

Evaluation Table

This evaluation process is one that combines objective data and judgment to determine the relative benefits of the widening and realignment alternatives and the No Build Alternative. In some cases there are standards to be met but in most cases the objective in the PD&E process is to avoid and minimize impacts while meeting the objectives of the improvement project. In general the effects of the Build Alternatives are compared to the No Build Alternative to establish relative ratings. The evaluation discussion below provides the logic behind the assignment of the degree of effect each alternative has relative to the specific criteria. Highlights of the discussion are provided in the evaluation matrix. Once these effects are identified, the Intergovernmental Agency's approved weightings are applied to determine a numeric weighting for each of the two build alternatives and the No Build Alternative. This numeric value will be an aid in determining the preferred alternative. This table is prepared consistent with the PD&E guidelines and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. This requires that the impacts be evaluated before mitigation. However, the effect of the project on floodplains will be insignificant due to provision of compensating storage. Further, noise impacts will be reduced by noise walls. Thus the effects of mitigation have been demonstrated at the end of the table.

IA Approved Weighting	Evaluation Discussion
<p>Environmental</p> <p>1. Floodplains Floodplains</p> <p align="center"><u>1</u></p>	<p>The widening alternative has a lower floodplain impact with 16 acres and the encroachment is in an area where the floodplain is impacted by the existing roadway. The realignment impact is nearly 41 acres. Minimization techniques can reduce this impact to 37 acres. Most of the floodplain impact for the realignment alternative is located south of Orange Avenue and the road would be a new encroachment into that area of the floodplain. It is not cost effective to reduce the impacts below 37 acres; however, the effect of the floodplain encroachment can be reduced to no effect with the planned provision of compensating storage. The same is true with the widening alternative. The evaluation reflects pre mitigation conditions as required by the NEPA process. The widening alternative has a relatively small impact, but the realignment alternative has a greater impact on floodplains. A -1 was set for the widening effect. The relative increase in impact plus the new encroachment of the alignment yielded an impact rating of -3 for the realignment. Without mitigation the floodplain impacts for the realignment alternative are extensive. However, considering the impact shown in this part of the table and the mitigation shown at the end of the table, there would be no net effect on the floodplain due to the compensating storage being provided. The realignment alternative will require more land acquisition and will have a higher right of way cost for flood plain compensation but this will be accounted for in the cost criteria. The No Build would have no impact on the floodplain and is rated 0.</p>
<p>2. Surface Water Protection Water Quality (Surface Water Protection) Wild and Scenic Rivers (N/A) Outstanding Florida Waters (N/A) Essential Fish Habitat (N/A)</p> <p align="center"><u>3</u></p>	<p>Currently there are multiple points of direct discharge into water bodies in and around the study area. Surface water will be protected by careful erosion control during construction and existing direct discharge at Munson Slough and Bradford Brook will be eliminated or greatly improved in both alternatives. There is a benefit in both alternatives in treating storm water; therefore both alternatives receive a value of 1. The No Build would continue to provide direct discharge at Lake Bradford and Munson Slough and is therefore rated -1.</p>
<p>3. Vegetation and Wildlife Wildlife and Habitat Contamination Farmlands (N/A)</p> <p align="center"><u>3</u></p>	<p>The total acres of impact for the realignment alternative are about 19 percent more than the widening alternative. Most of the effected uplands could be developed for residential or business uses, if they are not used for roadway purposes. In spite of the higher number of upland acres effected on the realignment alternative, the widening alternative impacts 11 acres of national forest land and the Golden Aster Preserve, land that would not be available for other development if the realignment alternative were selected. As a minimization technique a hybrid typical section, adjacent to the national forest land and Golden Aster Preserve was develop to preserve 50 feet of the right-of-way. The realignment does cut through upland habitat, which increases the secondary effects associated with this alternative (increased habitat fragmentation, edge effects, increased competition for resources, and vehicular conflicts). Listed species were evaluated and with avoidance and minimization the effects for both alternatives would not be adverse. Based on the foregoing, the widening alternative will be assigned a -1 and the realignment alternative will receive a -1.5. The relative ratings recognize the difference in upland and the potential secondary effects of the realignment. The No Build alternative would have no effect on vegetation and wildlife and is this rated 0.</p>
<p>4. Wetlands Wetlands</p> <p align="center"><u>3</u></p>	<p>The wetland impact for the widening alternative is minimal. The realignment alternative reflects substantial efforts to minimize impacts on this alignment. The center alignment at Black Swamp reduces the wetland impacts and keeps the roadway on the fringe of Black Swamp. In addition, the roadway footprint has been reduced at Black Swamp by 50 feet. This reduces the impact from 7.1 acres to approximately 5.1 acres. This effect is small and may be mitigated through mitigation contribution pursuant to Florida Statutes 373.4137. Based on the foregoing the widening alternative is rated at 0 and the realignment alternative is rated -0.5. These enhancements could be included for any alternative, including the No Build alternative. The No Build alternative would have no effect on vegetation and wildlife and is this rated 0.</p>
<p>5. Stormwater Management Stormwater Management Construction Ponds Acreage</p> <p align="center"><u>3</u></p>	<p>There are two elements to the stormwater criteria, stormwater management and construction effects. An extensive erosion control program with monitoring is included in both alternatives. This is needed for the widening alternative to protect Bradford Brook and Munson Slough. In the Realignment Alternative Black Swamp and Munson Slough must be protected. Because of the extensive erosion control programs for both alternatives, Construction aspects do not effect the ratings. The same stormwater management criteria are applied to both alternatives. The improvement would enhance the environment by eliminating direct discharge and treating the roadway stormwater. So the rating for both alternatives is 2. The No Build alternative would not treat any storm water and would allow existing storm water pollution to continue. The No Build alternative is rated -1.</p>
<p>Economic</p> <p>6. Cost Floodplain Mitigation Wetland Mitigation Construction Cost Design and CEI Cost Road Right-of-Way Cost Pond Right-of-Way Cost Noise Mitigation Cost</p> <p align="center"><u>2</u></p> <p>See Analysis Summary Table</p>	<p>A wide range of elements contribute to cost. For the purposes of this evaluation, most enhancement costs are included. Enhancements can be added to either alternative. Special enhancement costs are included for the realignment for noise mitigation at Paradise Cove and for Bradford Brook. The cost of the realignment is \$31 million more than the widening alternative. This reflects an increase of 24 percent above the widening cost. Another possible consideration is potential for government right of way to be provided at lower cost or at no cost. Therefore, the acreage of government owned land needed as right-of-way (City, County, State) has been included in the evaluation. The two alignments have similar amounts of right-of-way to be acquired from government entities (92.9 acres for the realignment and 97.8 acres for widening). However, when only undeveloped acreage is considered, the difference is more pronounced (64 acres for the realignment and 46 acres for widening, including 17.5 acres of US Forest Land). Additionally, the Strategic Intermodal System designation and the opportunity for special state funding must be considered as the widening alternative has approximately one additional mile available for this funding, from Orange Avenue to the airport entrance. The widening alternative is assigned a -2. Due to the cost differential, the realignment alternative is rated at -2.5. For the No Build Alternative there would be no cost so this criterion is rated 0.</p>

7. Access & Mobility <u>2</u> Access and Mobility Traffic Operations (Level of Service) Safety Emergency Management Evacuation	Both build alternatives enhance access and mobility. However, the realignment improves access between residences and job opportunities and provides access flexibility by the combination of the existing roadway and the realignment. The realignment also improves access to the FSU southwest Campus and Innovation Park. The widening alternative provides multi-lane access to the existing airport terminal entrance. The realignment provides only two lane access. This access has sufficient capacity to accommodate projected traffic on the roadway at an acceptable level of service; however, passing will be very limited. The realignment roadway is ten percent shorter than the widening alternative. Both alternatives are considered enhancements and are rated with a positive value. The widening alternative is rated at 2 and the realignment alternative is rated at 2.5. The No Build Alternative would limit access and mobility, would restrict traffic operations due to congestion and would reduce safety due to a low level of service. Emergency Management and evacuation would be limited to the existing two lane road. Therefore, the No Build Alternative is rated -3.
8. Economic Development <u>2</u> Economic Development Access and Mobility Utilities and Railroads (N/A)	Both alternatives support economic development. The effect on the regional economic development is minor but both provide access to development and redevelopment opportunities. The realignment alternative provides accessibility to more opportunity and is therefore rated above the widening alternative. The realignment alternative is rated at 2.5 and the widening alternative is 2. The No Build alternative would discourage economic development due to congestion on the roadway. No Build is rated -2.
<i>Social</i> 9. Historical and Archaeological Sites <u>1</u> Historical Sites Archaeological Sites	There is no expected differential in the alternatives for this criterion. Neither build alternative is expected to have an effect on historic sites or archaeological sites. Both alternatives are rated at 0. No Build is rated 0 also.
10. Mixed Housing <u>1</u> Mixed Housing	Since the majority of the alignment for the widening alternative is not supportive of residential development this alternative is rated 1. The realignment alternative has substantially more opportunity for mixed housing and is rated at 2. The No build alternative would be similar to the widening alternative in the amount of land which is provided access for mixed housing. The No Build alternative is rated 1.
11. Recreation/Open Space/Greenways <u>2</u> Recreation/Open Space/Greenways Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities Scenic Highways Road Right-of-Way Air 4(f)	There are excellent recreational opportunities created by both alternatives. The widening alternative allows for the meandering trail to be located in the forest, instead of the road right-of-way, to enhance the user's experience. The realignment allows new access to be created that could supplement the trail in the forest which is in the Greenway Master Plan. The realignment could also provide access to a trail adjacent to Black Swamp. Both alternatives allow for connection of residential neighborhoods to an excellent trail system. However, the realignment alternative, due to its location nearer existing residential communities provides substantially more access to these communities for recreational opportunities. Scenic Highways and 4(f) matters are not expected to affect either alternative. The widening Alternative is rated 2 and the realignment alternative is rated 2.5. The No Build Alternative provides no recreational/ open space opportunities and is therefore rated 0.
12. Residential Neighborhoods: <u>3</u> Residential Neighborhoods Number of Household Relocations Road Right-of-Way Noise (prior to mitigation) School (N/A)	The major consideration in this category is relocated households, and residential noise impacts. The widening alternative requires relocation of 14 households. Sixteen households have noise impacts. The realignment alternative requires the relocation of 28 households. The majority of the added relocations in the realignment alternative are mobile homes. There are 40 households that would be impacted by noise on the realignment. The No Build condition will also have noise impacts on CCSW and Orange Avenue as traffic grows so it was rated at -0.5. The widening alternative would have substantially more impacts so it is rated at -1.5. The realignment has double the relocations and slightly more net noise impacts so it is rated at -2.5. The mitigation afforded by noise walls is reflected at the end of the table. The net impact for residential, after mitigation, is -1.5 for the realignment and -1 for the widening alternative.
13. Business Community <u>1</u> Business Community Number of Business Relocations Road Right-of-Way	Both alternatives affect the business community to a similar degree with similar relocations. The realignment affects businesses along the south end of the corridor and the FSU Master Plan future expansion area. It also requires the relocation of the Leon Regional Juvenile Detention Center. The extent of the effect of the realignment on the campus will depend on the effectiveness of government planning and intergovernmental coordination. The widening alternative also impacts businesses along the south part of the corridor, the Tallahassee Airport, Airport Industrial Park, and the Airport Commerce Center. The build alternatives have a similar number of relocations. Thus, both alternatives are rated -1. The No build Alternative will not have any relocations; however, access to business will be reduced by deficient capacity. This will have a negative effect on the business community. The No Build is rated -1.5.