CHAPTER 5

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES AND IMPLEMENTATION

5 EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES AND IMPLEMENTATION

This chapter summarizes results of the evaluation conducted for the Environmental Assessment (EA) alternatives. Relevant information regarding the impacts of each alternative are presented and compared against the established goals and objectives for the Project. Where potential adverse impacts associated with an alternative are possible, the level of their significance, if any, is indicated. This chapter also provides a summary implementation plan describing the key next steps and general phasing from Initial Operating Segment (IOS), to Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), and ultimately the Full Build, for which this EA was prepared.

5.1 Approach to the Evaluation

The project purpose and need statement developed and approved during the Alternatives Analysis (AA) was updated during the EA. The update process confirmed the need for the project and verified its established goals and objectives, while further shaping the definition of the alternatives that were originally evaluated in the EA.

The approach to the evaluation addresses local goals and objectives as well as FTA criteria prescribed for major transit capital investment projects. The evaluation addresses the No-Build, TSM (New Starts Baseline), and Build Alternatives. The Commuter Rail Build Alternative is consistent with recommendations in the AA to provide a new transit service on the existing CSXT A-Line by making selected infrastructure improvements and utilizing DMU passenger train equipment.

The Build Alternative defined in the EA is referred to as the Full Build. It extends from DeLand to Poinciana with 16 stations. As a subset of the Full Build Alternative, and as mentioned in the preface of this document, the EA also examined the LPA, which does not contain the link from DeBary/Saxon Boulevard Extension Station to DeLand Amtrak Station, and has 15 stations with a different operating plan. Finally, the EA also identifies DeBary/Saxon Boulevard Extension Station to the Orlando Amtrak/ORMC Station as the recommended North Corridor starter line, referred to in the documentation as the Initial Operating Segment (IOS). The IOS is 31 miles long, has 10 stations, and an operating plan that focuses on weekday peak direction service. The phased implementation strategy of starting with the IOS and phasing into the LPA and ultimately the Full Build has been discussed and coordinated with municipal and county governments in the corridor.

5.2 Summary of Results

A review of the evaluation results confirms there are substantial benefits to both the users and to the general public by implementing the Full Build Alternative and there is limited environmental risk in its implementation. The value of the investment is positive for the region and, more importantly, it provides additional person carrying capacity in the region's critical and primary north-south travel corridor. The largest advantage to the Full Build Alternative over the No-Build and TSM Alternatives is the ability of commuters to use an existing, active rail corridor (CSXT A-Line) that is free flowing and reliable as compared to the peak periods on I-4 and US 17/92 on the north; and US 441, and Orange Avenue on the south. This is especially true because any bus service under the

TSM Alternative would be faced with virtually the same lack of roadway capacity as the auto users in the corridor.

The northern portion of the CRT corridor is severely constricted in terms of available surface transportation capacity. It is generally limited to the I-4 facility with very few alternatives, all of which are either congested or too distant from the corridor to be useful. For example, US17/92 that generally parallels I-4 is also severely congested and expected to worsen in the future. Moreover, any significant traffic incident along I-4 during the peak commute leaves the traveling public to deal with significant added travel time delays. Congestion and incident-induced delays adversely impact travel time and reliability of express buses. By comparison, commuter rail provides the traveling public with the choice of a travel option that is faster and more reliable than in the No-Build or TSM Alternatives.

The southern portion of the project is faced with similar congestion and is the focus of significant residential and industrial development - particularly between Kissimmee and Poinciana. In the future congestion is projected to be severe in the south portion of the corridor on segments of I-4, US 441, Orange Avenue, and the Florida Turnpike. Providing additional transportation capacity will afford the traveling public with mobility options not available in the No-Build or TSM Alternatives.

The CSXT right of way and existing rail infrastructure is attractive as an established foundation for high quality commuter rail transit. From an environmental standpoint, the corridor is already disturbed, and is active with passenger and freight rail traffic. The development of a CRT service in the corridor is relatively inexpensive and the facility is well positioned to serve major activity centers along and within the corridor. Its purpose and use as an existing transportation corridor makes it compatible with the purposes of the CRT project. The evaluation finds that the transportation and land use benefits of the proposed CRT are substantial and widely distributed within the corridors. The number of potentially adverse impacts is both small and capable of being reduced to an acceptable level or eliminated through mitigation.

Measures considered appropriate for addressing project goals, objectives, and specific concerns were evaluated under the criterion of effectiveness. These measures address the major goal categories of:

- Mobility;
- Land Use and Development;
- Environment;
- Investment; and
- Community.

Table 5-1 summarizes the results of the evaluation against the criteria and measures used to determine effectiveness at satisfying the Project's local goals and objectives. The Full Build and LPA alternatives are evaluated through comparisons with both the No-Build and TSM Alternatives.

Table 5-1: Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Criteria	Measure	No-Build Alternative	TSM Alternative	Full Build – Commuter Rail Alternative	Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)
MOBILITY					
Transit Ridership (year 2025)	Regional Daily Transit Riders	139,660	154,460	168,600	161,660
	Estimated New Daily Transit Riders - Unlinked	N/A	14,800	28,940	22,000
	Estimated New Daily Transit Trips - Linked	N/A	10,600	18,040	15,350
	Daily Rail Boardings	N/A	N/A	13,760	8,310
Travel Time Savings	Transit travel Times Between Major Activity Centers With and Without Commuter Rail	N/A	Minor improvement	Significant improvement plus greater reliability	Significant improvement plus greater reliability.
	Forecast Travel Time Savings in Region	N/A	Minor improvement	Minor improvement	Minor improvement
Congestion Reduction	Forecast Daily VMT	100,388,726	100,347,740	100,298,530	100,317,229
	Forecast Daily VHT	3,598,000	3,596,941	3,595,150	3,595,850
Regional Transit Service Integration	Connections to Amtrak (number of stations within ¼ mile of Amtrak station	N/A	2	4	3
	Connections to Transit Centers (number of stations within ¼ mile of transit centers)	N/A	6	6	6
LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT					
Transit-related Development	Number and Location of Existing Transit-related Developments	1 LCS	1 LCS	6 Altamonte Springs; Winter Park; Florida Hospital; LCS; Church Street, Kissimmee	6 Altamonte Springs; Winter Park; Florida Hospital; LCS; Church Street, Kissimmee
	Likelihood of and Market for Transit-related Developments	Low	Low	Higher	Higher
Conforms to Local, Regional, and Comprehensive Plans	Consistent with Local Land Use and Transportation Plans	Fully Consistent	Partially Consistent	Consistent	Consistent
Transit a catalyst for future economic (re)development	Proximity to Area with Significant Redevelopment Goals	None	None	Medium-High	Medium-High

Criteria	Measure	No-Build Alternative	TSM Alternative	Full Build – Commuter Rail Alternative	Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)
ENVIRONMENT					
Transit, Street, and Highway Impacts	Number of Intersections at LOS E or F (year 2025)	18	18	18	18
	Travel Delay Time at Rail Crossings	The No-Build cumulative daily delay at these grade crossings is a combined 34,069 minutes.	No Change	Increase total daily vehicle delay project-wide and corridor wide at the grade crossings by less than 8 percent	Lower total daily delay than Full Build due to fewer CRT operations per day.
Neighborhoods	Noise Impacts	N/A	Low	Limited number of noise impacts due to increased frequency of train horn soundings. All impact locations to be mitigated.	Fewer train horn soundings per day than Full Build due to fewer CRT operations per day.
	Potential Impacts to Visual and Aesthetic Qualities	None	None	No adverse impacts. Utilizes existing active rail corridor and rail yard areas. Stations would provide an opportunity for positive impacts associated with transit-related design.	Same as Full Build except for DeLand Amtrak Station which is not included in LPA.
	Potential Impacts to Air Quality	Low	Low	Low	Low
	Safety Around Station Areas	N/A	No Change	Station area design will incorporate safety measures.	Station area design will incorporate safety measures.

Criteria	Measure	No-Build Alternative	TSM Alternative	Full Build – Commuter Rail Alternative	Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)
Parklands/Open Space and Recreation Areas	Number and Location of Parklands/Open Space Potentially Impacted	None	None	No direct or indirect impacts on any parks or open space. Temporary construction phase indirect impacts on park access will be mitigated.	Same or less than Full Build because no construction or operations north of DeBary/Saxon Blvd Extension Station, and less construction of double track.
ENVIRONMENT					
Ecosystems	Changes to Habitat and Removal or Damage to Unique Vegetation	None	None	Project is located in an existing railroad ROW. No impact on vegetation. Habitat addressed in ESBAR	Same or less than Full Build for reasons described above.
	Floodplain Encroachment	None	Minor No adverse effect	Minor (5.65 acres) No adverse effect. To be further analyzed in PE.	Same or less than Full Build for reasons described above.
	Wetlands Impacted by New Construction	None	Minor (Where TSM Park and Ride is at same location as Full Build stations)	Minor (23.56 acres) 18.21 acres of the total is at stations. Impacts to be mitigated pursuant S. 373.4137 FS	Same or less than Full Build for reasons described above.
Water Quality	Number of Stream Crossings with New Construction	None	None	No adverse impact. All track improvements over streams use existing or improved structures.	Same or less than Full Build for reasons described above.
Environmental Justice	Population of Minority, Low Income, and Transit Dependent Households Potentially Impacted	N/A	Low	No disproportionate adverse effects on minority and low-income households. Access and mobility benefits are high.	Same as Full Build. No disproportionate adverse effects on minority and low income households

Criteria	Measure	No-Build Alternative	TSM Alternative	Full Build – Commuter Rail Alternative	Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)
				Potential noise impacts from horn soundings to be mitigated.	
ENVIRONMENT					
Historical, Cultural, Community, Archaeological Resources	Number of Historic and Archaeological Resources Potentially Adversely Impacted	None	None	No Adverse Effect finding at 4 of the properties NRHP-Listed. FDOT commitment to provided specific design conditions regarding architecture and materials selection of station elements and site buffering are in final design.	Less potential effect than the Full Build because the LPA does not serve the DeLand Amtrak Station.
Threatened and Endangered Species	Impact to Wildlife Within the Corridor	None	None	ESBAR shows either no effect or effect not likely adverse for all identified species. Protection measures and guidelines will be followed for design and construction.	Same or less than Full Build due to no construction north of DeBary/Saxon Blvd Extension Station and less double tracking.
Hazardous Materials	Number of Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST) and Hazardous Waste Sites Impacted	None	None	No Superfund sites, proposed Superfund sites, or state-equivalent sites are in the study area. 11 locations with medium or high risk of existing contamination require further investigation in PE.	Same as Full Build relative to Superfund sites. 10 station or facility locations with medium or high risk compared to 11 in the Full Build. Lower risk along right of way due to less double track.

Criteria	Measure	No-Build Alternative	TSM Alternative	Full Build – Commuter Rail Alternative	Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)
Relocations and Property Impacts	Residential and Non-residential Properties Impacted. Takings in Acres.	None	80.4 acres	130.2 acres	124.4
INVESTMENT					
Project Capital Costs		N/A	$47.1	$632.0	$447.0
Operating Efficiency	Entire Bus and Rail System Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs (2005 millions)	$141.6	$153.1	$180.8	$167.7
COMMUNITY					
Accessibility	Existing Population (2000) within ½ mile of Proposed Rail Stations	N/A	N/A	23,110	22,918
	Existing Employment (2000) within ½ mile of Proposed Rail Stations	N/A	N/A	97,573	97,648
	Forecast Population (2025) within ½ mile of Proposed Rail Stations	N/A	N/A	33,260	32,865
	Forecast Employment (2025) within ½ mile of Proposed Rail Stations	N/A	N/A	141,156	141,016
Equitable Access	ADA Accessibility (existing sidewalks in proposed transit station areas)	N/A	N/A	Stations and vehicles will be ADA compliant	Same as Full Build
	Low Income Population Served Within 1 Mile of Proposed Transit Stations	N/A	N/A	1,711	1,704
	Pedestrian Access	N/A	N/A	Station area design will include sidewalks for convenient and safe pedestrian access.	Same as Full Build

The Full Build Alternative would have commuter rail ridership of 13,760 per day in the year 2025. Compared to the No-Build Alternative overall transit ridership (unlinked) in the region would increase by 28,940 daily riders with the Full Build Alternative, while the TSM Alternative would achieve an increase of 14,800 daily riders – about half the impact of the Full Build Alternative. The increase in regional linked transit trips compared to the No-Build Alternative is 18,040 daily riders with the Full Build Alternative compared to the 10,600 riders with the TSM Alternative. The increase in linked transit trips is a better measure of the ability of the Full Build Alternative to divert automobile trips to transit.

The Full Build Alternative is superior to the No-Build and TSM Alternatives across most evaluation measures, particularly in the categories of transportation and land use benefits. In the small number of environmental categories where a potential for adverse impact was identified, mitigation will eliminate or reduce the impact to below significant levels.

The Full Build Alternative will provide opportunities for investment in the community particularly around the CRT stations. This Transit Oriented Development (TOD) would not exist in these specific areas in the other alternatives. The Full Build Alternative would be compatible with the existing land use and zoning in the corridor where existing stations would be utilized. Where new stations would be constructed, they would be planned with the communities allowing for the desired TOD land use in the future.

In order to achieve the significant benefits of the Full Build Alternative at lower cost the project sponsor worked closely with local governments and other project stakeholders to define the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As described in Chapter 2, the LPA alignment and stations between DeBary/Saxon Boulevard Extension on the north and Poinciana Industrial Park on the south is identical to the Full Build, except there are fewer trips per day, less double track, longer headways, and no direct commuter rail service to DeLand. These differences amount to Capital cost savings of approximately $185 million and Operations and Maintenance cost savings of over $13 million per year. As shown in Table 5-1, the LPA achieves benefits comparable to the Full Build at significantly lower cost.

5.3 Implementation Plan

To best meet the needs of the community, a plan has been developed for implementing the CRT in a time efficient and cost effective manner. This plan has been divided into the short-term and long-term activities required for full implementation of the CRT. Due to the physical arrangements coordinated with CSXT and the availability of funding, project phasing has been proposed to provide early implementation of a segment of the Full Build. The phasing section separates the Full Build into three segments: 1) the North Segment between DeBary/Saxon Boulevard Extension Station and Orlando Amtrak/ORMC Station; and, 2) the South Segment between Orlando Amtrak/ORMC Station and Poinciana Station; and 3) The north extension to the DeLand Amtrak Station.

5.3.1 Short Term-Plan

The short-term plan involves completing a series of activities prior to the implementation of the CRT. The following short term activities pertaining to adoption of the project within local, regional, and state plans have already been completed. These activities are listed below.

- Included CRT Project in the current Florida State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP);
- Included CRT Project in the Long Range Cost Feasible 2025 Networks of both MPOs within the project corridor (METROPLAN ORLANDO and the Volusia County MPO);
- CRT Project endorsed by all four county governments of Volusia, Seminole, Orange, and Osceola counties; and
- CRT Project endorsed at the local level by municipalities with proposed stations along the corridor.

Environmental clearance under Federal NEPA and Florida PD&E requirements has proceeded with preparation of this Environmental Assessment within the framework of a major public outreach and agency coordination program. Input received during this coordination process shaped the alternatives to maximize project benefits while avoiding or mitigating the limited number of adverse impacts the EA will be completed following the public hearing and will address any remaining issues that may emerge at that time. Environmental issues identified during this EA process will be resolved following the EA public hearing and prior to issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).Preliminary Engineering (PE) during this time will be sufficient to resolve these issues and define all proposed mitigation. The Initial Operating Segment (IOS) will be the first segment of the Full Build CRT to be implemented and consequently will be addressed first during PE and final design.

5.3.2 Long-Term Plan

The long-term plan is to implement the entire DeBary/Saxon Boulevard Extension to Poinciana Industrial Park 54 mile corridor, with the ability to extend to 7 miles to DeLand as the market for that service develops in the future. Development of detailed engineering design plans and construction documents for the LPA, and possibly the Full Build Alternative is the centerpiece of the long-term plan for project implementation.

5.4 Project Phasing

The alternatives are being evaluated based on year 2025 characteristics. However, additional analyses have been performed for intermediate years in order to assess project viability as well as potential project phasing. The transportation system variability, particularly for the I-4 corridor, is significant between now and 2025, and alternative transportation modes in the corridor are needed because traffic conditions will worsen despite the planned roadway improvements. In 2025 most of the extensive I-4 improvements will be completed, yet as shown in Chapter 1, the number of roadway segments with traffic Level of Service F will increase. During the interim years, while work is being performed on I-4, travel will be significantly impacted by the roadway construction projects.

From a utility point of view, the LYNX Central Station (LCS) is critical to all phases of the commuter rail project because it provides critical connectivity with the regional bus system to permit travel to destinations throughout the Central Florida area. Additionally, a mid-day layover facility is needed for the commuter rail equipment in the vicinity of

downtown Orlando. Finally, this is one of the prime locations where Commuter rail transit will interface with the proposed State of Florida Intercity Rail system.

5.4.1 North Corridor - Initial Operating Segment (IOS)

Analysis conducted during the EA confirmed the North Corridor as the preferred segment for the IOS, and based on operations analysis concluded that the IOS mid-day layover facility would need to be located south of downtown Orlando at Kaley Yard. By terminating the IOS at Orlando Amtrak/ORMC Station rather than the LCS, a substantial increase in ridership is achieved for relatively low additional cost because the rail line is already double tracked in this area, the station spacing is relatively close, and the destination station requires no parking. In the north Corridor, the IOS terminates at DeBary/Saxon Boulevard Extension, which is a few miles north of the DeBary station identified in the AA. This new proposed location has better access, a greater opportunity for TOD land use, and expansion potential long-term. As a result, the IOS defined in the EA is 31 miles long and has 10 stations.

In summary, based on the objective of early implementation of CRT service in the corridor, it was determined that greater initial benefit to the traveling public would be realized through initial implementation of the North Corridor. Three key factors identified in the AA supporting selection of the North Corridor for the IOS remain valid:

- The traveling public would benefit from an alternative travel mode, especially during the reconstruction projects on I-4, as maintenance of traffic measure.
- Development in much of the North Corridor is relatively mature and the longer term ridership expectations would occur in the near term.
- The physical modifications to the CSXT facilities would be easier to achieve, in the near-term in the North Corridor.

5.5 Identification of Key Milestones

The following is an updated list of key milestones that must be addressed in order to implement the project.

- *CSXT Agreement:* The majority of property that would be used for the CRT service, but not the stations, is owned by CSXT. Prior to completion of the EA process sufficient information should be known to allow for the formal agreement to be executed between the FDOT and the Project Sponsors and CSXT on use and control of the rail corridor.
- *Engineering Documentation:* The work required would most likely be a combination of work that will be performed by private contractors and suppliers with involvement by CSXT. The definition of how the work will be performed will be defined as a part of the CSXT agreement. Once the contract packaging approach is determined, the detailing of the designs and packages will be completed.
- *Establishing the Operator:* The presumption, to date, is there will be a contract operator that provides the service. Contracting will be done via a comprehensive

procurement package to allow for a competitive opportunity. Concurrent with the preparation of the procurement package, the state, regional and local entities will need to determine the local organization for overseeing the contract operation. Approximately 9 to 12 months is required to advertise, select, award, hire and train personnel necessary to implement the Contract Operation.

- *Construction:* This phase will be dependent upon the agreement with the CSXT and the division of responsibilities.

- *Start-Up Operations:* For the IOS, the start of operations could be achieved by the end of 2009. In 2013, the addition of the second segment would complete the LPA. Further extension north to DeLand Amtrak Station will be dependent on local decisions that will be made later in the process.

- *Procurement Lead Time:* The DMU equipment some of the railway materials/equipment (e.g. signals and systems) will have long lead times and may need to be pre-ordered to ensure an on-schedule delivery**.**

5.6 Compliance and Consistency with Environmental Laws, Regulations and Programs

This section briefly outlines the consistency of the CFCRT project with various Federal and State of Florida environmental laws, regulations and programs. For brevity, the information is presented in matrix format in the following tables. Table 5-2 presents relevant federal statutes, regulations and policies, while Table 5-2 presents Florida statutes, regulations and policies.

Table 5-2: Compliance with Federal Laws, Regulations and Programs

Law, Regulation or Program	Brief Description of Compliance
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)	Completion of this Environmental Assessment and FONSI signifies compliance with NEPA
Clean Water Act of 1977 (Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972)	Under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, any Federal activity that will result in a discharge to waters or wetlands subject to Federal jurisdiction is required to obtain a State Water Quality Certification (WQC) to ensure compliance with State water quality standards. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act governs the disposal of fill into waters of the United States. Build alternative will result in estimated 18.66 acres of wetlands impact in South Florida Water Management District (WMD) and 4.9 acres of impact in St. Johns River WMD. Mitigation of CFCRT wetland impacts will be implemented by the appropriate Water Management District where the impacts occur. FDOT will contribute to mitigation bank program of each affected WMD.

Law, Regulation or Program	Brief Description of Compliance
National Historic Preservation Act of 1966	FDOT, in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer, has determined that the proposed action will have no adverse effect on the DeLand ACL Railroad Station (8VO2653), the Orlando ACL Railroad Station (8OR139), the Old Orlando Railroad Depot (8OR25), and the Downtown Orlando Historic District (8OR422). Refer to Appendix E for a copy of the letter received from SHPO dated March 9, 2007.
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act	Correspondence with USFWS – no Federal listed Threatened and Endangered (T&E) Species are likely to be affected by the project.
Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act	No direct impacts to publicly-owned parklands identified. Minor indirect and temporary construction period impacts possible to adjacent parks, appropriate mitigation will be provided. There are no noise impacts to publicly owned parks. No impacts to Section 4(f) have been identified.
Section 6(f) of the Department of Transportation Act	No parklands or recreation areas funded with Land and Water Conservation Fund dollars identified along the CFCRT corridor – not applicable.
Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970	Takings estimated at 130.2 acres of property on 98 separate parcels are needed for the Build Alternative. A total of 12 occupied residences,19 active businesses, and a business parking lot will require relocation due to station construction in Sanford, Lake Mary, Longwood, and Altamonte Springs and at Sand Lake Road in Orlando. Affected property owners will receive just compensation in compliance with the FTA procedures established under the Act.
Safe Drinking Water Act: 42 U.S.C. 300F-300J-6 (P.L. 93-523) (P.L. 99-339)	The project is not located over a Sole Source Aquifer – not applicable.
Executive Order 12898: Environmental Justice DOT Final Order on Environmental Justice (DOT Order 5680.1, "Environmental Justice," February 15, 1997)	The Project does not disproportionately impact EJ populations within the Project corridor. The project provides for improved transit access and provides increased mobility and access to regional employment and activity centers for transit-dependent populations throughout the corridor. Potential noise impacts from CFCRT operations to identified EJ populations will be fully mitigated by FDOT.
Executive Order 11900: Protection of Wetlands	Build alternative will result in estimated 18.66 acres of wetlands impact in South Florida (Water Management District) WMD and 4.9 acres of impact in St. Johns River WMD. Mitigation of wetland impacts will be implemented by the appropriate WMD where the impacts occur. FDOT will contribute to mitigation bank program of each affected WMD.
Executive Order 11988: Floodplain Management, as amended by Executive Order 12148	Project will impact an estimated 5.65 acres of floodplains. Based on the preliminary evaluation, the encroachments to the floodplain are not anticipated to have an adverse effect. A more detailed analysis will be conducted during the final design phase of the project.

Law, Regulation or Program	Brief Description of Compliance
CZMA of 1972: 16 U.S.C. 145 et seq. (P.L. 92-583) (P.L. 94-310) (P.L. 96-464) and CZMA Reauthorization Amendments of 1990: 6217(g)	Project is unlikely to affect coastal resources and is considered consistent with the approved Florida CZM program – no determination from Florida Division of Community Resources has been made.
Clean Air Act (as amended), Transportation Conformity Rule: 23 U.S.C. 109(j), 42 U.S.C 7521 (a), (P.L. 101-549)	The project is included in the current Florida State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The project is not located in a non-attainment area. The Transportation Conformity Rule and its air quality requirements do not apply to the project.
Preservation of Historic and Archeological Data Act of 1974, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 469 et seq.	Not applicable; project will not require mitigation of direct impacts to historic or archaeological resources. FDOT commitment to design, landscaping and visual impacts.
Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.	Coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) has yielded no formal consultation requirements pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. CFCRT project is unlikely to adversely affect Federally-listed threatened and endangered species.
Executive Order 11593, Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment, 13 May 1971.	Coordination with the State Historic Preservation Officer signifies compliance.
Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks, 21 April 1997	Not Applicable; the project would not create a disproportionate environmental health or safety risk for children.
Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, 6 November 2000	Consultation with Indian Tribal Governments, where applicable, and consistent with executive memoranda, DoD Indian policy, and Corps Tribal Policy Principals signifies compliance. Distribution of CFCRT project Advanced Notification (AN) package.
Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA), 7 USC §§ 4201 et. seq. Executive Memorandum - Analysis of Impacts on Prime or Unique Agricultural Lands in Implementing NEPA, 11 August 1980	Not Applicable; project does not involve or impact prime or unique agricultural lands
White House Memorandum, Government-to-Government Relations with Indian Tribes, 29 April 1994	Consultation with Federally Recognized Indian Tribes, where appropriate, signifies compliance. Distribution of CFCRT project Advanced Notification (AN) package included Federally Recognized Indian Tribes.

Table 5-3: State of Florida Environmental Laws and Policies

Law, Regulation or Program	Brief Description of Compliance
Chapters 253, 267, and 872 of the Florida Statutes – Historic Preservation	Florida SHPO has determined, that the Project would have "No Effect" on historic properties in the vicinity of the Florida Hospital, LYNX Central Station, and Kissimmee Amtrak stations. FDOT in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer, has determined that the proposed action will have no adverse effect on the DeLand ACL Railroad Station, the Orlando ACL Railroad Station, the Old Orlando Railroad Depot, and the Downtown Orlando Historic District . SHPO consultation will continue into the preliminary engineering phase.
Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) mitigation program - Florida Statutes 373.4137, 1996	Project will result in estimated 18.66 acres of wetlands impact in South Florida WMD and 4.9 acres of impact in St. Johns River WMD. Mitigation of CFCRT wetland impacts will be implemented by the appropriate WMD where the impacts occur. FDOT will contribute to mitigation bank program of each affected WMD.
Water Resources Act, Chapter 373, F.S.	FDOT will obtain authorization for project wetlands impacts by obtaining an Environmental Resource Permit/Authorization to Use State Owned Submerged Lands/Federal Dredge and Fill Permit, as established under a 1998 Operating Agreement between the USACOE, FL DEP, and four Water Management Districts (WMDs). FDOT will also obtain coverage under the NPDES Florida Construction Stormwater General Permit for construction activities.
Rules 40E-4, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), and 40C-4, F.A.C. – Stormwater	The proposed stormwater facilities design will include, at a minimum, the water quantity requirements for water quality impacts as required by the South Florida WMD and St. Johns River WMD.
Florida Department of Transportation Environmental Policy, September 15, 2005	The project will be designed and operated in compliance with the relevant principles and requirements of the Environmental Policy.