**FDOT SWAT SCOPING GUIDE**

To be used for both Federal and State Funded Projects

**SECTION A (Items 1-8 ideally completed prior to SWAT Planning Meeting)**

1. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE AND NEED**

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Information** |
| Project Name |  |
| Project Limits |  |
| Roadway Context Classification |  |
| County |  |
| ETDM Number |  |
| Financial Management Number |  |
| FDOT Project Manager |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Brief Description of Existing Conditions** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Preliminary Project Description**  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Purpose and Need Components**  |
|  |

1. **PD&E STUDY EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **Maybe** | **Not****Likely** | **No** | **Question** |
|  |  |  |  | Is this a transportation project qualifying for ETDM EST screening? (See ETDM Manual, Section 2.3) |
|  |  |  |  | Will the project cause adverse noise impacts? |
|  |  |  |  | Will the project cause adverse impacts to wetlands and require a federal permit? |
|  |  |  |  | Will the project require a US Coast Guard permit? |
|  |  |  |  | Will the project affect endangered or threatened species or their critical habitats and require a federal finding? |
|  |  |  |  | Will the project require right of way acquisition and result in any residential or non-residential displacements? |
|  |  |  |  | Is there any potential involvement with resources protected under Section 4(f) of U.S. DOT Act of 1966? |
|  |  |  |  | Will the project affect any historic and archaeological resources protected under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and/or Chapter 267, Florida Statutes? |
|  |  |  |  | Does the action potentially impact contamination sites that result in more than a minimal impact to design, right of way, or construction activities, and can’t be avoided or remediated? |
|  |  |  |  | Is a public hearing required in accordance with 339.155(5)(b), F.S., as described in Part 1, Chapter 11 of the PD&E Manual? |
|  |  |  |  | Will the project cause substantial controversy? |

Limited project scope or low impacts may determine that an ETDM Screening is not necessary and a PD&E Study may not be required. Given the qualifying scope: If the answers to all questions in Item 2 are “no”, then the anticipated COA for the project is either a NMSA (if state funded) or a Type 1 CE (if federally funded).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Check ONLY one** | **PD&E Study required?** |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Does this project fall below the scope and impacts threshold of a PD&E study? If the answer is YES, then it is still useful to complete SWAT Scoping Guide through Item 5, to determine funding source, local priority, and estimated cost. Items 6 and 7 are not necessary.

1. POTENTIAL CLASS OF ACTION

|  |
| --- |
| What is the potential Class of Action or type of environmental document, and WHY? |

1. **ESTIMATED COSTS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Cost** | **Year of Estimate****(i.e. Present-day cost)** | **Source of Estimate** **(i.e. LRTP)** |
| PE & PD&E |  |  |  |
| Right of Way |  |  |  |
| Utilities |  |  |  |
| Mitigation |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |

1. **FEDERAL NEXUS**

The following evaluation steps should be considered in order to identify a federal nexus and whether projects are recommended for State Funding Only (SFO). Consultation with Work Program staff is often necessary, and OEM coordination is also a possibility. Refer to the Module 4 of the SWAT Training Workbook for specific guidance.

Complete the coordination process below to progressively determine whether the project is:

1. Federal funding required,
2. Federal funding recommended, or
3. State Funding Only (SFO) recommended

##### **FEDERAL FUNDING REQUIRED**

Work Program staff is uniquely qualified to inform the SWAT Team and production staff about required federal funding parameters that pertain to the following eight (8) scenarios. (PD&E Manual: Part 1 Chapter 2, Section 2.2)

Scenarios 1-8

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Interstate projects
 |
| 1. Projects using or involving Interstate right of way (e.g., air rights, adjacent)
 |
| 1. Projects within and impacting federal lands, such as National Parks or Forests;
 |
| 1. Projects where a federally funded phase has occurred (funds expended)
 |
| 1. Projects where current work is federally funded
 |
| 1. Transportation Alternatives (TA) program projects
 |
| 1. FHWA Safety Program projects
 |
| 1. Off-System projects
 |

##### **FEDERAL OR STATE FUNDING RECOMMENDED**

If federal funding is not required, the project can still be considered for either state or federal funding. In this case, the District or Turnpike will want to pursue the funding type (federal or state) that results in the most efficient project delivery approach. For example, if it is determined that there is informal or formal Section 7 [Endangered Species Act (ESA)] Consultation or required federal permits, FDOT may strategically consider a particular funding source. In these situations, it is advisable to talk with OEM - as this decision is a function of the type of permit and type of species issue involved in the project.

Is the project required to be federally-funded? **Yes** or **No**

If the answer to the question is “NO”, then the project is eligible for State Funding Only (SFO). The SWAT Team can decide whether to fund the project with federal OR state funds, as indicated in the box below. (Overall cost and phasing may be a large consideration.)

**ENTER THE FUNDING RECOMMENDATION**

From the coordination above, check “Federal Required” box just below if Work Program has determined that the project must receive federal funding. If federal funding is not required, then check the box which indicates the District or Turnpike’s decision to pursue either Federal Recommended or SFO Recommended as a funding source.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Check ONLY one** | **Project Funding Decision** |
|  | Federal Required |
|  | Federal Recommended |
|  | SFO Recommended |

Enter the funding decision into Step 6 of the SWAT Planning Meeting Summary.

1. **LOCAL PRIORITY AND LONG-RANGE PLANNING PRODUCTS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Describe**  |
| Lead Local Government, if applicable |  |
| Priority # in List of Priority Projects (LOPP)  |  |
| Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Priority |  |
| FDOT Strategic Intermodal System Plan |  |
| Other products (i.e. planning study) |  |

1. INITIAL IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECT RISKS AND CHALLENGES

|  |
| --- |
| Develop an initial list of risks and challenges to infrastructure, resources, and stakeholders.  |

**SECTION B**

**(Section B prepared for SWAT Strategy Mtg, Sections A & B revisited during SWAT Kick-off Mtg)**

1. POTENTIAL PROJECT IMPACTS TO ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES

The following should be considered when determining potential impacts to environmental resources: Environmental resources that are marked as “No Involvement” must have an acknowledgement that it was considered but not present on the SWAT Scoping Guide and therefore the scope of services should only require the consultant to verify and include a statement to that effect in the Environment Document. Resources that are marked as “No”, “Enhance”, or “Yes” on the guide must be included in the scope of services for analysis during the PD&E Study.

**ETDM No.:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Resource Categories Potential Impacts? Basis for Decision

 Yes No \*Enhance \*No Inv

**A. SOCIAL and ECONOMIC**

1. Social [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  2. Economic [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

3. Land Use Changes [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

4. Mobility [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

5. Aesthetic Effects [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

6. Relocation Potential [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

**B. CULTURAL**

1. Historic Sites/Districts [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

2. Archaeological Sites [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

3. Recreation Areas [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

**C. NATURAL**

1. Wetlands and Other [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

Surface Waters

2. Aquatic Preserves and

 Outstanding FL Waters [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

3. Water Quality [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

4. Wild and Scenic Rivers [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

5. Drainage and Floodplains [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

6. Coastal Barrier Resources [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

7. Protected Species and

 Habitat [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

8. Essential Fish Habitat [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

**D. PHYSICAL**

1. Highway Traffic Noise [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

2. Air Quality [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

3. Contamination [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

4. Utilities and Railroads [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

5. Construction [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

6. Bicycles and Pedestrians [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

7. Navigation [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

\* NoInv = Issue absent, no involvement.

\* Enhance = Issue that could be enhance due to project

1. UPDATED LIST OF PROJECT RISKS AND CHALLENGES

|  |
| --- |
| Update the list of project risks and challenges to infrastructure, resources, and stakeholders.  |

1. LEVEL OF DESIGN EFFORTS

|  |
| --- |
| State whether design phase activities will be concurrent with PD&E. State the percent completion of design effort that might be anticipated during the PD&E phase. |

1. PROPOSED PROJECT DELIVERY METHOD

|  |
| --- |
| State potential project delivery method |

1. ACTIVITIES TO BE ADVANCED PRIOR TO PD&E

|  |
| --- |
| List the data collection, technical reports, studies, or surveys that can be advanced ahead of the PD&E start. |

1. SWAT STRATEGY SCHEDULE

|  |
| --- |
| Develop a schedule that lists, links, and estimates durations for pertinent pre-PD&E activities and the following phases: PD&E, Design, Right-of-Way, and Construction. |