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Why Streamline at PHL?

▶ Executive Order 13274
  - Environmental Stewardship and Transportation Infrastructure Project Reviews

▶ Secretary designates priority projects
  - National or regional significance
  - Consequences of inaction
  - High level of state/local support
  - High likelihood of delay
PHL Runway 17-35 Extension Project

- SS aquifer
- Wetlands
- Noise

Extend Runway 17-35 1,000 feet
PHL Capacity Enhancement Plan

- SS aquifer
- Superfund site
- Archaeology
- Relocations
- Wetlands
- Rare species
- Noise
- 17 Agencies
- 3 States
PHL Overview

- Expedited, concurrent, coordinated
- State agencies
- Interagency Agreement (MOU)
- EIS Team
- Schedule / time frames
- Issue resolution / monthly reporting
- Environmental protection
Environmental Streamlining is

Anticipating and avoiding surprises and delays through openness, collaboration, and planning.

*It is not rushing through the environmental review process.*
PHL Agreement: Key Points

- Environmental Stewardship
- Identify and Respect Roles, Responsibilities and Statutory Authority
- Schedule and Time Frames
- Document Concurrence, Don’t Revisit
- Issue Resolution/Elevation Process
Roles & Responsibilities

- Attend meetings
- Review reports / documents*
- Concurrence Points *
- Permit decisions *
- Participate in issue resolution *

* within specific time frames
## Responsibilities and Time Frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US Environmental Protection Agency Region III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roles/Responsibilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus on study area, data requirements, and methodology to analyze air quality impacts…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and comment on Purpose and Need Technical Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Responsibilities</th>
<th>Approx. Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Need Report Review &amp; Comment</td>
<td>March 1-15, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Need Consensus Meeting</td>
<td>March 21, 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concurrence Points

- Avoidance / Minimization / Mitigation of Impacts
- Range of Reasonable Alternatives
- Purpose and Need
Reaching Concurrence

- FAA provides documentation/report
- Agencies review
- Agency does not agree
  - Notifies FAA
- Agency agrees
  - Concurrence Form signed
Reaching Concurrence

Agency notifies FAA

FAA & agency attempt to resolve

Not resolved

Resolved

Issue resolution process

Consensus Form signed
Agency Concurrence Form

- Agency concurs with the findings
- Agency concurs with the findings and offers comments for clarification/enhancement
- Agency concurs with the findings and provides comments that must be addressed for accuracy
- Agency has been provided opportunity to review and comment and there are no major issues
Issue Resolution Process

- Purpose – streamlined resolution
- Reasons for initiating – disagreement or missed deadline
- Any agency initiates
- Maximum of 21 days
Getting There: The PHL Approach

- Time
- Incremental steps
- Leadership
- Facilitated communication
- Flexibility, creativity and responsiveness
The PHL Approach: Leadership

- Agency leaders – 7 key points
- Elected officials – state agency participation
- Managers / champions
The PHL Approach: Champions

- Interagency agreement
- Schedule
- Resource allocation
- Staff support
Facilitated Communication

- Ground Rules
- Define Consensus
- Discussions
- Achieve Consensus
Achieving Consensus

Consensus

Agree

I’m okay with it

Neutral

I’m almost there

Disagree

I disagree
What the Agencies Told Us

- Staff resources
- Level of involvement
- Public input
- Single round of review
Celebrate!
Streamlining Challenges

- Aggressive schedule
- Understand agency needs
- Limited agency resources
- NEPA vs. single focus regulations
- Outside influences
What Can Be Streamlined?

Go For It:
- Reviews
- Concurrence
- Issue Resolution
- Elevation

Don’t Even Try:
- Technical Analysis
- Public Participation
Lessons Learned
Agency Coordination

- Agencies unfamiliar with FAA policies and airport operations – teach basics
- Discuss Technical Studies and Technical Reports
- Concurrence vs. Comments
- Make It Easy!
Lessons Learned
Public Involvement

- Make sure public does not feel cheated
- More educational links on website
- Involve elected officials
- Professional facilitator
Lessons Learned

Team Communications

- Team reconfiguration
  - Steering committee with group leaders
  - Defined roles and responsibilities
- Set periods for reviews and elevation
- Elevation ≠ Failure
Bottom Line

- Not every project can be a “streamlined” project, but every project can use aspects of streamlining
How Did It Go?

“It’s a good process. We’re participating in the streamlining because we believe a well-managed NEPA process provides benefits to all parties. We like the clarity on schedules and due dates. The consensus points meant that we knew our issues were heard and addressed early so that when we reached the DEIS or FEIS, the really important technical and regulatory issues were already discussed, dealt with and resolved and the final reviews were much easier.”

— David Burke, Pennsylvania DEP
Questions?

Frank Bracaglia  fbracaglia@vhb.com