

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC1	Navigation	Letter (10-6-06)	Brodie E. Rich Federal Permitting Agent Bridge Branch U.S. Coast Guard 909 SE First Avenue Miami, FL 33131		Bridge permits will be required for the waterway crossings at: the Loxahatchee River, Hillsboro Canal, Cypress Creek Canal, New River, and Dania Cut-Off Canal. Waterway crossings that are considered navigable waters of the United States but meet the criteria for Advance Approval in accordance with Title 33 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 115.70 are: the North Fork Middle River, South Fork Middle River, Tarpon River, Oleta River, Arch Creek, Biscayne Canal, and Little River. Advance approved waterways do not require Coast Guard bridge permits.	<p>Navigational concerns are addressed in the FPEIS in Summary Sections S.9 and S.10.1, Sections 3.12.1 and 3.12.2 of Section 3.12, Table 3.13, as well as Section 8.1.1, specifically Commitment 18.</p> <p>Those waterways needing a USCG permit and those qualifying for advance approval will be further studied in Tier 2 in coordination with the USCG, a SFECCTA coordinating agency.</p>
AC2	Navigation	Letter (11-13-06) (Similar to comments at 10-30-06 Joint ETAT Workshop on SFECCTA DPEIS)	Brodie E. Rich Federal Permitting Agent Bridge Branch U.S. Coast Guard 909 SE First Avenue Miami, FL 33131		If the proposed rail corridor to the Miami Inter-modal Center (MIC) crosses the Miami Canal at or near the existing CSX Railroad drawbridge at waterway mile 0.95, then a fixed bridge proposal would have to provide a vertical clearance of 40 feet above mean high water and a horizontal clearance of at least 90 feet between fenders. If the proposed rail crosses the New River system with a fixed structure, then a vertical clearance of 55 feet above mean high water and a horizontal clearance of at least 70 feet between fenders would be needed to meet the reasonable needs of navigation on this waterway. Lastly, if a bascule bridge is selected for the New River or the Miami Canal crossings, the operation of any movable span across these waterways will need to be addressed.	Navigational concerns regarding vertical and horizontal clearances are addressed in Table 3.13.
AC3	General	Letter (12-6-06)	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960	S	EPA supports transit options from an air quality perspective since such options generally reduce the amount of additional air emissions in the transportation corridor relative to the sole reliance on highways.	Comment noted.
AC4	Technology	Letter (12-6-06)	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		EPA supports hybrid transportation alternatives, smart growth approaches, and transit-oriented development for areas targeted for development to ensure that the proposed transit system does not only provide regional air quality benefits, but also minimize impacts to other environmental considerations within the corridors.	Comment noted.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC5	Technology	Letter (12-6-06)	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		Based on our review of the DPEIS, overall many of the issues above which were identified in the scoping, preliminary environmental screening process and documented in the Advanced Notification have been insufficiently discussed or evaluated. For example, it is difficult to assess the magnitude and amplitude of the noise impacts because of the lack of preliminary noise data incorporated in the document. Preliminary studies are referenced, but relevant preliminary noise data is not included in the document.	Based on guidance from the FTA as well as the FDOT PD&E Manual, the level of detail for identifying and assessing resources and potential project impacts is considered appropriate for the purposes of this Tier 1 Programmatic document. FTA considers this document mainly for public education and understanding. The more detailed information in the AN and in the technical support documents remain available on the project website. We have, however, provided additional information in the FPEIS in response to these comments. (please see comment AC19, below)
AC6	General and Document Rating	Letter (12-6-06)	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		EPA rates the document EC-2; that is, the document has identified environmental impacts to aquatic resources (wetlands, streams, sole source aquifer, and aquatic preserves), noise, communities/ EJ, archeological and historic property, contaminated sites that should be further addressed, avoided, or mitigated. Additional information is requested to adequately assess the degree of regional impacts and evaluate preliminary minimization and mitigation measures	In response to EPA comments, Section 3.14 has been prepared and added to Chapter 3 to address Indirect and Cumulative Effects (ICE). This new section broadly quantifies (consistent with the tiered process) the potential impacts to the resources listed as a result of new construction for each of the proposed alignments and station areas. Estimates of area (acres), number of sites and/or ranges of the natural resources involved have been provided to more readily assess the degree of regional impacts. In addition, a new section summarizing potential <u>ranges</u> of impacts and potential mitigation strategies has been prepared and added to Chapter 3 (see Section 3.13 and Table 3.13). See also response to comments AC19 and AC21.
AC7	SAFETEA-LU	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #1	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		It appears that the project sponsors wish to voluntarily demonstrate compliance with SAFETEA-LU, based on discussions about SAFETEA-LU in at least six different places in the text of the PDEIS (i.e. pg 1, 6). EPA recommends that if compliance with SAFETEA-LU is the intent of FTA, this should be explicitly stated in the introduction to the PEIS. The project has no "participating agencies" and the project's substantive compliance with this requirement using "cooperating agencies" is not adequately demonstrated in the document.	SAFETEA-LU is discussed with regards to this tiered NEPA study in Section 0.1 and in Section 1.1.1. Participating and cooperating agencies are addressed in Section 0.8. Both the FHWA and FTA have stated that FDOT's ETDM process satisfies the participating agency intent outlined in the SAFETEA-LU regulations.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC8	Purpose & Need	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #2	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The PDEIS's "Summary Statement of Purpose and Need (P&N)," appears to be somewhat incomplete (pg 19). It appears that the groundwork statements for P&N in both the project's Advanced Notification, dated January 2006, and the project's ETDM Programming Summary Report, dated 6/20/2006 have not been fully utilized to support the P&N statement for this project. EPA suggests that the DFEIS should discuss and or explain modifications made to the P&N statements after the submission of the Advance Notifications and ETDM Summary Report. This is important with respect to the Record of Decision since the P&N Statements in these two documents have been previously reviewed and approved by the ETAT members for FDOT, District 4 and the changes proposed to the P&N statement have not been specifically discussed or explained in the PDEIS.	The P&N statements in the AN and in the ETDM programming screen follow the categories of information outlined in the FDOT PD&E Manual (system linkage, transportation demand, modal relationships, safety, social and economic development and legislation). These AN statements were concise and streamlined for the purposes of the AN and ETDM screen. These same P&N statements were expanded in the DPEIS with more data, maps and documentation. Note that the same categories were utilized (system linkage, transportation demand etc). In addition, the format of the P&N statements in the DPEIS was modified in response to FTA's comment that the statements should be easy to understand from the public's perspective, thus the "Problem, Need, Action" format was established. Besides the formatting and additional supporting documentation, the same P&N statements presented in the AN and ETDM are included in the DPEIS.
AC9	General	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #3	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The listing of Selected South Florida Premium Transit Projects is useful to set the context for the project, and to begin analysis of cumulative impacts. EPA recommends the PFEIS include similar listings for the area's past and planned, Highway, Seaport, and Airport Projects, in order to fully analyze cumulative impacts of this project on transportation modal integration, its effects on this congested metropolitan area, and the parallel rail and highway routes, along with, the airports and seaports to be served.	In response to this comment, the list of Selected South Florida Premium Transit Projects has been added to Chapter 3, Section 3.14 to serve as a list of planned transportation projects. In addition, a list of past major transportation projects has been added as well and the potential, cumulative impacts on social, cultural and natural resources have been assessed for the project corridor.
AC10	Capacity	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #4	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		Other than a summary graphics of Level of Service (LOS) for each planning area, there appears to be no analysis or discussion of the current and future capacities [for example, average daily traffic (ADT) and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) or passenger miles traveled (PMT)] of transit, highways, rail, air, and sea services users within the study area, including freight services, and other commercial passenger services in the region.	This section contains the latest available information and analysis from recent studies of the corridor. Detailed analysis of these modes was beyond the level of a Tier 1 document. Relevant points were made regarding the need for the project. However, these items will be addressed in subsequent Tier 2 studies to the extent possible.
AC11	Transportation Demands	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #5	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The facts presented in Section 1.2.1 on Transportation Demand do not include: any discussions of aesthetics and context sensitive solutions (CSS) for each alternative reviewed. The PFEIS should discuss issues of aesthetics and context sensitive design solutions for proposed alternatives according to current DOT - - guidance. This should be discussed as a means to minimize or negate impacts resulting from elevated structures and other structures that are erected that substantially impact the view-shed within the corridor.	Visual and aesthetic qualities are addressed in Section 3.5.2 and have been expanded to include CSS in the discussion to the level appropriate of a Tier 1 study. This discussion will be further developed as alternatives are developed and assessed in Tier 2.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC12	Land Use	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #6	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The compliance of the alternatives listed, with any existing, State-approved, population projections for each county, or, the best practices and land use projections identified in all existing, Regional, State, or Federal, natural resources conservation plans, fish and wildlife conservation plans, surface water management plan, drinking water protection plan, or water resources development plans have not been discussed. Such discussions are required.	The transit alternatives being considered are to meet a need identified in 1.) Transportation Demand, Section 1.2.1, the Land Use Demand text, specifically Tables 1.5 and 1.6 and Figure 1.17, and, 2.) local, state and federally mandated plans for the counties as stated in Section 1.2.2. Section 3.3, specifically Subsection 3.3.2, discusses compliance of the transit alternatives with the State of Florida Governor's Initiative "Eastward Ho!". This text further discusses how the alternatives support redevelopment projects near the FEC Railway corridor. Further analysis and coordination with other relevant agencies and plans will occur in Tier 2 for the detailed alternatives.
AC13	Purpose & Need	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #7	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The P&N which includes problem statements associated with transportation and traffic demands contains almost no statistics to support analysis of air-freight, intermodal needs, nor, the projections for needed capacity for air / rail and highway passenger to seaport linkages. In addition, the effect of "Welfare to Work" program is not incorporated into the P&N Section. EPA recommends that the DFEIS should substantiate most of the problem statements made in the DPEIS. These discussions and statistics are needed because the problem statements given in the P&N section currently appear to be unsupported by documented factual data. In addition, the impacts of the "Welfare to Work" program should be incorporated into the document	Pursuant to FTA guidance, the P&N section was developed for ease of public understanding consistent with a programmatic regional assessment. Therefore, more empirical evidence and reasoning was used, as in "(SFECCTA Alternatives) Would support the Welfare to Work program by increasing access to north-south and east-west transit connections to major employment centers and related services such as childcare and training." See Section 1.2.4 in response to Welfare to Work and access to jobs discussion, including Figures 1.19 – 1.20 and Figure J.10 in Appendix J, Tables 1.7 and 1.8 [which used GIS analyze and display Census 2000 data as well as modeling results from the SERPM.
AC14	Technology	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #8	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		Hybrid transportation improvement alternatives are not included for project development and NEPA review in the PDEIS. The DFEIS should include a hybrid transportation improvements alternative. This alternative could include potential improvements and expansions of transit systems, Intelligent Transportation System measures (TSMs), Transportation Demand Management measures (TDMs), Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), and new and expanded highway options; for example, value pricing, HOT Lanes, more park-and-rides combined with HOV lanes, incentives for alternative-fueled vehicles, and restrictions on parking downtown and on use of freeways by heavy freight traffic during rush hours. To come closer to a solution for area congestion all of these measures will likely be needed.	Tier 2 studies will incorporate hybrid transportation improvements as an alternative, including TSMs and other measures combined with rail or bus technology alternatives. This is indicated in the PEIS in Summary Section Table S.2 "Urban Transport Modes and Sub-modes Considered" (repeated as Table 2.1 in Chapter 2). See entries for Bus, BRT, and RRT in this table. See also Section 2.2.2 "Modal Technologies" and Table 3.13. The text in Table 3.13 addresses mitigation strategy for Air Quality/Energy impacts to be evaluated in Tier 2. However, HOT lanes are being studied for I-95 in the vicinity of the project study area in a separate study, therefore are not included in the SFECCTA or the PEIS.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC15	Air Quality	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #9	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The DPEIS states that the proposed project is located in a re-designated attainment area and therefore, it must continue to demonstrate conformity through maintenance and an approved long-range transportation plan. It is unclear whether this project has been incorporated into the approved long-range transportation plan and whether it is included in the conforming SIP.	As stated in Section 3.7.1, since the year 2005 the entire State of Florida was found to be in full conformance with national air quality standards for ozone for both the 8-hour and 1-hour standards. Therefore, the long range transportation plans are no longer required to demonstrate air quality conformance. However, as stated in Section 1.2.3, the project is included in the LRTPs for Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach Counties. See also Section 3.7, particularly Section 3.7.2 wherein the PEIS documents "that the project is in a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) designated airshed for the air pollutant ozone, and that the project is part of approved LRTPs and consistent with the Transportation Improvement Programs for the three counties in the SFECCTA study area."
AC16	Air Quality	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #10	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		It does not appear that specific air quality issues or air quality improvements potentially attributable to the project have been discussed in any level of detail. Specifically, no current or past, demonstrations of compliance with National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) using specific TCMs, or, hot spot analyses required for criteria air pollutants or mobile source air toxic (MSATs) compounds have been reported or identified. These issues must be discussed for each alternative. Will any air quality modeling be done or be necessary to address these issues?	Additional air quality issues have been discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.14 with regards to the indirect and cumulative effects (ICE) along each of the proposed alignments. As coordinated with the FDEP ETAT representative, more detailed air quality studies will be conducted in the Tier 2 NEPA studies.
AC17	Land Use	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #11	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The analyses represented on page 100, "Table 2.17- Station Land Use Suitability," needs more explanation, especially of how numerical scores for each category of analysis were assigned, derived and, justified, otherwise little logic can be derived from these scores. For example, are the scores relative to each other or are they compared against some unidentified standards, how is specific value assigned and justified in each category rated? EPA recommends that should PFEIS should explain how the numbers were derived in Table 2.17. What approach and assumptions is involved in this assessment.	Section 2.3.5 discusses the major parameters and variables measured for each proposed station location included transit supportive land use, development patterns, connectivity, station area environment, etc. This section includes an explanation of each of these parameters and measures, their definition, and how potential station areas were scored for these measures. These parameters coincide with the columns listed in Table 2.19. As stated in the text of Section 2.3.5, each potential station area was measured relative to each other and those potential station areas with a high number of these variables scored higher than others with lower number of these variables. The detailed process for determining the scores is included in a Tech Memo titled "Deriving a Methodology for Assessing Transit-Supportive Land Uses and Station Suitability" which is available on the project website.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC18	Mitigation	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #12	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		Mitigation is discussed on page 129 and elsewhere in the text, relegated to Tier 2 for further discussions. EPA recommends that the PDEIS should take this opportunity to identify and discuss the selection and applicability of the range of best management practices (BMPs) that are available and applicable in each area of impacts needing potential mitigation, and, the possibilities of arranging mitigation banks for example for the impacts of all of the segmental projects to follow in Tier 2. This could provide some efficiency of both scale and timeliness to the further consideration of mitigate on opportunities.	The FDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction provide similar standards as BMP, as discussed in Section 3.12.3 in an expanded discussion of how construction effects can be positive or negative. This tiered assessment of mitigation is also addressed in the Tiered PEIS Methodology Technical Memorandum available upon request or from the project website at: www.sfecstudy.com/images/Tech_Memo_Tiered_EIS_SFECCTA_S.pdf . This memorandum was circulated to members of the ETDM Environmental Technical Advisory Team during the project screening for Tier 1.
AC19	Noise	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #13	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		Noise and vibration issues associated with transit projects are likely substantial. An inventory of noise and vibration sensitive areas and receptors is discussed in the PDEIS, but is not included. If this inventory is to be relied upon in Tier 2, it needs to be reviewed during the PDEIS to allow identification of any issues, deficiencies and excessive potential costs of mitigation for the noise issues and impacts of the segmental projects to follow. It is unclear what the overall magnitude or severity of the noise impacts will be on sensitive receptors along the project area and therefore this area is difficult to assess.	In response to this comment, Table A.22 (Evaluation Criteria and Alternatives Analysis Matrix for Noise and Vibration Sensitive Receptors) has been added to identify noise and vibration sensitive receptors found along the various alternatives which were considered as evaluation criteria for Table 5.3, NEPA Evaluation Criteria and Alternatives Analysis Matrix. Table A.22 may be found in Appendix A. In addition, noise issues have been further discussed in Section 3.14 with regards to indirect and cumulative effects (ICE) along the three primary proposed alignments.
AC20	Direct/Indirect Effects	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #14	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The analyses of routinely expected, potential effects for the corridor and the stations do not appear to include any analysis of the potential direct and indirect effects: of additional lighting on nearby sensitive receptors both during construction and during operations of the new systems, nor, of any analysis of noise and vibration on nearby sensitive receptors during construction, specifically of any need to blast, drive piles or sheet piling on land or water, or to use large, heavy equipment or vibratory compactors, especially at unusual work hours, nor, of any generation of noxious odors or fugitive dust during construction and operations of the planned new systems, nor, any air quality effects of the project on NAAQS or MSATs, nor, of any dewatering activities needed for the foundation work required, nor, of any creation of borrow pits or materials storage and stockpile areas during construction, nor, of removal of existing trees and stands of vegetation, or other impacts on valued areas of visual quality.	In response to this comment, Section 3.12.3 has been prepared and broadly identifies construction related impacts along the proposed alignments. More detailed analysis of these impacts will be conducted during Tier 2 studies where specific alternatives and their potential effects will be better developed.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC21	Land Use	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #15	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The data on "Table 3.2-SFECCTA Percent Existing Land Use (1.0 mi. Buffer)," should be expanded to include a category for "Water Features" to separate these from "Natural Land Cover." The current presentation of data may be somewhat deceptive, since water features have inflated the natural cover category and possibly obscured the rarity of natural land cover in the region. The PFEIS should separate water features from the national land cover data. This category might be used to identify locally rare, natural land uses potentially impacted by the projects.	In response to this comment, Tables 3.2, SFECCTA Percent Existing Land Use (1.0 mi Buffer) and 3.4, SFECCTA Future Land Use (2050) have been revised.
AC22	Water Quality	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #16	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The discussion of "Water Quality" on page 164 is inadequate because it does not include any discussion of existing surface water quality and of any current issues with the quality of surface water in the affected environment. Recommendation: Existing surface water quality, specifically including any water bodies or stream segments with current water quality not meeting State water quality standards, should be identified using the surface waters mapping system from the State's water quality standards, and also, identifying specific designated uses, applicable standards, and any Fish Consumption Warnings or Advisories for these waters. Then, these data should be analyzed for potential impacts on or from this project. The existence of any Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDLs) studies in any of the receiving waters should be identified and effects of these allocations on project engineering assessed. The project's impacts on storm water drainage to the Everglades and/or on the drainages across or off-shore of public beaches are also in need of discussion.	The analysis and evaluations described in the comment are Tier 2 level analysis that will be addressed in greater detail in the individual project sectional NEPA studies. However, we have expanded the water quality portion of Section 3.10.2 and Section 8.1.1 to include FDOT "Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction" and the use of Best Management Practices to control water quality impacts resulting from erosion and sedimentation. In addition Section 3.14 has been added which includes a section on cumulative impacts to water quality.
AC23	Water Quality	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #17	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The specific measures and requirements of the local and Florida State Codes on stormwater and surface drainage management should be identified and listed along with a commitment that these will be specifically followed in each of the segmental projects. Modeling of impacts of the project's direct and indirect effects on water quality is likely to be necessary to identify any projected issues with the impacts of stormwater drainage on the specific receiving waters for each segment of the project, possibly in Tier 2. These potential effects must be estimated or quantified and discussed in the PDEIS to allow for early planning and for approval and implementation of any additional BMPs needed to assure existing water quality is preserved or improved. The potential for dividing existing watersheds, rerouting current drainages, or, causing scour or hardening of exiting river, creek or stream bottoms must also be discussed.	The FDOT will comply with all state and local measures and requirements on stormwater and surface drainage management. A commitment has been added to Chapter 8.0, Commitments and Recommendations, to identify all local, state, and federal permits required (commitment 12). Specific information such as whether or not the proposed action(s) will divide watersheds will be assessed and documented in Tier 2 sectional NEPA studies.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC24	Water Quality	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #18	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		In each discussion of "Permits Needed by the project or segmental projects, the need for a Clean Water Act, Section 401 Water Quality Certification needs to be listed.	In response to this comment, Sections 3.10, Natural Resources, 3.10.2, Environmental Consequences have been revised. In addition, a commitment has been added to 8.1.1, Commitments; that the study will identify local, state and federal permits required, including a determination for a Clean Water Act, Section 401 Water Quality Certification.
AC25	Water Quality	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #19	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The proposed project is located within the boundaries of the Biscayne Aquifer system. Neither the stations, nor the corridor's direct and indirect or cumulative impacts on the local sole source aquifer, the Biscayne Aquifer system, appear to be discussed in an appropriate level of detail. EPA recommends that FTA contact the Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resource Management Office to obtain copies of the local Wellhead Protection Plans (WHPP).	In response to this comment, Section 3.14 has been prepared and added to Chapter 3 to address Indirect and Cumulative Effects (ICE). More detailed analysis of potential impacts to the Biscayne Aquifer will be addressed in Tier 2 sectional NEPA studies when there is sufficient development of the proposed alternatives, station locations and O&M facility locations. See the U.S. EPA Ground Water/Drinking Water Branch letter dated June 6, 2006 (in response to the SFECCTA Advance Notification) located in Appendix E and commitment 12 in Chapter 8.0, Section 8.1.1.
AC26	Environmental Justice	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #20	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		In discussions of potential socio-economic impacts on page 207 and elsewhere, the PDEIS discusses an analysis of Environmental Justice (EJ) issues. However, the analysis of demographics does not seem to be completely presented in the body of the PDEIS. The geographic distribution analyses of both demographics, and of community-related effects, such as, effects on subsidized housing, tax base effects in existing communities and the region as a whole, community bisection and cohesion, are necessary in some appropriate level of detail to complete the required EJ analysis. The issues of neighborhood interaction, community bisection and community cohesion appear to be highly relevant to the small communities of Miami Shores, Village, Wilton Manors, and Oakland Park, among others. Such issues are mentioned in these communities' comment letters and do not appear to have been definitively addressed in the body of the PDEIS.	Additional tables (Tables A.18 - A.23) have been added to Appendix A to support the analysis of EJ issues. Also see Table 5.3 NEPA Evaluation Criteria and Alternatives Analysis Matrix. Community cohesion is discussed in Section 3.1.1, Affected Environment. It is too early in Tier 1 to definitively determine whether communities will be bisected or not, or to what degree current impacts on community cohesion by existing corridors such as FEC Railway, US 1 or I-95 (or potential connecting alignments of railway, roadway or canal/utility alignments) will be exacerbated by new transit service on these corridors. This is due primarily to the fact that the technologies and alignments are not chosen yet. These issues (including cumulative effects or secondary impacts) will be assessed and documented in Tier 2 sectional NEPA studies as part of their EJ analyses and Community Impact Assessments.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC27	Environmental Justice	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #21	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		It does not appear that communities having predominantly minority populations have been specifically identified on the GIS outputs or given in tabular form. This is required for a complete analysis of EJ issues. Specifically, within five miles of the proposed rights-of-way, what disadvantaged populations are to be served by the project; specifically, where are these predominantly EJ populations located; what impacts will the proposed expansions and improvements have on these EJ populations; what disadvantaged populations are not being served; and, what specific impacts will the project have on these areas, including taxation effects; the specific locations of each minority area are needed in the CIS; and, any issues that are potentially due to the project that arise with children's health in any of these areas, should be discussed.	See Section 1.2.4, Social Demands and Economic Development for documentation on minority populations. Also see additional tables A.18-A.23 which supports inclusion of this type of population analysis and evaluation in Tables 5.1 and 5.4. The specifics of this section will be discussed in detail (to the greatest extent possible) within the Tier 2 sectional NEPA studies as part of their EJ analyses and Community Impact Assessments.
AC28	Environmental Justice	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #22	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		It does not appear that "Quality of Life" issues have been inventoried or analyzed for the communities along the transit corridors that will be disrupted by both construction and operation of the new facilities.	Detailed analysis of quality of life issues will take place in Tier 2. However, numerous socio-economic parameters have been inventoried in Table 5.4, Census Data and Alternative Analysis Matrix (Chapter 5). Table A.20, Evaluation Criteria and Alternative Analysis Matrix for Socio-Economic Services has been added to Appendix A to support the analysis matrix.
AC29	Contamination	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #23	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The locations provided of potentially contaminated sites do not include categories for: sources of air emissions in the AIRS tracking system, of water discharges tracked in the Permit Compliance System (PCS), of facilities in the Facility Registration System (FRS), of water supply sources registered under the Safe Drinking Water Act, nor, of any local nuclear materials storage or utilization sites. Other potential environmental hazards areas such as faults, karst, sinkholes, aquifer recharge areas, risky characteristics of soils, and subsidence zones are not discussed at all. All of these data are available in Federal GIS files or databases.	The databases listed in the comment were searched as part of an environmental risk management report completed by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (see Appendix J for the complete list of databases searched by EDR). The full report is available upon request. See the U.S. EPA Ground Water/Drinking Water Branch letter dated June 6, 2006 (in response to the SFECCTA Advance Notification) located in Appendix E. In response to the comment concerning potential environmental hazards, Section 3.11, Contamination and Hazardous Materials has been revised. These features will be identified and analyzed, where applicable, in Tier 2 sectional NEPA studies
AC30	Environmental Analysis Matrix	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #24	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The discussions of and the data presented on the table titled "Environmental (NEPA) Analysis Summary," do not include any explanations of the scoring methods utilized, nor does it seem to include a complete scoring for all relevant areas of potential impacts to natural and man-made environmental resources, resource by resource and impact by impact.	Additional tables (Tables A.18 - A.23) have been added to Appendix A to support the scoring shown on Table 5.1, NEPA Evaluation Criteria and Alternatives Analysis Matrix and an explanation of how the evaluation criteria was scored has been added to Section 5.1.1. (see also Tables 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4).

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCATA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC31	Section 4(f)	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #25	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		There does not appear to be any analysis of potential Section 4(f) or 6(f) effects for the corridor, nor, any integrated analysis of impacts on all publicly managed lands included in Section 5.1.2 of the PDEIS.	In response to this and other EPA comments, an indirect and cumulative effects (ICE) section has been added to Chapter 3 which includes a broad evaluation of potential ICE to parks and publicly managed lands along the project corridor. In addition, Section 3.6, Parklands and Recreation Areas, discusses potential impacts to these resources. Additional tables (Tables A.18 - A.23) have been added to Appendix A to support the summary assessment included in Chapter 3 and the alternatives analysis in Chapter 5. More detailed analysis of potential Section 4(f) or 6(f) effects and/or impacts on all publicly managed lands will be conducted in Tier 2 NEPA sectional studies.
AC32	Public Land	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #26	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		It does not appear that all of the nearby areas of publicly managed lands have been included in the analyses of impacts to the affected environment; especially those nearby and/or contiguous areas identified in the maps and GIS files provided by Palm Beach County in their comment letter.	Table A.14 found in Appendix A identifies the Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) managed lands found within a 1.0 mile buffer of the project corridor. These conservation lands were part of a large dataset that comprised the biological and natural resources criteria of Table 5.3, NEPA Evaluation Criteria and Alternatives Analysis Matrix. These datasets did not automatically identify anticipated impacts, or the degree of impacts to individual resources, nor did they identify the quality or value of the resources shown. The presence or absence of a resource was used as a proxy for determining potential impacts to the resources located in proximity to each of the alternative alignments. These buffer analyses were therefore used strictly for comparison purposes between alternative alignments. However, detailed analysis of impacts to publicly managed lands will be conducted in Tier 2.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC33	Direct/Indirect Effects	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #27	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		In general the identification, comparisons, and discussions of indirect, or secondary, and cumulative effects (ICE) are inadequate.	In response to this and other EPA comments, Section 6.4 has been removed and a separate Indirect and Cumulative Effects (ICE) section has been prepared and added to Chapter 3. This new section broadly quantifies (consistent with the tiered process) the potential impacts to social, cultural and natural resources as a result of new construction for each of the proposed alignments (FEC, I-95, US-1) and station areas. Estimates of area (acres), number of sites and/or ranges of the natural resources involved have been provided to more readily assess the degree of regional impacts. More detailed indirect and cumulative effects will be assessed in Tier 2 when specific projects/alternatives are analyzed.
AC34	Crossings	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #28	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		Again on page 207, interruptions of local traffic by at-grade crossings are discussed. But, there appears to be no discussion of grade or grade-separated rail crossings for pedestrians, bike, and or recreational trails. What disruptions of current pedestrian, bike and recreational trails are planned? Will all of these crossings be ADA compliant?	Sections 4.1.1, Traffic Conditions and Impacts (Regional and Neighborhood) and 5.2, Comparative Benefits and Environmental Effects have been revised to include potential impacts to vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle traffic at transit-highway grade crossings. Interruptions or disruptions to local traffic including, bikes, pedestrians and recreational trails, will be addressed in greater detail during Tier 2 studies. All crossings will be ADA compliant.
AC35	Demographics	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #29	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		There appears to be no identification or discussion of the study area's population of the numbers and distribution of disabled, transportation users. Review of compliance with neither the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) nor the Civil Rights Act can be completed without these data. These policies, guidance, and procedures are available from sources listed on FDOT's "Secondary & Cumulative Impacts Task Work Group Resource Links."	The density of disabled populations (density per acre) within the project study area are shown in Figure J.12, Disabled Population Density per Acre (2000) found in Appendix J.
AC36	GIS	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #30	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		Appendix A contents were vivid and useful GIS-based maps of the project area.	Comment noted.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC37	Advanced Notification	Letter (12-6-06) EPA comment #31	Heinz J. Mueller Chief NEPA Program Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		Overall, it does not appear that all of the issues and questions addressed in the FDOT's Advanced Notification (AN), dated January 2006, have been sufficiently or completely addressed in the PDEIS, some but not at all have been included to some degree. An item-by-item analysis of the data required to address each comment or question is recommended to establish a complete Administrative Record of Decision and meet the NEPA burden of proof. For example, the data on Table 16, as compared to Table 15, on page 40 of the AN, have been neglected in the PDEIS. This seems to be highly relevant to impact analyses for the project's indirect effects. Since the AN'S issues and questions are in the administrative record, the issues raised by these comments must also be discussed in the PDEIS	Pursuant to FTA guidance, this Tier 1 document was developed for ease of public understanding consistent with a programmatic regional assessment. Technical support documentation remains available on the project website. A new AN summary tech memo was developed in response to FTA guidance and posted on the website. Tables 15 and 16 of the AN are included as Tables 3.2, SFECCTA Percent Existing Land Use and 3.4, SFECCTA Future Land Use in Chapter 3.
AC38	Document Rating	Email (2-20-07) Comment #1	Ntale Kajumba NEPA Program Office Office of Policy and Management U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		Overall, many responses are general in nature, and/or relegated to the Tier 2 document. Some modifications were made that we will review during the FPEIS. However, based on the information in the DPEIS and additional info provided, there is still the potential for substantive environmental and societal impacts associated with the proposed project. While EPA supports transit projects in general, we are unable to modify the DPEIS rating. With refinements as the project progresses, we expect the potential for substantive environmental and societal impacts to reduce.	Significant progress has been made to further enhance the content of the FPEIS. Additional refinements and analyses have been incorporated into the FPEIS to reflect environmental and societal impacts.
AC39	Purpose & Need	Email (2-20-07) Comment #2	Ntale Kajumba NEPA Program Office Office of Policy and Management U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		According to applicable policy, guidance, and regulations, the project's purpose and need should contain substantiation of the needs for the project, as well as, the project goals and objectives, using text summaries and including graphics to represent and visualize complex data from the technical reports that have been incorporated by reference. These measures have not been fully included in the DPEIS.	The project purpose and need will substantiate the need for the project under all the categories outlined in the PD&E Manual. This section has a significant amount of maps and charts to graphically present the case.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC40	Indirect and Cumulative Impacts	Email (2-20-07) Comment #3	Ntale Kajumba NEPA Program Office Office of Policy and Management U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The indirect and cumulative effects of the project and other planned transportation projects in the project area, have not been fully identified and discussed, the technical reports on both tiering and scoping contain several commitments to analyze indirect and cumulative effects during Tier I.	In response to this and other EPA comments, Section 6.4 has been removed and a separate Indirect and Cumulative Effects (ICE) section has been prepared and added to Chapter 3. This new section broadly quantifies (consistent with the tiered process) the potential impacts to social, cultural and natural resources as a result of new construction for each of the proposed alignments (FEC, I-95, US-1) and station areas. Estimates of area (acres), number of sites and/or ranges of the natural resources involved have been provided to more readily assess the degree of regional impacts. More detailed indirect and cumulative effects will be assessed in Tier 2 when specific projects/alternatives are analyzed.
AC41	Alternatives Analysis	Email (2-20-07) Comment #4	Ntale Kajumba NEPA Program Office Office of Policy and Management U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		It appears that some alternatives have been eliminated from further consideration without reference to complete information on their potential environmental impacts; since the DPEIS is incomplete in regard to many potential impacts, this may not allow identification of the environmentally preferred alternative.	The document has included additional information on the environmental screening conducted in Tier 1, which allowed a proper fatal flaw analysis of the alternatives in relation to environmental impacts. Based on the Tier 1 environmental screening, only those build alternatives that were clearly inferior from both an environmental and engineering perspective were eliminated from further study. During Tier 2 a specific environmentally preferable alternative will be identified and evaluated as part of the review and decision-making process.
AC42	Visualization	Email (2-20-07) Comment #5	Ntale Kajumba NEPA Program Office Office of Policy and Management U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The DPEIS has not used any visualization techniques other than maps to present complex data, rather much of these data on relevant issues have been left out all together to make the DPEIS more readable; In doing so, the DPEIS becomes an incomplete decision document that does not fully inform either the public reviewers or the decision maker.	<p>Comment noted and incorporated into FPEIS in Chapter 7, Public Comment and Agency Coordination, as an entirely new 2-Page summary treatment of visualization techniques utilized in the public involvement program (PIP), including agency coordination. See Section 7.3.8, Visualization Techniques for Decision Makers, Agencies and the General Public. As a Tier 1 Programmatic EIS, this document was intended to be readable for both public and other decision makers, for instance by appending the bulk of the GIS data inventoried in Tier 1 as tables and maps.</p> <p>It is important to note that the referenced maps were only a representation of the work done via GIS which cannot be readily presented without maps and tables, especially in regards to the results of the GIS analyses of the extensive geodatabase inventory utilizing buffer analysis screening out alternatives. However, the more technical aspects of all the methodologies, analyses, and results are summarized and referenced in ancillary technical memoranda and reports. All such referenced materials have been made readily available to all decision makers, public and agency alike, via the project website document download page or by request for hard copies.</p>

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC43	Visualization	Email (2-20-07) Comment #6	Ntale Kajumba NEPA Program Office Office of Policy and Management U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		Several of the maps contained in the DPEIS are presented at too large a scale, and are too busy with data to be read at the scale of individual impacts; e.g., overlapping attribute data obscures any meaning at the level of individual impact areas.	FTA had similar concerns and was the agency that recommended these maps be included in an Appendix in this uniform scale rather than reworked extensively to various scales. The determination was that creating a wide variety of custom scales for so many varied maps is confusing to most readers and would still not result in decision makers being able to recreate the GIS analyses that these exhibits intend to represent, as explained in response to Comment AC 42 above. Therefore, we have kept the maps in consistent scales, although we have added supplemental materials in Appendix J for the FPEIS in order to better represent the analyses and basis for environmental screening of the alternatives in Tier 1.
AC44	SAFETEA-LU	Email (2-20-07) Comment #7	Ntale Kajumba NEPA Program Office Office of Policy and Management U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		The DPEIS does not consider or present much at all on measures for avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation of adverse effects, much less system-wide, large-scale or ecosystem-level mitigation opportunities. As such, it does not fully meet the requirements of either 40 CFR Part 1500 regulations or the FHWA / FTA NEPA regulations at 23 CFR Parts 771, 772, and 777 and / or SAFETEA-LU Sections 6001 and 6002.	In response to the EPA comment we have incorporated treatment of avoidance, minimization and mitigation appropriate to Tier 1 into the FPEIS, Chapter 3, as the entirely new Section 3.13. This includes extensive text (over 3 pages) in Section 3.13.1, Avoidance and Minimization of Adverse Direct Effects as well as Sub-Section 3.13.2, Mitigation of Adverse Direct Effects. See also the 4-page Table 3.13 (summarizing direct effects and mitigation strategies that will continue to be studied in Tier 2) that has been developed as a result of EPA comments and included in Chapter 3.
AC45	Mitigation	Email (2-20-07) Comment #8	Ntale Kajumba NEPA Program Office Office of Policy and Management U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		It does not appear that congestion mitigation opportunities and expected results from improved transit opportunities have been analyzed.	The opportunities for congestion mitigation were identified in Section 1.2.1 of the Purpose and Need where the project would alleviate system wide traffic congestion and address travel time and speeds for the movement of people in the study area. Section 4.2.2. Ridership results confirm that the project would alleviate traffic congestion with increased transit share opportunities in the study area. In response to this EPA comment and other comments we have also incorporated new text into the FPEIS addressing potential mitigation for effects of congestion as part of the entirely new Sub-Section in Chapter 3 entitled Section 3.14, Indirect and Cumulative Effects (ICE) Assessment. The Air Quality paragraphs of Section 3.14.1, Indirect Effects, include the following “The proposed project has the potential to have both adverse and beneficial indirect impacts on local and regional air quality. Local air quality may be indirectly affected from traffic congestion during crossing block times ... These potential localized effects to air quality along both alignments as a result of traffic congestion may be mitigated through synchronization of traffic control signals. Furthermore, detailed air quality analysis will be conducted during

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
						<p>Tier 2 studies ... to determine the <i>net</i> change in emissions (increase or decrease) throughout the Tri-County area as a result of the proposed project.”</p> <p>Furthermore, the text on Air Quality in Section 3.14.2, Cumulative Effects, includes “At the program-level (Tier 1), mitigation strategies to address localized impacts could include increasing emission controls from power plants that supply power for electric transit service (if applicable), designing the system to be energy efficient, use of state-of-the-art equipment; promoting increased use of public transit, alternative fueled vehicles, and parking for carpools, bicycles, and other alternative transportation methods; alleviation of traffic congestion around passenger station areas; and minimizing construction air emissions.”</p>
AC46	Noise	Email (2-20-07) Comment #9	Ntale Kajumba NEPA Program Office Office of Policy and Management U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		In the first paragraph on page 148 of the DPEIS, there is an error in presenting the expected noise level of average rail transit systems at 20 dBA. The following graph Figure 3.3 shows that the expected level is in fact approximately 65 – 98 dBA. Noise abatement techniques are not discussed, these are quite adequately presented in the new FTA Noise Manual and should be summarized from this document into the text of the DPEIS.	<p>The perceived error is construed from the fact that the sentence is written to illustrate that transit is typically around 20 dBA quieter than freight trains. This has been corrected by simplifying the sentence to read “It is important to note that rail transit is typically about 20 dBA quieter than freight trains with single diesel engines.” This change has now been incorporated into the FPEIS on page 170, still in the same location (Section 3.8 Noise and Vibration, subsection 3.8.1 Affected Environment).</p> <p>Abatement techniques discussed include train horn noise restrictions (e.g. “whistle bans” or quiet zones) on the same page as above and on the following pages. Furthermore, in subsection 3.8.2 Environmental Consequences (for Noise and Vibration) we reference how “the GIS methodology employed was a screening procedure that followed the FTA <i>Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment</i>, Report No. FTA-VA-90-1003-06 (May 2006, Harris Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc.)”. In that same paragraph we provided the website link for the readers’ reference, followed in the next paragraph by the statement “More detailed noise studies following the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration guidance will be conducted as appropriate in Tier 2 sectional studies.”</p> <p>Finally, the FPEIS has added extensive mitigation text in Section 3.13 “Summary of Measures for Avoidance and Minimization and Mitigation of Adverse Direct Effects”, including Table 3.13 which summarizes the ranges of potential impacts to the social and natural environment as well as potential mitigation strategies. These strategies will serve as the basis for developing mitigation plans in Tier 2 NEPA studies. Potential strategies to be assessed</p>

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
						<p>in Tier 2, based upon the FTA guidance, are outlined in Table 3.13: <u>Transit vehicle (Bus or Rail), freight rail, or associated roadway noise</u>: Based upon incrementally more detailed noise analyses, the following measures may be found reasonable/ feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Construct sound barrier walls (path mitigation) ➤ Acquire buffer zones (path mitigation) ➤ Ballast on at-grade or guideways (path mitigation) ➤ Provide enhanced building insulation (receiver mitigation) ➤ Equipment modifications (source mitigation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ resilient or damped wheels ▪ vehicle skirts ▪ undercar absorption treatment ▪ turn radii greater than 1000 feet (rail) ▪ engine compartment treatments (buses) <p><u>Transit horn noise</u>: Implement a program of transitway-highway grade crossing closure/consolidation and/or overpass studies that may also be implemented beginning with Tier 1 and continued if not accelerated in Tier 2 in order to address concerns of safety, quality of life in SFECCTA communities, as well as passenger and freight rail service. This program will incorporate USDOT (i.e., FTA, FHWA and FRA) guidelines and/or promote local governments to implement the FDOT Quiet Zone application approach for communities.</p> <p><u>Transit vehicle (Bus or Rail), freight rail, or associated roadway ground-borne noise/vibration</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Increase mass of support/foundations (source mitigation) ➤ Enhance design of ballast pads/mats (source mitigation) ➤ Construct deep trenches (open or filled) parallel to tracks (source mitigation) ➤ Locate turnouts and crossovers at non sensitive areas ➤ Acquire buffer zones (path mitigation)
AC47	Comments and Concerns	Email (2-20-07) Comment #10	Ntale Kajumba NEPA Program Office Office of Policy and Management U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960		There are many questions and conditions of approval and/or permitting raised by the responses from the cooperating agencies to the Advanced Notification and on the Planning screens of the ETDM. It does not appear that many of these comments and concerns have been completely addressed in the DPEIS. The questions, concerns and conditions should have specific, written responses and be tracked as commitments. Also the DPEIS does not present a complete responsiveness summary to all the comments received during scoping, advance notification, planning review on EDTM, and the review of the DPEIS. These responses should be tracked as project commitments.	<p>All responses to agency comments regarding the Advance Notification (AN) are included in the AN Tech Memo as directed by FTA specifically for the AN responses. FTA provided similar guidance in general for other technical matters for which summary reports and Tech Memos could be included by summarizing and referencing in the document while making them readily available to the public. The intent was creation of a Tier 1 <i>Programmatic</i> EIS, allowing circulation of a rather more readable, streamlined environmental document.</p> <p>Moreover, all responses to comments on the project or the Draft Programmatic EIS received from input to the comment form that was posted on the project website, via email, or through verbal or written comments at the Public Hearing venues are</p>

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
						comprehensively included in this Table (J.2). FTA did not direct that all comments at the scoping stage be addressed herein, since the ETDM Programming Summary Report addressed the ETAT comments and summarized the effects based upon input from the project team.
AC48	General	Letter (12-8-06)	Miles M. Croom Assistant Regional Administrator National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office 263 13th Avenue South St. Petersburg, Florida 33701-5511		FDOT has eliminated alternatives that would have required construction of a new crossing of the Loxahatchee River. This modification will reduce impacts to NOAA trust resources and is supported by NMFS.	Comment noted.
AC49	EFH/Biological Assessment	Letter (12-8-06)	Miles M. Croom Assistant Regional Administrator National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office 263 13th Avenue South St. Petersburg, Florida 33701-5511		To ensure conservation and avoidance measures are implemented, NMFS recommends that an EFH assessment be provided for this project. Since federally listed species may be present in the project area and the proposed railway and related construction may impact these species, a biological assessment/evaluation (BA/BE) for federally-listed species may be needed once the lead federal action agency is determined.	Detailed assessments, such as an EFH Assessment, will be completed as applicable in each Tier 2 sectional NEPA study. The crossing of Biscayne Bay may be included in future Tier 2 studies. However, Tier 1 studies recommend following the main FEC Railway corridor from Government Center north from Miami's CBD and not into the Port of Miami (or the other two ports in the study area). The option to provide additional service into the Ports will not be determined until Tier 2 studies. EFH would be evaluated and assessed for each and every applicable waterway involvement.
AC50	Wetlands	Letter (12-8-06)	Miles M. Croom Assistant Regional Administrator National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office 263 13th Avenue South St. Petersburg, Florida 33701-5511		Adverse impacts to wetlands should be sequentially avoided and/or minimized, and unavoidable impacts should be offset in a manner that precludes a net loss of wetlands and associated functions. A habitat characterization of the wetlands within the project corridor, including the size and location of wetlands that would be directly impacted by the proposed project. A mitigation plan to fully compensate for unavoidable impacts to wetland communities that would be degraded or permanently eliminated by the proposed project.	Detailed avoidance and minimization measures will be developed during Tier 2. Where wetlands impacts are unavoidable, a mitigation plan will developed to fully compensate for those impacts. NWI areas were assessed at a regional level for Tier 1.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC51	Bridge Crossing	Letter (12-8-06)	Miles M. Croom Assistant Regional Administrator National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office 263 13th Avenue South St. Petersburg, Florida 33701-5511		Complete list of stream, canal, and river crossing that includes latitude and longitude coordinates and details of the construction activities and bridge designs.	All stream, canal, and river crossings were identified through the use of GIS (see Chapter 3) and alternatives were broadly analyzed based on potential impacts to these resources on a regional level. Detailed analysis will be conducted in Tier 2.
AC52	Construction	Letter (12-8-06)	Miles M. Croom Assistant Regional Administrator National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office 263 13th Avenue South St. Petersburg, Florida 33701-5511		Conservation and protective measures (i.e., best management practices for water quality and erosion control) should be included in the project design and description, and implemented during construction activities. A stormwater management plan should be developed and implemented to ensure that the additional surface and stormwater runoff from the new impervious surface will be properly treated and disposed of in accordance with state and federal (NPDES) standards.	Section 3.12.3 identifies the use of the FDOT <i>Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction</i> and the implementation of best management practices to avoid and/or control impacts to water quality during construction activities. All stormwater plans will be developed in accordance with the NPDES permit requirements. Furthermore, these issues will continue to be assessed and addressed in Tier 2 analyses.
AC53	Coordination	Letter (12-8-06)	Miles M. Croom Assistant Regional Administrator National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office 263 13th Avenue South St. Petersburg, Florida 33701-5511		Timely coordination between NMFS and FDOT staff should continue through project planning and until environmental issues are fully addressed.	Comment noted. Chapter 3 of the FPEIS asserts the FDOT commitment to continuing coordination efforts with the NMFS throughout the duration of the project, including subsection 3.9.2 wherein it is stated that "Close coordination with ETAT agencies will continue throughout Tier 1 and Tier 2 of the project to further avoid impacts to these resources."
AC54	ETDM	Letter (12-8-06)	Miles M. Croom Assistant Regional Administrator National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office 263 13th Avenue South St. Petersburg, Florida 33701-5511		Through the ETDM process NMFS recommended several information needs and provisions to be addressed as the project progresses towards implementation.	Chapter 3 of the FPEIS confirms and addresses the various comments received from the NMFS through the ETDM process. Coordination with NMFS will continue throughout both tiers of the study and through ETDM (see comment above).

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC55	Historical Resources	Letter (11-9-06) Addressed to FDOT (Ann Broadwell)	Frederick P. Gaske State Historic Preservation Officer Florida Department of State Division of Historical Resources 500 S. Bronough Street Tallahassee, FL 32399		The background research and reconnaissance survey resulted in the identification of 58 significant historic districts, 277 significant historic individual resources, 10 significant archaeological sites, and one archaeological resource group. It is our understanding that once individual segment projects are selected, a comprehensive cultural resource assessment survey (CRAS) will be conducted. The DPEIS identified up to 30 freight trains that may require re-routing. As the project progresses, additional areas of potential effect related to the re-routing may need to be included in the CRAS.	Comment noted. A more detailed CRAS will be conducted, as stated in Section 3.4.2, Environmental Consequences, for each Tier 2 sectional NEPA study and may include additional areas of potential effect for freight train re-routing if applicable.
AC56	Historical Resources	Letter (11-9-06) Addressed to Florida SCH (Lauren Milligan)	Frederick P. Gaske State Historic Preservation Officer Florida Department of State Division of Historical Resources 500 S. Bronough Street Tallahassee, FL 32399		To accommodate this potential rerouting, three possible scenarios are identified: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Status quo where the current freight operations are preserved 2. South Florida Rail Corridor (SFRC) Freight Spine where all FEC operations are rerouted to the SFRC 3. Western Freight Bypass where all operations of the FEC and CSXT are rerouted to new rail line on the eastern edge of the Everglades Any rerouting of the freight lines as expressed through scenarios 2 and 3 would require new connections and infrastructure improvements as well as right-of-way acquisition for the bypass alternative. Our office requests additional information regarding how cultural resources will be addressed in this portion of the project and recommends that the final PEIS include provisions related to cultural resources and the potential rerouting of the freight trains.	Should any freight rerouting occur as a result of this project, the effects on cultural resources will either be assessed as part of Tier 2 NEPA studies for independent SFECCTA sections or as part of separate NEPA studies undertaken as part of the SFECCTA Tiered NEPA Analysis. This has been incorporated into the FPEIS as Commitment 16 in Chapter 8, Commitments and Recommendations.
AC57	Contamination	State Clearinghouse Letter (11-30-06)	Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP)		The FDEP notes that there are many sites of confirmed and potential contamination located in the project area. Each site should be identified, characterized and mapped for latter use.	Comment noted. However, in accordance with the tiered NEPA process followed for this study, the Tier 1 FPEIS provides a broad listing of potentially contaminated sites, by categories, summarizing the quantity of sites first in the general study area and then along alternative alignments utilizing data collected from publicly available GIS layers. The first listing corresponds to the 2-mile wide study area quantities reported in the AN and the ETDM screening as well as the Affected Environment (Appendix A for instance). Then a refined GIS buffer analysis (per alignment) for the environmental screening of alternatives was conducted (see Chapter 5 and new materials in Appendix J, such as the Wellfield map series) More detailed assessments of contaminated sites will be conducted in Tier 2 for all alternatives, including specific identities, characterizations (i.e., risk ratings) and mapping, in accordance with FDOT guidelines up to and including Contamination Screening Evaluation Reports (CSERs) for sectional Tier 2 EIS studies.
AC58	Natural Resources	State Clearinghouse Letter (11-30-06)	Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP)		More detailed information is needed to ascertain the actual direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the proposal on several state parks, aquatic preserves, and a wild and scenic river identified along the project corridor.	As described in the response to the comment above, the Tiered NEPA study approach is utilized in this Tiered document for a broad, regional perspective to this issue. Chapter 3 of the FPEIS broadly identifies the potential for involvement with these and other resources, including direct, indirect and cumulative effects (see Table 3.13 in Section 3.13, and especially, Section 3.14, with Table 3.17). More detailed information on actual impacts to these

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
						resources will be provided in Tier 2 analysis for specific alternatives by section, particularly in the Tier 2 EIS studies.
AC59	Permitting	State Clearinghouse Letter (11-30-06)	South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD)		This project will most likely require an Environmental Resource Permit and may require a water use permit if dewatering activities are proposed. The FDOT is advised to schedule a pre-application meeting with SFWMD permitting staff prior to submittal of any permit applications and prior to the completion of final project design.	Comment noted. Section 3.10.2 identifies the need to coordinate with local and state agencies, including the SFWMD, with regards to water quality issues and permits. In addition, Chapter 8, Section 8.1, includes Commitment 12 to "Identify local, state and federal permits required including a determination for a Clean Water Act, Section 401 Water Quality Certification."
AC60	Air Quality	State Clearinghouse Letter (11-30-06)	Florida Department of Environmental Protection Southeast District Air Program		We support the Tier 1 analysis and commitment to providing transit and pedestrian/bicycle facilities within the South Florida East Coast Corridor. Additional information will be needed regarding potential increase in localized air pollution resulting from additional traffic congestion at the 200 plus crossings, any major parking facilities that may be generated by this project and on the air emissions from the proposed transit vehicles. It is recommended the consultant, during tier 2 analysis, meet with the three local air programs.	Agreed. Further analysis regarding these issues will be provided in Tier 2.
AC61	Air Quality	State Clearinghouse Letter (11-30-06)	Florida Department of Environmental Protection Southeast District Air Program		If the project moves on to development, during site preparation and construction fugitive dust control measures will need to be consistent with all relevant DEP and local air program requirements. It is recommended that construction equipment employ clean burning diesel technology and/or alternative fuels to help reduce air pollution. In addition, any demolition site preparation activities will require that a notice be sent to the appropriate local air program as required by the National Emission Standards for Asbestos, 40 CFR Part 61, Subpart M.	Comment noted. Section 3.12.3 identifies the FDOT commitment to mitigate construction related impacts, including air quality, in accordance with their <i>Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction</i> and best managed practices. See also Chapter 8, commitment #13.
AC62	Air Quality	State Clearinghouse Letter (11-30-06)	Florida Department of Environmental Protection Southeast District Air Program		The positive completion of this project, including the pedestrian/bicycle facility, is of utmost importance in mitigating future increases in automobile travel and its contribution to air pollution. The Tier 1 commitment to pedestrian and/or bicycling facilities including bike storage and vehicle carrying capacity is to be commended. The potential for passenger service and a safe bike route from Jupiter to Miami is a rare opportunity to enhance our transportation network that should be explored to its fullest.	Comment noted.
AC63	General	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		Overall the DPEIS document is well organized and does a solid job of documenting the study. The maps and graphics are especially helpful.	Comment noted.
AC64	General	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		SFRTA would like to see coordination among the three projects proposed to move forward as part of the Tier 2 effort.	Comment noted. As stated in the FPEIS at conclusion of Section 3.1.2, "It is anticipated that the Tier 2 sectional studies may each require a Coordination Plan as part of the overall study Public Involvement Plan that complies with the SAFETEA-LU ... The Coordination Plan is intended to guide the project team through the agency and public coordination activities, unless it is determined

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
						<p>that the FDOT Public Involvement Plan and ETDM process sufficiently comply with this provision of SAFETEA-LU.” Coordination is also explicitly outlined to continue from that in Tier 1 into Tier 2, as in Section 7.2 Federal, State, and Local Agency Coordination, Sub-section 7.2.1 Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM).</p> <p>Furthermore, Commitment 4 in Chapter 8 reads “Establish logical limits and relative priorities (as approved by all relevant agencies and stakeholders) for further individual studies that address inter-section travel issues and coordination as well as overarching corridor issues such as consistency of technologies and station needs (see Section 6.2.2 and Section 6.2.4, “Agreement on Further Study in Tier 2)”. The FPEIS outlines numerous other coordination efforts for both Tier 1 and Tier 2, including the following directly related to this SFRTA comment (Summary Section S.4) “South East Florida Corridor Section: Extending the entire length of the corridor and overlaying the South, Middle and North Corridor Sections; this “section” addresses inter-section travel issues and coordination, as well as overarching corridor issues common to all sections (e.g., Amtrak and freight operations, design standards, express and premium longer-distance travel markets).”</p>
AC65	Greenway/Bike Paths	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		In all three counties, numerous bicycle/pedestrian path proposals have been developed in the study area, including within the FEC corridor. These bike/pedestrian projects should be mentioned, along with a brief statement of their compatibility with the alternatives still under consideration for ridership, land use, and ROW purposes.	Specific bike/pedestrian projects and their relationships to the various alternatives will be analyzed in Tier 2. However, Section 4.4 has been added to Chapter 4 to summarize general issues and concerns regarding greenways and Rails With Trail (RWT) and includes a brief description of planned greenways in Miami-Dade and Broward Counties.
AC66	General	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		Please make sure that Ft Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport (FLL) expansion plans are incorporated into the study analysis, and that the airport projects do not affect the concepts and rights of way being considered as part of the SFECCTA.	Comment noted. Section 1.2.1 briefly identifies the relationship between expansion plans at FLL and the proposed improvements. However, detailed analysis of how the proposed project may be affected by or affect the expansion plans at FLL will be conducted in Tier 2 when specific alignments and technologies are identified.
AC67	Noise	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		Page 5. Specify when regional rail and light rail alternatives will be analyzed for noise and vibration issues.	Section 3.8 provides a preliminary assessment of noise and vibration issues associated with various means of transit. Detailed noise studies for each alternative will be provided in Tier 2.
AC68	Technology	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		Pages 6-7. It is not made clear whether multiple technologies could be evaluated or implemented within a corridor segment. (for example, could RGR be pursued from Pompano Beach to Ft Lauderdale, and then LRT or RRT from Ft Lauderdale to the south)	As stated in Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2, different potential modes are considered for each service segment. However, BRT, LRT, RGR and RGB are all viable options for consideration along all segments as stated in Chapter 6 – specifically Section 6.2.5 wherein it states “Each LPA will consist of a combination of an alignment and modal technology...”.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
						Combinations of transit technologies found viable for use within the SFECCTA Corridor as a whole, including similar technology combinations provided in this comment by Mr. Quinty, will be evaluated in Tier 2 for each corridor section.
AC69	Ridership	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		Page 20. There should be more information to back up the statement that "Transit demand in the study area is high" considering the overall transit mode share is less than 5%.	The demand for transit within the project corridor was identified by the Southeast Regional Planning Model (SERPM) and validated by a series of on-board surveys. Section 1.2.1 of the FPEIS discusses the results of the model runs as well as the on-board surveys.
AC70	Freight	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		Page 20. Provide more detail on how the project "would provide opportunities for additional freight capacity enhancements to serve growing needs at adjacent seaports and airports." Perhaps there should also be reference to a prior study or figures to support the statement that the "demand for movement of goods via freight is increasing beyond rail capacity". This can also be applied when the freight issue is raised again on Page 40.	The potential to enhance additional freight capacity stems from potential grade crossing improvements and sharing of infrastructure/tracks in some locations. These and other issues regarding freight capacity are discussed in the <i>SFECCTA Summary of Prior Studies</i> available on the project website, as referenced in Section 1.1.3, under continuous, comprehensive and coordinated studies.
AC71	Document	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		Pages 23-24. US-1 lines on the chart are barely visible.	These graphs have been revised.
AC72	Trip Length	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		Page 26. We are encouraged by the trip length findings that an FEC service would serve a different (shorter) travel market than Tri-Rail, providing complimentary, not competitive service.	Comment noted.
AC73	Tri-Rail	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		Page 42. The section on Airport demand does not mention existing Tri-Rail service to MIA and FLL.	This section refers to demand not existing facilities that serve airports.
AC74	Funding	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		Pages 44-45. An update is needed to reflect failure of the November 2006 Broward County ballot initiative for transit funds.	In response to this comment, the text in this section has been amended in.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC75	Right-of-Way	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		Page 139. A map showing the substandard FEC ROW locations or a more detailed description of where this exists would be helpful.	A table and four figures identifying constrained ROW areas have been added to Appendix J.
AC76	Ridership	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		Page 182. The model's projected decline in Tri-Rail ridership caused by the build alternatives (vs., the no-build and TSM alternatives) is explained well. The relationship between the SFECCTA alternatives and the existing Tri-Rail system is critical, and should be monitored even more closely in the detailed Tier 2 analyses.	Comment noted.
AC77	Document	Letter (12-11-06)	Joseph J. Quinty Transportation Planning Manager South Florida Regional Transportation Authority		Page 256. The South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) should be included in the list of "regional organizations" being DPEIS recipients.	The South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) has been added to the list of recipients.
AC78	Station Request	Meeting with Commissioners (11-29-06)	Commissioner Edmonson Miami-Dade County		Why a big gap between 79th street station and 96th street station? I understand why Miami Shores is against the 96th street station since it is all residential. I propose a station at 87th or 90th street. I support east/west connections (circulators) to FEC.	The parameters considered in the initial modeling process to identify suitable station locations are described in Section 2.3.4. This preliminary screening however does not preclude from adding or removing station areas as specific choices are made regarding alignments, technology, and service needs. For example, 13 additional station locations/areas will be considered based on public recommendations made during the public hearing. These public recommendations are listed in Table J.2 in Appendix J.
AC79	Station Request	Letter to Scott Seeburger	Susan Gottlieb Mayor City of Aventura Government Center 19200 West Country Club Drive Aventura, FL 33180		Currently a station has been proposed on the west side of Biscayne Boulevard at NE 213 Street. The City's preferred location is to the west of the Aventura Hospital between NE 209 Street and NE 213 Street. This location will not only be easily accessible for the City's Shuttle Bus System, but would efficiently service passengers to the Aventura Hospital immediately adjacent, the Aventura Mall approximately 2.8 miles to the south and the Gulfstream Racetrack approximately 1 mile to the north.	The parameters considered in the initial modeling process to identify suitable station locations are described in Section 2.3.4. This preliminary screening however does not preclude from adding or removing station areas as specific choices are made regarding alignments, technology, and service needs. For example, 13 additional station locations/areas will be considered based on public recommendations made during the public hearing. These public recommendations are listed in Table J.2 in Appendix J.
AC80	Natural Resources	Letter (12-5-06)	Richard E. Walesky Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management 2300 North Jog Road West Palm Beach, FL 33411		The Chain of Lakes Aquatic Natural Area, the Leon M. Weekes Environmental Preserve, the Lake Worth Lagoon Aquatic Natural Area, the Lake Park Scrub Natural Area, and Peanut Island should have been included in the list of sites under "Identified Resources and Level of Importance." These sites are located within the one-mile buffer area. The Leon M. Weekes Environmental Preserve is owned jointly by Palm Beach County and the City of Delray Beach, and directly abuts the Florida East Coast Railway. Please include these sites in your review.	Lake Park Scrub Natural Area, Chain of Lakes Aquatic Natural Area, Leon M. Weekes Environmental Preserve, and the Lake Worth Lagoon Aquatic Natural Area have been added to Table A.14, SFECCTA Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) – Land Managed Areas (1.0 mi Buffer) in Appendix A. Peanut Island is listed in Table A.12, SFECCTA County-Owned Parks – Palm Beach County (1.0 mi Buffer) in Appendix A. These areas are found on maps provided by Palm Beach County DERM in Appendix H.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC81	Natural Resources	Letter (12-5-06)	Richard E. Walesky Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management 2300 North Jog Road West Palm Beach, FL 33411		Two preserve areas owned by the City of Boca Raton are not included on the list: Rosemary Ridge Preserve and Gopher Tortoise Trace Preserve. These sites are located adjacent to the FEC Railway just south of the Leon M. Weekes Environmental Preserve. We recommend that you contact the City of Boca Raton for information on these sites.	These two sites have been added to Table A.14, SFECCTA Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) – Land Managed Areas (1.0 mi Buffer).
AC82	Natural Resources	Letter (12-5-06)	Richard E. Walesky Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management 2300 North Jog Road West Palm Beach, FL 33411		Jupiter Beach Park and Carlin Park are not located within the one-mile buffer area and should be deleted from the list. The correct name for the natural area listed as "Jupiter Inlet" is "Jupiter Inlet Natural Area."	Carlin Park has been removed from Table A.14, SFECCTA Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) – Land Managed Areas (1.0 mi Buffer). However, the extreme northwest corner of the Jupiter Beach Park is within the study area and so it shall remain in Table A.14. Jupiter Inlet has been corrected to show Jupiter Inlet Natural Area.
AC83	Airport	Letter (12-5-06)	Richard E. Walesky Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management 2300 North Jog Road West Palm Beach, FL 33411		The correct name for the airport located in Lantana is "Palm Beach County Park Airport" (Figure 0.1).	Figure 0.1, Study Area Location Map has been revised to show Palm Beach County Park Airport.
AC84	Natural Resources	Letter (12-5-06)	Richard E. Walesky Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management 2300 North Jog Road West Palm Beach, FL 33411		Add Palm Beach County to the list of owners of the Jupiter Ridge Natural Area (Table A. 14). Although most of the site is owned by the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund (BTIITF), the County owns several small parcels. Also add the City of Boca Raton and Palm Beach County to the list of owners of the Yamato Scrub Natural Area. Although most of the site is owned by the BTIITF, the City and the County are joint owners of one parcel.	These corrections have been made in Table A.14, SFECCTA Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) – Land Managed Areas (1.0 mi Buffer).
AC85	O&M Facilities	Letter (12-5-06)	Richard E. Walesky Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management 2300 North Jog Road West Palm Beach, FL 33411		Delete Jonathan Dickinson State Park and the Hypoluxo Scrub Natural Area from consideration as Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Facilities H and F, respectively. Both sites contain high-quality native communities and listed species and are not suitable sites for the construction of any transportation-related facilities. The Hypoluxo Scrub Natural Area should be on the Conservation and Recreation shape file and not on the FL Land Management Areas shape file, since this site is owned and managed by Palm Beach County (Table 5.5).	<p>Comment noted. These proposed locations for O&M facilities were based on a <i>preliminary</i>, regional screening approach for Tier 1. Section 3.13 provides a preliminary list of avoidance and minimization measures that will be considered when locating O&M facilities in Tier 2 studies. Some of these measures include the use of disturbed, developed or vacant parcels <u>and</u> locating the facilities away from sensitive areas. These avoidance and minimization measures and the selection of suitable locations for O&M facilities will be developed in greater detail during Tier 2, with consideration to your comments.</p> <p>Table 5.5, Preliminary Evaluation for Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Facilities Alternatives has been revised to reflect that the FNAI data layer indicates "managed conservation areas" within the</p>

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
						State of Florida, some of which are public, others private. Note also that one of the early activities of Tier 2 will include GIS data layer updates and field verification, including feedback to the FGDL and other clearinghouses of the data to communicate errors/updates.
AC86	City Boundaries	Letter (12-5-06)	Richard E. Walesky Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management 2300 North Jog Road West Palm Beach, FL 33411		The boundaries for several municipalities, including the City of Delray Beach, the City of Palm Beach Gardens and the Town of Jupiter, appear to be incorrect on these figures. The current boundaries for municipalities in Palm Beach County that are located adjacent to the FEC Railway are shown on the enclosed figure (Figures A.4 and A.5).	Figures A.4, Municipalities (North-Central Study Area) and A.5, Municipalities (Northern Study Area) have been revised to show the correct municipality boundaries in Palm Beach County.
AC87	Land Use	Letter (12-5-06)	Richard E. Walesky Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management 2300 North Jog Road West Palm Beach, FL 33411		This figure is based on land use data from 1999. The figure should be updated with more current land use data, if possible (Figure A. 11).	The dataset utilized in preparing the SFECCTA was based on the best available information in GIS format, including land use.
AC88	Contamination	Letter (12-5-06)	Richard E. Walesky Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management 2300 North Jog Road West Palm Beach, FL 33411		All of the potential contaminant sources in the study area have not been identified, specifically petroleum-contaminated sites (Figures A.31 - A.33).	Petroleum contaminated sites were identified in an environmental risk management report completed by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (see Appendix J for a complete list of databases searched). The full report is available upon request.
AC89	Community Impacts	Presentation (10-14-06)	Broward Black Elected Officials		Does the study take into account the impacts of development to existing communities or is it limited to just the rail line in terms of where it goes, how much it costs, etc?	Yes these impacts are being considered, and continuing consideration as well as coordination with these communities will take place throughout the study. Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.14 discuss the potential impacts to adjacent communities including the indirect and cumulative impacts of the proposed improvements. More detailed analysis of these impacts will be conducted in Tier 2 as required by NEPA and State laws.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC90	Park & Ride	Presentation (10-14-06)	Broward Black Elected Officials		While building stations would probably be at busy connecting points such as downtown terminals, etc. Wouldn't you still have to have some stations even if not a park and ride along the corridor for people to access the system? And where do you get the land to do it?	The process will be to assess the local development patterns, access needs, and community desires for each station area to assist with decisions regarding station type. Then attempt to work the transit stations in with new adjacent development and redevelopment in order to minimize land acquisition and relocations.
AC91	Affordable Housing	Presentation (10-14-06)	Broward Black Elected Officials		Wouldn't development of the corridor increase the cost of real estate to surrounding areas making it more difficult for there to be affordable housing around such development?	Land values in Southeast Florida are escalating as developers are assembling and clearing land for high density developments. An improved transit system will help to sustain these trends and generally increase values at station areas which will encourage higher densities. Density can be positive for affordable housing in that adequate revenue can be made on the higher-valued units to offset the revenue loss on the lower-valued affordable units.
AC92	Community Impacts	Presentation (10-14-06)	Broward Black Elected Officials		There is also discussion on having rail on Broward Boulevard also in predominately Black neighborhoods. Has the impacts of two rail lines in a community been discussed in conjunction with each other in regard to impacts on the community?	Both the Central Broward Transit study and the FEC study will assess impacts, such as economic and community cohesion, to the African-American community in northwest Ft. Lauderdale. Assessing the cumulative effects of the two projects is a requirement of both state and federal law.
AC93	Funding	Presentation (10-14-06)	Broward Black Elected Officials		Where will the money come; what is the timeline; will each county be asked to contribute to the development; what will be the connections to the CSX and Tri-Rail, etc.	At this point, only State funds have been committed towards further implementation of the project. No local revenue has been made available as of yet other than in Palm Beach County where the MPO has committed \$15 million towards an extension of Tri-Rail from West Palm Beach to Jupiter. Miami-Dade County has allocated funds from the half-cent transit sales tax to other projects. Broward County does not have a dedicated revenue source to expand transit services. Eventually local funds will be required to operate the system that will connect to Tri-rail.
AC94	General	Palm Bch PH	John Reilly City of Boca Raton	S	City of Boca Raton is in favor of a passenger service on the Florida East Coast Railroad.	Comment noted.
AC95	Station Request	Palm Bch PH	John Reilly City of Boca Raton		The City of Boca Raton would like to see a station at an appropriate location within the city, and will work in acquiring or using existing city-owned property for this purpose.	The parameters considered in the initial modeling process to identify suitable station locations are described in Section 2.3.4. This preliminary screening however does not preclude from adding or removing station areas as specific choices are made regarding alignments, technology, and service needs. Thirteen additional station locations/areas will be considered based on public recommendations made during the public hearing. These

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
						public recommendations are listed in Table J.2 in Appendix J.
AC96	Traffic	Palm Bch PH	John Reilly City of Boca Raton		Congestion on the adjacent roadway system is another concern which must be addressed as part of this project.	Section 4.1.1 provides a preliminary assessment of the regional and local traffic conditions and impacts associated with the SFECCTA. More detailed analysis of impacts to traffic, including adjacent roadways, will be conducted in Tier 2.
AC97	East-West	Palm Bch PH	John Reilly City of Boca Raton		A feeder bus system must be in place to provide the necessary connectivity to major businesses, shopping centers and high density residential areas.	East/West connectivity will be further analyzed in Tier 2 for all services including emergency access. This need has already been indicated in the FPEIS, Section 1.2.1 "Transportation Demand", see subheading "Transit Demand". See also Section 7.3.7 "Public Workshop Series 2 (August and October 2006)" wherein "the majority of the attendees were in support of having passenger service along the FEC corridor. The following study-related issues were discussed during the break-out group sessions: ➤ the need for east-west connections and connectivity with Tri-Rail;"
AC98	General	Letter (10-16-06)	Herta Holly Councilwoman Miami Shores Village 10050 N.E. Second Avenue Miami Shores, FL 33138	O	As an elected official of Miami Shores Village, I want to re-emphasize my opposition towards the proposed passenger rail service along the FEC corridor. As I indicated to you, I remain concerned about the environmental impacts on the many single family residential homes that abut the FEC railroad tracks within our community. I also wish to go on record opposing the possibility that a train stop or station may be located in our community. That possibility was recently presented to our Village Council by Mr. Scott Seeburger at a recent Council Meeting. I realize that I may be in the minority in terms of my opposition to this project, however, as a Council Member of this community, I will continue to fight to protect the peace and tranquility that our Village currently enjoys which I believe will be jeopardized should this project come to fruition and the many proposed passenger trains be allowed to transverse the FEC railroad tracks as well as the existing freight trains.	The parameters considered in the initial modeling process to identify suitable station locations are described in Section 2.3.4. This preliminary screening however does not preclude from adding or removing station areas as specific choices are made regarding alignments, technology, and service needs.
AC99	General	State Clearinghouse Letter (11-30-06)	Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council		The study is not in conflict or inconsistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. It furthers regional goal 7.1, a Balanced and Integrated Transportation System.	Comment noted.
AC100	Station Request	Letter (10-16-06)	Tom Benton Village Manager Miami Shores Village 10050 NE Second Avenue Miami Shores, FL 33138		On behalf of Miami Shores Village, I would once again like to go on record indicating that we are opposed to the train station that appeared on your maps at the NE 96 Street location. We respectfully request that the 96 Street stop/station to be completely deleted from the area of study in the future.	The parameters considered in the initial modeling process to identify suitable station locations are described in Section 2.3.4. This preliminary screening however does not preclude from adding or removing station areas as specific choices are made regarding alignments, technology, and service needs.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC101	Technology	Palm Beach MPO Endorsement Meeting (11/16/06)	Delray Beach Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization		Make sure where modes changes there are seamless connections.	As stated in Section 1.3, key among the goals of this project is to coordinate corridor transit investments with established services such as Tri-Rail to contribute to a seamless, integrated multi-modal network (Goal 2).
AC102	Crossing	Palm Beach MPO Endorsement Meeting (11/16/06)	Commissioner Wade Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization		Any additional use of FEC must be precluded by a solution to the crossing at SR 710.	Tier 2 may include studies for transitway-highway grade crossing closures/consolidation and/or grade separations of roadway-transitway crossings. These studies will involve local communities as the studies proceeds. Figure J.2 in Appendix J identifies the existing transitway-highway crossings within the study area.
AC103	Funding	Palm Beach MPO Endorsement Meeting (11/16/06)	Commissioner Koons Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization		How do we score high with FTA and how does FDOT/DCA allow TOD under GMR/TRIP and LOS requirements?	FTA criteria for station suitability can be found on the project website. Variables for scoring, based on these criteria, are included in Chapter 2.
AC104	General	Palm Bch PH	Bill Moss City Commissioner City of West Palm Beach		The City of West Palm Beach, City Commission and the Mayor discussed the project in our commission meeting. And while there was no formal vote taken, there was consensus and unanimous consensus that we support the program of the FEC railroad to include passenger service along the corridor. We think the FEC rail corridor was probably a much better corridor for passenger rail than the CSX one, because the FEC is closer in to the residential areas.	Comment noted
AC105	Noise	Palm Bch PH	Bill Moss City Commissioner City of West Palm Beach		With the double tracking program we ask that there would be a quiet zone program or a four-quadrant gate program at the crossings.	The possibility of quiet zones and safety at crossings will addressed in detail during Tier 2 studies.
AC106	Crossings	Palm Bch PH	Bill Moss City Commissioner City of West Palm Beach		We support the closing of certain aggregate crossings to facilitate the movement of the passenger trains in a more effective manner. When you have double the amount of trains going back and forth, it only makes sense to have as fewer crossings as possible. We will also cooperate with any overpasses that the train, the DOT would like to contemplate. We think Okeechobee Boulevard, of course, should be one that would be considered for an overpass because of the amount of traffic that Okeechobee Boulevard carries on a daily basis as well as the number of train trips that will be going back and forth.	Section 4.1.1 provides a preliminary assessment of the regional and local traffic conditions and impacts associated with transitway-highway crossings within the study area. Detailed grade crossing analysis will be conducted in Tier 2.
AC107	General	Broward PH	Leslop Daley Project Engineer City of Fort Lauderdale Public Works Department	S	Just for the record, the City supports this concept.	Comment noted.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC108	General	Broward PH	Jim Naugle, Mayor City of Fort Lauderdale	S	This is probably the most significant project for the residents of South Florida in the next century I think it is going to be the way we are going to be able to move people here in South Florida absent double decking 1-95.	Comment noted.
AC109	General	Broward PH	Anthony Longo Senior Planner City of Wilton Manors	S	We support this study. We recently passed a resolution encouraging the station in Wilton Manors and supporting this study.	Comment noted.
AC110	Station Request	Broward PH	Anthony Longo Senior Planner City of Wilton Manors		It seems that some of the criteria regarding station suitability that you are using is skewed towards having a CRA or a brown field which we have neither. I'm concerned about the medium to low rank that we have received. I don't know how you would do this but we would like to see our suitability level increased. We really want this station in Wilton Manors and I think we meet and exceed the other criteria that are part of this process.	Comment Noted. The parameters considered in the initial modeling process to identify suitable station locations are described in Section 2.3.4. This preliminary screening however does not preclude from adding or removing station areas as specific choices are made regarding alignments, technology, and service needs. For example, 13 additional station location areas will be considered based on public recommendations made during the public hearing. These public recommendations are listed in Table J.2 in Appendix J.
AC111	General	Letter (6-21-06)	Joseph E. Sanchez Florida Gas Transmission Company 601 S. Lake Destiny Road, Suite 450 Maitland, FL 32751		We would like to attend any pre-construction or design meetings you may hold regarding this project. Please give 48 hours notice to the Coral Springs Team at (941) 341-0100 and the West Palm beach team at (561) 688-9970 prior to any work near FGT's facilities.	Early coordination with all local utility agencies is an integral part of the FDOT PD&E process and will be included in the Tier 2 studies.
AC112	General	Palm Bch PH	Ed Breese Principal Planner City of Boynton Beach Planning & Zoning Department 100 E. Boynton Beach Blvd		The City of Boynton Beach supports this study and ultimate expansion of the role the FEC corridor will have on coastal redevelopment. City initiates already indicate our support of and need for such a service, with zoning provisions for a transit facility in the downtown mixed-use district, with the initiating of a City/CRA trolley service that can provide connector service to the downtown and suburban areas, and by the policy directives included in the Comprehensive Plan, TCEA and redevelopment plans that emphasize transportation planning.	Comment noted.
AC113	Alternatives Analysis	Joint ETAT Workshop on SFECCTA DPEIS (10-30-06)	Alisa Zarbo USACOE 4400 PGA Blvd. Suite 500 Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410		Alternatives analysis needs to show the most practicable alternative and its associated environmental impacts (wetlands and waters of the US). As we find out more information in Tier 2 EIS, the Corps may need to evaluate alternative plans/locations/projects that may have less environmental impacts that would still meet the needs of the specific project. We need enough details in Tier 1 to make a permitting decision with respect to alternatives. We also need to keep some alternatives open from Tier 1 and Tier 2.	The primary goal of the Tier 1 process was to develop sufficient information to select a corridor and general alignment for transit among the three counties. Tier 1 was not intended to identify specific alternatives (i.e. alignment, modal technology and segment). The details necessary to make permitting decisions will be provided in individual Tier 2 studies.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Agency (Federal, State and Local Government) Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
AC114	Project Effects	ETDM Comments on Purpose and Need, Project Effects (11-6-2007)	Alisa Zarbo USACOE 4400 PGA Blvd. Suite 500 Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410		Purpose and Need review "Understood", no comments. "Moderate Effects" review ratings for Alternative 1 on topics of Navigation Effect, Wetlands Effect, Secondary and Cumulative Effects. "Moderate Effects" review ratings for Alternative 2 on topics of Wetlands Effect as well as Secondary and Cumulative Effect "Moderate Effects" review ratings for Alternative 3 on topic of Navigation Effect.	Sections 3.9, 3.12, and 3.14 of the FPEIS identify these resources (wetlands, navigation, and Indirect (Secondary) and Cumulative Effects, or ICE, respectively). These sections broadly discuss the potential impacts associated with the proposed improvements, in particular waterway crossings. Section 3.13 outlines preliminary avoidance and minimization measures that will be considered during forthcoming phases of the SFECCTA. Detailed analysis of potential impacts and specific measures to avoid or minimize impacts to these natural and biological resources will be provided in Tier 2.
AC115	Natural Resources	Joint ETAT Workshop on SFECCTA DPEIS (10-30-06)	Brandon Howard NOAA Fisheries 400 North Congress Ave. Suite 120 West Palm Beach, FL 33401		Expressed that areas of concern will be the proposed crossing of Biscayne Bay and the crossing of the Loxahatchee River. Mentioned that the northern half of Biscayne Bay is critical habitat for Johnson's seagrass. In both locations there is the potential to impact listed species under NMFS purview including swimming sea turtles, smalltooth sawfish and Johnson's seagrass. All crossings over the water will impact Essential Fish Habitat (EFH). The crossing of Biscayne Bay would impact seagrass. If the I-95 corridor is used for the crossing of the Loxahatchee River, seagrass would not be impacted but palustrine wetlands would be which are considered to be EFH. All crossings over water will be reviewed but these two areas will be of particular concern.	Sections 3.9 and 3.10 of the FPEIS identify these resources and broadly discusses the potential impacts associated with the proposed improvements, in particular waterway crossings. Section 3.13 outlines preliminary avoidance and minimization measures that will be considered during forthcoming phases of the SFECCTA. Detailed analysis of potential impacts and specific measures to avoid or minimize impacts to these natural and biological resources will be provided in Tier 2.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Public Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
PC1	General	Letter (10-26-06)	Bunting, David Lantana	O	Mr. Bunting stated he was totally against the FEC Corridor Study and the project that might come from it. He said, "We don't need more construction and more building, we simply do not need it. South Florida is overbuilt already. It is screwed up." He said that he and his thirty family members all oppose what might become a future transportation project (from Kommunikatz letter).	Noted opposition to project.
PC2	Station Request	Letter to Palm Beach County Commission	Chester, Don Associate Administrator St. Mary's Medical Center 901 45th Street West Palm Beach, FL 33407	S	In addition to providing a mass transit alternative for current employees, the proposed railroad line could be used to help St. Mary's recruit nurses and other key health care professionals from Miami-Dade, Broward and the southern reaches of Palm Beach County. It is requested that the FDOT consider 45th Street as a stop in West Palm Beach. In addition to St. Mary's there are numerous other employers including the Palm Beach County Home, Columbia 45th St. Hospital and the Oakwood Center located on this key east-west corridor. St Mary's owns the land east of Greenwood Avenue and adjacent to the FEC existing tracks and right of way.	The parameters considered in the initial modeling process to identify suitable station locations are described in Section 2.3.4. This preliminary screening however does not preclude from adding or removing station areas as specific choices are made regarding alignments, technology, and service needs. For example, 13 additional station locations/areas will be considered based on public recommendations made during the public hearing. These public recommendations are listed in Table J.2 in Appendix J. 45th Street station will be considered.
PC3	Greenway/Bike Paths	Palm Bch PH	Clavijo, Marcella Florida Avenue		I thought that maybe there could be more bicycle lanes, like they have at some universities, such as in Gainesville.	Presently, only Broward and Miami-Dade Counties show bike paths/greenways adjacent to FEC in their LRTP. A regional bike path/greenway adjacent to FEC will be considered in Tier 2. See Section 4.4 for a discussion on bike trails and greenways.
PC4	General	Miami-Dade PH	Crapp, Tony 9304 N. Miami Avenue Miami Shores, FL 33150	S	I am supportive of the expanded potential use of the FEC corridor for increased passenger use.	Comment noted.
PC5	Station Request	Miami-Dade PH	Crapp, Tony 9304 N. Miami Avenue Miami Shores, FL 33150		I would like to see station locations integrated into and coordinated with redevelopment opportunities or be co-located with existing public facilities and residential developments that are transit-oriented.	The parameters considered in the initial modeling process to identify suitable station locations are described in Section 2.3.4. This preliminary screening however does not preclude from adding or removing station areas as specific choices are made regarding alignments, technology, and service needs. For example, 13 additional station locations/areas will be considered based on public recommendations made during the public hearing. These public recommendations are listed in Table J.2 in Appendix J.
PC6	General	Palm Bch PH	Doudna, Marvin 803 Kanuga Dr. West Palm Beach, FL 33401	O	Billions of dollars need not be spent to bring service on the FEC to dozens of coastal downtowns on the 85-mile corridor, or on elaborate, new maintenance facilities, or expensive stations need not be built.	Comment Noted.
PC7	Technology	Website	Dunn, Charles Coral Gables FL 33134		From endpoint to endpoint of the corridor, Miami-Jupiter, it is very important that only one mode of rail should be used, so that it is a one seat trip without change (like Tri Rail is now Miami-WPB).	Design on exact alignments and technologies will be further analyzed in Tier 2.
PC8	Station Request	Meeting with Homeowners Association (11-28-06)	Frenchmen's Creek Homeowners Association		At the Frenchmen's Creek meeting they stated opposition to the Donald Ross Road station. Also opposed to the project extending north of PGA Blvd. If it goes north of PGA Blvd, they would only support a tunnel at Donald Ross Road. They support east/west connections to airport.	The parameters considered in the initial modeling process to identify suitable station locations are described in Section 2.3.4. This preliminary screening however does not preclude from adding or removing station areas as specific choices are made regarding alignments, technology, and service needs. For example, 13 additional station locations/areas will be considered based on public recommendations made during the public hearing. These public

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Public Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
						recommendations are listed in Table J.2 in Appendix J.
PC9	Ridership	Meeting with Homeowners Association (11-28-06)	Frenchmen's Creek Homeowners Association		How much of the 7,000 ridership projected in this section is from WPB to PGA and how much of it is north of PGA Blvd? We would like the estimate of cost for this section broken up as well between these two segments.	Separate Ridership information was provided to the homeowners association. Further detailed analysis of costs and ridership will be provided in Tier 2.
PC10	Funding	Broward PH	Glickman, Dan 153 Farnham Deerfield Beach, FL 33442		I don't see when you talk about the other RGR, which is the DMU, I don't see much significant difference between the capital cost in your chart for the DMU versus the LRT.	At this level of analysis there is not much difference in capital costs between the two. More detailed capital cost analysis will follow in Tier 2.
PC11	Funding	Broward PH	Glickman, Dan 153 Farnham Deerfield Beach, FL 33442		Is it possible to do a TSUB now prior to the second phase so we are in some knowledgeable ballpark by an order of magnitude perhaps such that we know if phase two money might be well spent?	A TSUB will be completed in Tier 2. However, ridership and costs (part of TSUB) were analyzed as part of alternatives evaluation.
PC12	General	Broward PH	Glickman, Dan 153 Farnham Deerfield Beach, FL 33442		I personally feel very good about supporting the tier 2 dollars for the service segment five. I know there is some interest in segment one, but there's a lot of miles and a lot of money. At the moment, I don't see a great advantage in that.	Comment noted.
PC13	Funding	Broward PH	Glickman, Dan 153 Farnham Deerfield Beach, FL 33442		You have a bullet point which talks about the Broward County MPO LRT 2030 update in December 2004 which identified light rail transit and crossing improvements on the FEC corridor from Miami-Dade County to Palm Beach County as a cost feasible project. As I mentioned earlier, I think that is appropriate to qualify because, in truth, what is actually in the 2030 LRT at footnote one indicates it is only 52 percent funded, according to the estimate in 2004, which I estimate as being closer to 30 percent funded. If you think that is reasonable, I would ask for you to change the wording in whatever appropriate fashion you deem possible.	Each county determines cost feasibility for each project in their plan based on various assumptions. This plan and its assumptions were approved by FHWA.
PC14	General	Broward PH	Glickman, Dan 153 Farnham Deerfield Beach, FL 33442		The document states "overall local support for transit expansion with in the study area is evident". Well, it might have been evident until we had the election of the transit tax November 7th where it failed 61 percent to 39 percent. I would ask you to look at that because it gives a wrong indication of what the sentiment might be.	The statement is still correct in terms of a need/demand. However, funding with taxes was what failed. The need is evident as stated in the document. A financial analysis for implementation funding will be part of Tier 2. See response to comment AC64
PC15	General	Broward PH	Glickman, Dan 153 Farnham Deerfield Beach, FL 33442		On page 179, the document sates the trip length most common is 10 to 15 miles. When you go from that, which says comprising almost 15 percent of all trips to which you call the same page, next sentence, the mean trip length and then you say 30.4 miles. I wonder how accurate that is. That is a huge difference between the median and the mean. I ask that you would double-check that.	Text has been changed from median to mode in the FPEIS.
PC16	East-West	Palm Bch PH	Goldenberg, Judith		We have grave concerns with respect to the east/west corridor emergency access for vehicles trying to cross.	Comment noted, and the issue of East/West emergency connectivity will be further analyzed in Tier 2 for all services including emergency access. This has been recognized in Tier 1 and is addressed in the FPEIS, for instance in Table 3.13 under the Potential Mitigation of Adverse Effects under subheading <u>Displacements, Relocations and Community Cohesion</u> : ...provide improvements in local access and connections to transportation facilities...Analyze the need in Tier 2

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Public Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
						studies to grade separate (raise either the roadways crossing the transitway or the transitway itself), or close crossings altogether wherever practical, in order to minimize delays to local street traffic in the street networks adjacent to or crossing the SFECCTA. Each municipality along the SFECCTA alignment will be coordinated with and these issues studied in greater detail in Tier 2 as part of a program of RR crossings evaluations along the SFECCTA."
PC17	General	Palm Bch PH	Hawthorne, Kenneth 22116 Embassy Drive West Palm Beach, Florida	S	I would like to see this go. I think it's important.	Comment noted.
PC18	General	Letter (10-26-06)	McKnight, Irby Chairman Overtown Empowerment Zone Neighborhood Assembly 3050 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 300 Miami, FL 33137	S	As Chairman for the Overtown Empowerment Zone Neighborhood Assembly (OEZNA), dedicated to revitalizing the business and residential corridor of the Overtown Community, I offer this letter in support of the FEC Railroad Commuter Project.	Comment noted.
PC19	Traffic	Website	Kilmer, David A. 12330 Griffing Blvd North Miami, FL 33161		The need for more freight movement closer to the shipping ports (FEC Dixie Hwy Rail Line) will further delay ground traffic; unless, (a) multiple rail lines are built immediately adjacent to the existing rail lines and (b) frequent overhead road and foot crossover points are provided. The long freight trains that are currently transiting the West Dixie FEC right-of-way are bogging traffic and increasing frustration. This frustration of traffic will only be exaggerated further without giving frequent overhead passages for vehicular and pedestrian traffic.	Section 1.2.6 of the PEIS briefly addresses safety concerns at transitway-highway crossings. Measures being considered include a program to consolidate and/or elevate or depress railroad-highway grade crossings along the FEC. More detailed analysis of safety and traffic flow will be conducted in Tier 2.
PC20	Funding	Broward PH	Kimball, Nancy 1029 Southeast 12th Way Ft Lauderdale, FL		I am very much concerned about funding, funding cost of your research, your analysis, your everything that is going on here. Especially, in light of the fact that we were not willing to do the one penny sales tax. We would love to have this, but you need to start putting some major impact fees on these developers or you have got to find some other way of paying for it that doesn't require residents to pay for it.	Section 2.6 of the FPEIS describes some of the more significant funding options that may be incorporated into detailed project financial plans. More detailed financial analysis will be provided in Tier 2 to determine how to fund portions of or the ultimate system.
PC21	General	Email (10-26-06)	Kwiat, Artie WorldStreet by the Silver Companies Washington, DC Boca Raton, FL 561-243-1755	O	I would like to know whose idea this was, since only one mile or less to the west, are TRI RAIL trains running day and night from Miami to West Palm Beach? Furthermore, as a taxpayer and resident of South Palm Beach county who goes over the FEC railroad tracts at least thirty times a week, it is bad enough to have to wait for the long freight cars to move up and down the corridor. To add the expense, which is not necessary, is foolhardy. Instead, spend the money to increase the efficiency of the existing tri rail tracks and infrastructure used by TRI RAIL. I work too hard for my tax dollars to be wasted by some hair brained idea. It must have to do with private interest groups who have ulterior motives.	The concept of incorporating passenger service along the FEC has been studied for many years (see prior studies report available on project website). Transit trains along FEC would be shorter in length than freight trains. However, grade separations to minimize impact to traffic will be further analyzed in Tier 2.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Public Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
PC22	Greenway/Bike Paths	Website	Lassel, Jeff		Within the last few years I have been learning about the "rails to trails" bicycle paths that have been built in Florida and other states. Broward County needs some sort of continuous protected path whether it be for recreational or commuting activities. It has become much too dangerous to ride along A1A except for very early in the mornings. A trail along the eastern corridor makes a lot of sense because it is close to the centers of business areas from Pompano south to Fort Lauderdale and even Hollywood. What a great way to promote bicycle commuting to downtown business areas!	Presently, only Broward and Miami-Dade Counties show bike paths/greenways adjacent to FEC in their LRTP. A regional bike path/greenway adjacent to FEC will be considered in Tier 2. See Section 4.4 for a discussion on bike trails and greenways.
PC23	Technology	Via Cummunikatz	Lopez, Isak 2691 South Course Drive, #606 Pompano Beach, FL 33069		I've always believed that the best way to ensure the timeliness & safety of the proposed East Coast corridor system you are developing is to utilize an elevated rail (heavy/light rail or monorail). The fact that three cars in as many days have been struck by Tri-Rail trains and that car-strikes occur throughout the year should be evidence enough of the dangers of having these commuting vehicles at ground-level. The SIGNIFICANT safety & reliability enhancements an elevated system will afford its riders over any ground-based systems should be highlighted in your efforts to educate & inform the public as to the various technology/transit alternatives being researched. When residents realize that their children are much less likely to be hurt by oncoming trains if they are elevated and that horn-usage by the trains will be substantially reduced as compared to ground-level alternatives, these will be compelling arguments for elevated rail.	Section 1.2.6 of the PEIS briefly addresses safety concerns at transitway-highway crossings. Measures being considered include a program to consolidate and/or elevate or depress railroad-highway grade crossings along the FEC. More detailed analysis of safety and traffic flow will be conducted in Tier 2.
PC24	Ridership	Broward PH	Mathis, Douglas 500 North 6th Street Pompano Beach, Florida		To gain acceptance and assure accurate ridership, there needs to be a central intermodal facility in each of the three downtown areas. This facility will provide a significant access point and all forms of transportation. Shuttles should be planned to meet each commuter train at the facilities to distribute passengers throughout the downtown area. Is this part of the plan?	Yes. Intermodal facilities, east/west connections and other operational issues will be further analyzed in greater detail in Tier 2. Figure J.1 in Appendix J provides a map of the existing east-west transit connections.
PC25	Funding	Broward PH	Mathis, Douglas 500 North 6th Street Pompano Beach, Florida		It seems that hundreds of millions of dollars of public funds are going to be used on a transportation system, they could be used to put rail transportation into residential areas such as Coral Springs, Weston, Wellington, and the western areas of Dade and other residential centers. Why isn't this being done?	Local governments are responsible for providing transit service to existing residential areas. This study will evaluate how to link with existing transit systems to create a comprehensive transportation system.
PC26	Ridership	Broward PH	Mathis, Douglas 500 North 6th Street Pompano Beach, Florida		The current study appears to be mostly independent of Tri-Rail. Why isn't this study and Tri-Rail tightly integrated? A scale of common would indicate that all public forms of transportation in Dade, Broward and Palm Beach County's metropolitan areas should be tightly integrated or merged into a single system. Then all planning and funding would be centralized in some common scale. Why hasn't this been done?	This study is closely integrated with Tri-rail and closely coordinated with the SFRTA. Examples of trip lengths for both services can be found in Section 1.2.1, Transportation Demand where stated services would be complimentary. Other examples include ridership discussions for FEC rail in relation to Tri-rail found in Section 4.2.3, Relationship between Tri-Rail and Build Alternatives.
PC27	Greenway/Bike Paths	Website	Matthewman, William 7200 N.W. 126 Terr. Parkland, FL 33076		I think that it is a great idea to have bike and pedestrian access along the South Florida East Coast Corridor. My family and I often run and bike and this would be a benefit to South Florida residents and visitors. Please note my support for this project.	Comment noted.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Public Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
PC28	General	Website	Merrill, Frank 435 NE 88th St El Portal, FL 33138	O	The project purpose is commendable and the need for a Miami Dade transit system in the northeast corridor is obvious. There are two fundamental flaws with the proposed project. First, that there needs to be a tri-county solution and worse it is dictated by a large corporation of FEC holdings. Second, that traffic is a more pressing need than preserving our communities. Without any uncertainty the level of noise and aggravation will be stratospheric in the communities of El Portal and Miami Shores.	The need for the project is stated in Chapter 1. Transportation planning will be completed consistent with community desires. Detailed noise studies, which may include quiet zones, will be conducted in Tier 2.
PC29	Goals & Objectives	Website	Merrill, Frank 435 NE 88th St El Portal, FL 33138	O	The goals and objectives are lofty and impossible to meet. Let's facilitate mass transit but also manage to mitigate the permanent damage to well established communities.	Comment noted.
PC30	Construction	Website	Merrill, Frank 435 NE 88th St El Portal, FL 33138	O	Whatever construction there may be will inevitably be detrimental. Further, if Biscayne Boulevard construction is indicative; it will also last at least a decade.	Comment noted.
PC31	Safety	Website	Merrill, Frank 435 NE 88th St El Portal, FL 33138	O	This project will make the neighborhoods less safe for our children. You can not seriously argue that additional trains going through our neighborhoods at 30-60 MPH will make things safer?	Section 1.2.6 of the PEIS briefly addresses safety concerns at transitway-highway crossings. Measures being considered include a program to consolidate and/or elevate or depress railroad-highway grade crossings along the FEC. More detailed analysis of safety and traffic flow will be conducted in Tier 2.
PC32	Community Desired	Website	Merrill, Frank 435 NE 88th St El Portal, FL 33138	O	Miami Shores and El Portal would prefer to have no train, period. Projects that increase the amount of extraneous noise and snarl local traffic with increased trains in a dense, long standing, we-never-needed-the-railroad communities will result in nothing positive. We moved to Miami Shores/El Portal because they felt like and are good, solid, safe communities. In addition, I believe the project would discourage growth of businesses in these areas.	Comment noted.
PC33	Technology	Palm Bch PH	Metcalf, David 1495 Wood Row Way Wellington, FL 33414		I think mixed technologies could work (i.e. each segment could have a different system. Tri-rail is the full corridor service)	A combination of suitable technologies will be considered for the entire corridor and for individual segments during Tier 2.
PC34	Ridership	Palm Bch PH	Metcalf, David 1495 Wood Row Way Wellington, FL 33414		I would like to see benefits by land use scenario. If we could concentrate growth in the corridor, what would ridership be?	Additional land use issues and demand modeling will be addressed in Tier 2, particularly at station areas.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Public Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
PC35	Greenway/Bike Paths	Website	Miller, Randall B. Environmental Supervisor Palm Beach County Health Department EHE Air Pollution Control PO Box 29 901 Evernia Street West Palm Beach, FL 33402-0029		Just thought I'd offer positive incentive for such a bicycle path. At present, we have white lines in our traffic lanes that are supposed to protect the bikers in PBC. If you have ever visited PBC and driven in PBC, you would know how foolish this little white line is. I would encourage a bicycle path along the FEC right of way so that bikers can get out of the traffic lanes and ride safely along a bike path that could be beautified with local, native and shade producing landscaping. Landscaping would also improve the scenery for the rail operators during their daily routine.	Presently, only Broward and Miami-Dade Counties show bike paths/greenways adjacent to FEC in their LRTP. A regional bike path/greenway adjacent to FEC and landscaping will be considered in Tier 2. See Section 4.4 for a discussion on bike trails and greenways.
PC36	General	Palm Bch PH	Munoz, Maria 1212 SE 2nd Ct. #3 Ft Lauderdale, FL 33301		I was a seven year commuter Broward/Miami-Dade and see with interest that transit between both Counties is being studied.	Comment noted.
PC37	General	Palm Bch PH	Oster, Clint 845NE 71 St Boca Raton, FL 33487	S	I love the concept and look forward to implementation. I would like to see this train geared to short distance riders with stops every one or two miles.	Different operational scenarios for stops to be analyzed in detail in Tier 2.
PC38	Station Request	Palm Bch PH	Oster, Clint 845NE 71 St Boca Raton, FL 33487		Serious consideration should be given to a train station at Jeffry Street or just north of North Boca Raton. Currently a multi-use project is being proposed in conjunction with the Caldwell Theater Rehabilitation.	The parameters considered in the initial modeling process to identify suitable station locations are described in Section 2.3.4. This preliminary screening however does not preclude from adding or removing station areas as specific choices are made regarding alignments, technology, and service needs. For example, 13 additional station locations/areas will be considered based on public recommendations made during the public hearing. These public recommendations are listed in Table J.2 in Appendix J.
PC39	Technology	Palm Bch PH	Oster, Clint 845NE 71 St Boca Raton, FL 33487		I'm still not convinced that a trolley system on US-1 would not be used more than the FEC train. Such a system would appeal to local riders more than regional riders.	The FEC system would serve both local and regional riders. A trolley system along the entire corridor would be impacted by traffic and congestion and suffer low speeds and low reliability. A dedicated BRT along US-1 was analyzed in Tier 1 but the cost and other impacts were too high.
PC40	Technology	Palm Bch PH	Parsons, John 141 Wooden Mill Terrace Jupiter, FL 33458		No rapid Rail Transit. Was tried in Miami-Dade. If it didn't work there - it will not work. Eliminate it as a possibility.	This technology will be reevaluated in more detail in Tier 2.
PC41	General	Palm Bch PH	Rose, Rick 1608 Lake Avenue West Palm Beach		I think it's a fantastic idea to improve public transportation. I want to just put that down for the record. But whatever you do, do make sure that the quality of life of the people living around the tracks is not negatively impacted.	Transportation and station area planning for transit along the FEC will be conducted consistent with local government and community desires in Tier 2.
PC42	General	Broward PH	Saker, Riva 20 Northeast 152nd Street Miami, FL 33162.		I am here to express support for the train because I consider South Florida a metropolitan area. I think it should have the conveniences of other metropolitan areas, which include bus, train and then special automobiles and vans.	Comment noted.
PC43	Funding	Broward PH	Saker, Riva 20 Northeast 152nd Street Miami, FL 33162.		If there are counties like Broward and Palm Beach that are hesitant about creating a mass transit, then can the project be created in segments so that Dade County starts and then it moves northward with trial and error and progress reports?	An ultimate implementation plan will be developed as part of the financial analysis in Tier 2.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Public Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
PC44	General	Palm Bch PH	Santamaria, Carlos 204 Meadows Drive, Boynton Beach.		I believe that this corridor is an unwanted but necessary evil, if you want to call it that, but it's necessary.	Comment noted.
PC45	Crossings	Palm Bch PH	Shores, Richard		CSX trains or the CSX right of way has quadrant gates, which means four gates to prevent cars from getting out of the track. The FEC does not. All 203 crossings would have to be put into the quadrant gates. Also, what are we going to do to provide safety for the additional trains between those gates for pedestrians and kids and stuff crossing the tracks?	Section 1.2.6 of the PEIS briefly addresses safety concerns at transitway-highway crossings. Measures being considered include a program to consolidate and/or elevate or depress railroad-highway grade crossings along the FEC. More detailed analysis of safety and traffic flow will be conducted in Tier 2.
PC46	General	Miami-Dade PH	Short, Scott 44 NE 46 Street Miami, FL 33137		We are extremely concerned that station stops and future TOD will be used to justify extremely high density in Miami.	Tier 1 FPEIS has identified that densification is already occurring in locations throughout the study area, the project Purpose and Need is to meet this demand, not create it. However, as begun in Tier 1, Station area planning conducted throughout Tier 2 will be conducted consistent with adjacent community desires.
PC47	Greenway/Bike Paths	Website	Stempe, Leslie P.O. Box 4551 Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33338		Is a bike path being considered? This would be a great opportunity to make bike commuting feasible and safe.	Presently, only Broward and Miami-Dade Counties show bike paths/greenways adjacent to FEC in their LRTP. A regional bike path/greenway adjacent to FEC will be considered in Tier 2. See Section 4.4 for a discussion of bike trails and greenways.
PC48	General	Miami-Dade PH	Steve 725 NE 73 Street Miami, FL 33138	S	I am in favor of a rail system on the FEC corridor from Miami to Jupiter. I would prefer an electric system. I would oppose any higher density along the system in excess of six stories abutting single family neighborhoods.	Comment noted.
PC49	Technology	Miami-Dade PH	Swauer, James C. Miami, FL		Important factor through residential corridors is noise and speed - lighter rail the better.	Chapter 3 of the PEIS discusses noise and vibration concerns and outlines some the mitigation measures that may be implemented to avoid or minimize increased levels of noise. More detailed noise analysis will be conducted in Tier 2 for each technology.
PC50	Park & Ride	Palm Bch PH	Thompson, Christova 114 Wedgewood Plaza Dr. Riviera Beach, FL 33404		This is good for business but how do you get to these different systems when you work late, have to go in earlier, there is no park and ride or if you have car problem. Will the operators be more people conscious and keep train schedules taking into consideration the passenger's need to know why their train does not turn up. At present, I think the operators think that it's only seniors and joy riders take local buses. I am among those who have just moved to Florida and has to take the bus to work.	Ultimately, operational issues will have to be addressed by the agency that operates the transit service along the FEC. Transportation demand strategies like guaranteed ride home can also be implemented.
PC51	Scheduling	Palm Bch PH	Thompson, Christova 114 Wedgewood Plaza Dr. Riviera Beach, FL 33404		Will the operators be more people conscious and keep train schedules taking into consideration the passenger's need to know why their train does not turn up?	Operational issues would have to be addressed by ultimate operator of the transit service along the FEC.
PC52	Station Request	Palm Bch PH	Ward, Gerald 31 West 20th Street Riviera Beach	0	The rail connections proposed in Riviera Beach are obnoxious. You have had it pointed out to you multiple times and you keep ignoring it, that one of the closest points of the two rail lines, FEC and CSX, is 45th Street, which is also a major hospital, which would be a nice station location.	The parameters considered in the initial modeling process to identify suitable station locations are described in Section 2.3.4. This preliminary screening however does not preclude from adding or removing station areas as specific choices are made regarding alignments, technology, and service needs. For example, 13 additional station locations/areas will be considered based on public recommendations made during the public hearing. These public recommendations are listed in Table J.2 in Appendix J. A station at 45th Street will be considered.

Table J.2

Agency and Public Comments on the SFECCTA DPEIS and Responses

Public Comments and Responses

Comment #	Topic	Source	Name	S/O*	Comment	Response
PC53	Ridership	Palm Bch PH	Ward, Gerald 31 West 20th Street Riviera Beach	0	The proposed 100,000 or so ridership is totally inadequate to support the massive cost of this project.	FTA will require cost/benefit analysis in Tier 2 which will show whether this statement is supported.
PC54	Technology	Palm Bch PH	Ward, Gerald 31 West 20th Street Riviera Beach	0	There's no rational justification presented as to why you dropped from consideration either the intracoastal route or the straits of Florida route.	The Straits of Florida route is too far to travel for the type of transit service under study. See Section 2.2.3, Alternatives Considered but not Advanced in Tier 1 for a more in depth discussion for eliminating the intracoastal route.
PC55	Crossings	Palm Bch PH	Ward, Gerald 31 West 20th Street Riviera Beach	0	The failure to consider the obstruction to the public for the 200 or so intersections is a gross mistreatment of the public.	Section 4.1.1 of the FPEIS provides a discussion of potential impacts associated with transitway-highway crossings in the SFECC. More detailed studies will be conducted during Tier 2 to address the potential of closing/ consolidating and/or elevating or depressing at-grade crossings. These studies will involve local communities as the studies proceeds.
PC56	Navigation	Palm Bch PH	Ward, Gerald 31 West 20th Street Riviera Beach	0	Navigation impacts on the New River. Navigation impacts at the Loxahatchee River. Unless you find a way to elevate the rail at high levels, we can't put up with further navigation impact.	Navigation impacts will be analyzed in detail in Tier 2. Elevated rail will also be considered in Tier 2.
PC57	Greenway/Bike Paths	Palm Bch PH	Ward, Mary 28 Starboard Way Tequesta, FL	S	I just want to say that I think you guys are doing a great job with this project and I hope that it continues to go forward. I hope that they do integrate some bike trails in with this system.	Presently, only Broward and Miami-Dade Counties show bike paths/greenways adjacent to FEC in their LRTP. A regional bike path/greenway adjacent to FEC will be considered in Tier 2. See Section 4.4 for a discussion on bike trail and greenways.

Note: S - Person or agency supports the project O - Person or agency opposes the project

List of Abbreviations: **FTA:** Federal Transportation Administration; **FDOT:** Florida Department of Transportation; **PD&E:** Project Development and Environment; **AN:** Advance Notification; **PEIS:** Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement; **SAFETEA-LU:** Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users; **ETDM:** Efficient Transportation Decision Making; **P&N:** Purpose and Need; **MPO:** Metropolitan Planning Organization; **LRTP:** Long Range Transportation Plan; **TIP:** Transportation Improvement Plan; **CSS:** Context Sensitive Solutions; **TSM:** Transportation Systems Management; **NEPA:** National Environmental Policy Act; **ETAT:** Environmental Technical Advisory Teams; **BMP:** Best Management Practices; **EJ:** Environmental Justice; **NWI:** National Wetland Inventory; **BRT:** Bus Rapid Transit; **LRT:** Light Rail Transit; **RGR:** Regional Rail; **RGB:** Regional Bus; **O&M:** Operations & Maintenance; **TSUB:** Transportation System User Benefits; **FHWA:** Federal Highway Administration; **FEC:** Florida East Coast Railway; **SFRTA:** South Florida Regional Transportation Authority