irwin: Thank you, Brenda, for recognizing. That's what we see, too. There's no difference there.

Brenda Craig: Okay. Thank you.

Louise Fragala: Other questions?

Speaker: How long did the 106 process take on this project until you had a signed MOA?

Speakers: Oh, wow. That's... I think... I had here...

Speaker: How long was it?

George Ballo: It took -- let's see -- 6 years. That's because, like people alluded to -- we were delivered -- bam! -- a master plan. "Just make it work." If it had been done now and we knew now and took everybody going back -- taking a step back and actually going back through the avoidance and minimization -- not only for 4F, but basically just to redesign the project and step through Section 106 -- that just hadn't been done. It took reeducating our own [SHIPPO]. It didn't actually really require convincing them that we ought to have an APE larger than the actual right-of-way when we're going through these historic districts.

It took working with the Advisory Council to become really involved in a project of this scale. Bringing the Park Service down to actually see it on the ground. The Park Service. A great example of the way things work -- Park Service took one look at this job after there was a National Historic Landmark designation, and wrote a letter saying they intended to de-designate this historic landmark. Well, our clients said, "Hey, great! We don't have a problem with that." I said, "No, no. You don't understand how bad that is." That means the Secretary of Transportation has to report to the Secretary of the Interior at a Cabinet-level meeting why this project is so bad or so egregious that it's going to dedesignate this historic landmark.

It took a long time because there was so much education, and it was so large. And it was just so late in the process when we got involved. But I think, for instance, I4 is a great example of another large... The I4 in Orlando. When we got to another large one, we anticipated that, and started the committee early on. We got an MOA, and still, starting with communities that said, "You're not going to build this job. You're not going to do this in our community." But working with them at that base, they said, "Okay. What do you want? What are your alternatives?" We got that MOA in two years.

Speaker: Right.

Louise Fragala: Questions?

George Ballo: Ken, did you mention the first day when we just looked at each other, [like we had to go on medication]. They wanted to know if we had to do site files on the project.

Ken Hardin: Yes.

Leroy Irwin: I have one [inaudible] The guy that actually came down from the National Park Service to visit that Ken was talking about, actually made this statement. "You will build this project over my dead body."

That's the attitude we had to work with, to start working on whether we were going to do this or not. Remember, when we started this, this was not a national historic landmark district. That has a life and a process all its own. We had to go through that process. We...

[tape turn]

...on a master plan that had already been developed. We took a long time, there. We went back and forth with that. It's a long corridor. It's actually three different highways that merge together as a major interchange, right in the middle of the city that's involved.

Then we got into this thing with Federal Highway Administration about that you could only get approval on things that are in the 20-year plan or whatever it is. We didn't have enough money to build all of this in the foreseeable 20 years. So all those things played into this thing.

Then we started trying to come down to move projects. You had to buy right-of-way. A tremendous amount of right-of-way had to be bought. You had to...

George Ballo: Encouraging early acquisition of properties.

Leroy Irwin: Early. Yes.

George Ballo: To protect the historic resources that were being demolished.

Leroy Irwin: It was just tremendous. If you had to say one thing about this project, there are lots of good things that came out of it. Florida DOT had a change of attitude. That was one thing. They then became agreeable to start working with a lot of different entities. This was pre-CIA for doing things. This committee -- it came to the point where Florida DOT was becoming an advocate of what we were trying to do, there.

Part of the reason why Ken's I4 project he's talking about went so well was he was advising another district in DOT of the things that he learned in the Tampa interstate stuff. That district immediately became open to doing this process.

So we learned a lot from that, and we're just trying to move that. Every project is not a Tampa interstate study. But we were learning from that and being able to transfer that into the non-interstate studies, where they can be used.

It was a learning process, and we followed through. 4F took a long time -- we had to change attitudes both within the DOT and even within the City. We had opponents within the City that was opposing what we were trying to do. The Historical Preservation folks in the City were opposed. They just thought it was a bad impact; not as an opportunity to come in and do some good things. But that all changed.

Over the past 15 years or so, a lot of players have changed. We had mayor changes. It got political. You name it all. So it's a lot of learning process, and we're trying to capture that and move it into the way we do business.

Louise Fragala: George, we have another question.

George Ballo: Okay.

Speaker: Yes. George? A lot of this stuff that we've seen today and I guess yesterday -- when you're inventing or refining projects and processes... It's like you take almost the biggest project and worst case scenario. "Here are all the things that we could do."

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: For the more routine projects -- say like a bridge replacement -- how do you decide how much is enough? I mean you mentioned earlier the screening tools. And one of the earlier speakers mentioned not having approved the negative. So how do you figure it out? You've got this menu of CIA questions and things -- how do you figure out how much is enough for a particular type of project?

George Ballo: We can let a number of gentlemen speak to that. I'll tell you from a fact, what you can do with this tool and what have you. Number 1, some projects of course, ETDM is designed essentially for major-capacity projects like bridge replacements. Some projects won't even reach the threshold for ETDM.

Also, even within ETDM, we have cut down versions of how we're using the tool. We just did a thing for the strategic intermodal system, where we actually reviewed 200 projects in a couple weeks. We went from 107 datasets that were in the community or socio-cultural effects section, down to using about 10. Basic stuff.

They were going to make educated guesses at funding levels with a degree of difficulty. We did it for archaeology and history, too. You can click on a screen and have something come up. If it's got 50 historic houses on it, you say it's a problem. If it's got none, you guess it's not. You use the tool across a wide range of things. And no, you don't use it all the time. You don't get all tied up.

Speaker: I have a quick example of how just one meeting of talking to the community -- particularly for a historic bridge -- this is Section 106 -- can save a bundle. That was a Max Brewer Bridge project in Volusia County, where it needed to be replaced. Historic bridge -- a swing bridge. We're losing a lot of wooden bridges, as everybody is. So the [SHIPPO] was very concerned about the loss of this bridge.

We had one meeting with the Historical Society and asked them how they felt about this bridge built in 1949 -- Max Brewer Bridge -- Max Brewer was an important judge. We thought, coming from the outside, "Oh, wow, they're going to be really excited." Well, you meet with the Historical Society, and they're like, "That's not the old bridge. We remember the old bridge. The old bridge was that wooden bridge. And the bridge-tender's wife, when he got drunk, would have to go out and crank that thing. Max Brewer? Someone just picked that up off of a list of judges. He wasn't our judge.

Going in with that, well, "What is important to you about the community? If you lose this bridge, what do you want?" "Well we want people to realize that we've always had a connection over there to what is now the cape. We've always had a connection over there. We want to have a little history. Can you help us develop our history a little bit more?"

So when we were working with mitigation for the loss of that bridge, they really responded. Instead of moving and rehabilitating this giant swing bridge, we were able to work with everybody -- including the [SHIPPO], that mitigation would be a lot more scaled down, because of the personal community value they had on that bridge.

George Ballo: Ken, we're going to move fast, because I've got a couple of other things to do. Frank had a quick response, and then I'm going to have to close this out, here.

Frank Kalpakis: Just real quickly. In the ETDM process, we do evaluate bridge-replacement projects. It's during a programming screen. Part of the programming screen that we want to accomplish is or a lot of agencies to actually identify what the key issues are. We're actually scoping what needs to be done in project development. Then we're not overanalyzing different issues, but focusing on the issues that an environmental agency, for example, has identified.

George Ballo: Thank you, Frank. I'm going to go ahead. It's getting time. We're going to close real fast. I have two things to do -- three, actually. First of all, I really want to get our last report from Allen, here. Last of this nature from Allen.

Allen Ibaugh: This pretty much wraps up our feeling about CIA.

[video begins]

Voice: I'm Allen Ibaugh, reporting from the field.

Voice: Sorry, sir, but your time's up.

Voice: Hey! I have another interview.

Voice: Sorry, sir.

Voice: Wait!

Voice: Yes. Yes, sir. Everything's taken care of. Situation's resolved. Mission complete.

Voice: The bottom line is, the CIA is here to protect you.

[Video ends]

Audience: [applause]

George Ballo: We'll finish with one quick thing, and then Judy's going to make an announcement. We have one thing in what you'd call context-sensitive solutions. We're going to end with a short success story, and I think it's what happens if you do socio-cultural effects evaluation right. We feel that the clip speaks for itself. So we're closing out, and you can all just be happy. You can take the cotton out of your ears now, and we'll all be happy.

We're closing out with this clip, and then Judy will make an announcement before lunch.

[video begins]

Voice: To minimize the effects of the interstate... Through the section 106 process, a memorandum of agreement was developed, stipulating that the design be consistent with the 1996 Urban Design Guidelines set forth in the Tampa Interstate Study. A team of designers, local historic agencies, representatives from the public, and Ybor City's special interest groups assisted in the evolution of the design. The result was a concept that complements the heritage of Ybor City, without competing with the simplistic styling of the historic cigar factories.

The proposed interstate will create a one-way frontage road system, to improve access to Ybor City. 19th Street will be closed to pedestrians and vehicles. Access under the interstate will be provided at 21st 22nd Streets, and 14th 15th streets. For this reason, added emphasis on pedestrian enhancements was planned -- helping to recreate the north and south Ybor communities.

Utilizing the design plans, 3D visualization was used to accurately depict colors, materials and locations of urban features, which were selected to mitigate the visual impacts to the adjacent historic community. The

focal point of the 14th 15th Street intersection is a beautiful, hard-edged pond with a floating fountain. The historic 5-globe lights and brick details uniquely distinguish this destination for the driving public.

The gateway into Ybor City will continue to be the 21st 22nd Street area. The gateway will include similar restored brick intersections, with black-and-white hex pedestrian crosswalks. A 4-tiered fountain ordered by a brick kneewall. Black specialty fencing. Five...

[video ends]

Speaker: That's enough. Yes. That's enough. It's time to go to lunch.

I'd like to thank you very much. We certainly enjoyed being here. We appreciate you listening to us for this long a time. Thank you, again.

Audience: [applause]

Moderator: Before we have lunch, I have a couple things to ask, and then a kind of good and bad story. First thing I want to do is thank George, Leroy, Frank, Allen, Louise and Ken for their fine presentation. I think it's been really great. So if we could all thank them.

Audience: [applause]

Moderator: Then I have just a couple of housekeeping things. Yesterday on the table where you all...

[session ends]