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SHRP2 & Its Focus Areas

**Safety:** Fostering safer driving through analysis of driver, roadway and vehicle factors in crashes, near crashes, and ordinary driving.

**Renewal:** Rapid maintenance and repair of the deteriorating infrastructure using already-available resources, innovations, and technologies.

**Capacity:** Planning and designing a highway system that offers minimum disruption and meets the environmental, and economic needs of the community.

**Reliability:** Reducing congestion and creating more predictable travel times through better operations.
SHRP2 Implementation:
INNOVATE.IMPLEMENT.IMPROVE.

$130 million
FUNDING ASSISTANCE

63
SHRP2 SOLUTIONS

430+
PROJECTS IMPLEMENTED

- DOT: 52 Recipients
- MPO/LOCAL: 30 Recipients
- UNIVERSITY: 10 Recipients
- FEDERAL/TRIBAL: 7 Recipients

- RENEWAL: 230+
- CAPACITY: 100+
- RELIABILITY: 90+
- SAFETY: 11
SHRP2 Implementation: INNOVATE.IMPLEMENT.IMPROVE.

224,761 PARTICIPANTS ENGAGED

8,939 OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

14,961 HOURS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

- TRAINING: 8,286
- WORKSHOPS: 463
- PEER EXCHANGES: 81
- DEMOS: 62
- SHOWCASES: 47
SHRP2 at a Glance

• **SHRP2 Solutions** – 63 products

• **Solution Development** – processes, software, testing procedures, and specifications

• **Field Testing** – refined in the field

• **Implementation** – 430+ transportation projects; adopt as standard practice

• **SHRP2 Education Connection** – connecting next-generation professionals with next-generation innovations

13 agencies were selected to implement C19 strategies.
Expediting Project Delivery

- *Expediting Project Delivery* identifies 24 strategies for addressing or avoiding 16 common constraints in order to speed delivery of transportation projects.

- Strategies Grouped Under Six Objectives:
  - Improve internal communication and coordination;
  - Streamline decision-making;
  - Improve resource agency involvement and collaboration;
  - Improve public involvement and support;
  - Demonstrate real commitment to the project; and
  - Coordinate work across phases of project delivery.
## Expediting Project Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Early Planning</th>
<th>Corridor Planning</th>
<th>NEPA</th>
<th>Design/ROW/Permitting</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Change-control practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consolidated decision council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Context-sensitive design and solutions</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinated and responsive agency involvement</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dispute-resolution process</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. DOT-funded resource agency liaisons</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Early commitment of construction funding</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Expedited internal review and decision-making</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Facilitation to align expectations up front</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Highly responsive public engagement</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Incentive payments to expedite relocations</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Media relations manager</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Performance standards</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Planning and environmental linkages</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Planning-level environmental screening criteria</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Programmatic agreement for Section 106</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Programmatic or batched permitting</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Real-time collaborative interagency reviews</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Regional environmental analysis framework</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Risk management</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Strategic oversight and readiness assessment</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Team co-location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Tiered NEPA process</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Up-front environmental commitments</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Award Recipients

• Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT)
• Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department (AHTD)
• Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)
• California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
• Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)
• Idaho Transportation Department (ITD)
• Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG)
• Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)
• Nebraska Department of Roads (NDOR)
• South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT)
• South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT)
• Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans)
AASHTO & FHWA Contacts

Kate Kurgan, AASHTO
kkurgan@aashto.org
202-624-3635

David Williams, FHWA
david.Williams@dot.gov
202-366-4074
SHRP2 on the Web

• GoSHRP2
   www.fhwa.dot.gov/GoSHRP2
   – Apply for Implementation assistance
   – Learn how practitioners are using SHRP2 products

• SHRP2 @AASHTO
   http://SHRP2.transportation.org
   – Implementation information for AASHTO members

• SHRP2 @TRB
   www.TRB.org/SHRP2
   – Research information

• FHWA C19 Website
Streamlining With NEPA Assignment at ODOT

March 2017

Office of Environmental Services
Tim Hill, Administrator
Jacque Annarino, NEPA Assignment Coordinator
Streamlining at ODOT

- ODOT’s need to integrate and streamline
- How ODOT changed approach to project development
- Accomplishments and Benefits of new approach
Why the need to Integrate and Streamline?
ODOT’s Approach to Project Development

- Project Development Process
- Consultant Scoping Fees Guidance
- Online Environmental Documentation System (EnviroNet)
ODOT’s Approach to Project Development

Programmatic Agreements
- Farmlands
- Coastal
- Ecological
- Indiana & Northern Long-Eared Bat
- Cultural Resources
- Categorical Exclusion (CE)

Future Programmatic Agreements
- Emergency Projects
- Scenic River
- Section 6(f)
- Section 4(f)
- Environmental Justice (guidance approved by FHWA- similar to an MOA)
- Endangered Species
NEPA Assignment Potential Benefits for Ohio

- Estimated 20-25% time savings to program
- Estimated savings of up to **$23 million annually**
  - Reduced project inflation
  - Project user delay costs
- Low risk - maybe 1 lawsuit every 8-10 years
Potential Streamlining Opportunities with NEPA Assignment

For projects under $20 million

- FHWA reviews 4(f) and other support documents = 15-30 days
- 40 per year = 1,000 review days per year
- 35% performed concurrently = 650 project review days
- Out of the 650, only 15% result in critical path reviews = 98 days
- 3.9% inflation and delay cost = $500,000 per year
Potential Streamlining Opportunities with NEPA Assignment

For projects $20 million to $149 million

- FHWA performs reviews on:
  - Purpose and Need = 30 days
  - Feasibility Study = 30 days
  - Alternative Evaluation Report = 30 days
  - Section 4(f) actions = 45 days
  - Review and approval of the CE = 60 days
  - ...plus multiple reviews (drafts, etc.)
Potential Streamlining Opportunities with NEPA Assignment

For projects $20 million to $149 million

- FHWA review for a medium sized project- 390 days
- 30% performed concurrently = 273 project review days
- ODOT averages 12 projects per year = 3,276 review days
- Out of this, 25% results in critical path reviews
- = 819 days of delay
- 3.9% inflation and delay cost = $5.7 million per year
- User costs/crash reduction benefits = $13.2 million per year
Potential Streamlining Opportunities with NEPA Assignment

For biggest projects...
ODOT’s *New* Approach to Project Development

- NEPA Assignment
  - For environmental actions on transportation projects
  - Does *not* include FTA or FRA
Implementation of NEPA Assignment

- 10/21/14 - Letter of Interest submitted
- 12/01/14 - Brief ODOT Executive Leadership & Agencies
- 12/15/14 - Draft Application submitted
- 12/15/14 - Begin district visits and meetings with Associations
- 12/24/14 - Letters to Tribes sent
- 04/12/15 - Draft Application Public Notice
- 04/22/15 - Draft MOU submitted
- 05/28/15 - Final Application submitted
- 10/15/15 - MOU Public Notice
- 12/28/15 - MOU Effective Date
Updated Agreements

- Section 106 Programmatic Agreement
- Ecological Memorandum of Agreement
- Categorical Exclusion Programmatic Agreement
- Indiana Bat Programmatic Agreement
- Tribal Letter Agreement
- Sole Source Aquifer Agreement
- Section 106 Consulting Party Guidance
- Section 4(f) Manual
- Section 6(f) Manual
- Farmlands Letter Agreement
- Federal National Scenic River Agreement
- Cover Letter for Other Agreements
New Guidance Documents

- Escalation Procedures
- 4(f) Guidance
- CE Guidance
- Emergency Projects Guidance
- File Management & Documentation Guidance
- Internal Communication Guidance
- Legal Sufficiency Review Guidance

- QC/QA Guidance
- Records Retention Guidance
- Self-Assessment Guidance
- Self-Assessment Checklists
- Signature Authority Guidance
- Statute of Limitations Guidance
Other New Items

- Performance Measures
- Goals
- Baseline Data
- Training Plan
NEPA Assignment Benefits for Ohio

- Opportunity to “refresh” environmental staff
- Updated manuals and guidance
- Updated process improvements Department wide
- Updated training

1st Quarter Actual Savings was $4.6 million
NEPA Assignment Audit Results

Audit Report

- Eleven Observations (mostly positive)
- Three successful practices
  - Dedicated legal counsel as part of environmental team
  - Pre-qualified consultants for environmental work
    - Required to take same training as ODOT environmental staff to be prequalified
  - Required, on-going training of all environmental staff and consultants
Lessons Learned

- Good team is important
- Dedicate time
- Push FHWA
  - Bi-Weekly Conference Calls with detailed agenda to keep everyone on task
  - Elevate issues quickly and push for resolution

- Proactive outreach
  - Executive Management
  - Districts
  - Partner Agencies
  - Environmental Groups
  - Contractors
  - Locals
  - ACEC
  - Etc.
Ohio Department of Transportation
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Office of Environmental Services
Tim Hill, Administrator
Tim.Hill@dot.ohio.gov
(614) 644-0377

Jacque Annarino, NEPA Assignment Coordinator
Jacque.Annarino@dot.ohio.gov
(614) 466-1484
Questions?

Please remember to type in your questions to the question prompt.

Thank you for participating!
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