5.10 SELECTION OF THE RECOMMENDED PLAN

Based on extensive screening, as described in previous sections of this report, alternatives 2a, 7a, and 8a remain for possible recommendation.

A comparison of alternatives 2a, 7a, and 8a was made using Project Objectives and Performance Measures as shown in Table 33. A summary of that comparison follows:

- Cost Effectiveness - Alternatives 2a and 7a are of comparable cost. The cost of Alternative 8a is approximately double that of 2a and 7a.

- Compatibility with Future CERP Actions – For flexibility for increased water flows, states, and capacity, the three alternatives are equal. For capacity to add features to achieve full sheetflow, Alternatives 2a and 8a offer partial compliance; Alternative 7a offers full compliance. For ease of adding features to improve Decompartmentalization and ecological connectivity, all alternatives are considered equal. For opportunities to degrade the roadbed, Alternative 7 provides slightly fewer linear feet than alternatives 2a and 8a. Alternatives 2a and 7a would provide partial compliance with the project objective, while Alternative 8a would provide minimal compliance. Alternative 7a would provide approximately 3 acres for potential wetland restoration, while alternatives 2a and 8a would provide none.

- Minimization of Construction Impacts - The three alternatives are equal in their abilities to meet the MWD schedule, their temporary impacts on the Miccosuckee Tribe and businesses of the area, construction duration, turbidity controls, and their abilities to maintain distances and implement phasing to avoid impacts to wood storks and snail kites.

- Minimization of Socioeconomic Impacts – Alternative 7a provides full compliance with the objective of avoiding impacts to businesses, while Alternatives 2a and 8a offer partial compliance. The three alternatives are equal in impacts on access, privacy, and noise impacts on the Tigertail and Osceola camps.

- Restoration and Enhancement of Ecological Function – Alternative 2a offers the opportunity to restore 11.1 acres, while Alternative 7a offers 3.42 acres and Alternative 8a offers 3.51 acres. Alternative 7a offers more ecological connectivity (3,000 feet) than Alternatives 2a (1,450 feet) or 8a (240 feet). The three alternatives are equal in the amount of exotic vegetation removed, areas with affected flow magnitude, and differences between average velocity at the road and the marsh.

- Minimization of Impacts to Recreation Facilities – Alternative 7a would result in more impacts to recreational fishing from the Tamiami Trail right-of-way than Alternatives 2a or 8a. The alternatives are equal in their effects on maintaining access for visitor use, duration of construction impacts on recreation, access to fishing in the L-29 Canal, and maintaining boat accessibility to WCA-3B.

- Minimization of Wetland Losses – Alternatives 7a and 8a are approximately equal in the amount of permanent wetland loss (5.0 and 5.1 acres, respectively) and temporary wetland loss (1.0 and 0.0 acres respectively), while Alternative 2a would result in the permanent loss of 11.8 acres and the temporary loss of 4.9 acres.

- Minimization of Impacts to the L-29 Canal – The three alternatives were equal in their effects on the capacity of the L-29 Canal and their effects on fish and wildlife.

Based on this evaluation Alternative 7a was selected as the "Final Recommended Plan" because it was judged to provide the best overall Performance Measure rankings. The implementation of Alternative 7a would result in no significant adverse impacts to the natural or human environments.

Wildlife features are not included in the Final Recommended Plan. However, at the request of DOI, information and costs associated with providing wildlife protection have been developed (See Section 5.6.5 Wildlife Crossing Options). These features could be added as an enhancement to project and therefore funded by DOI.

The 3,000-foot bridge has been preliminarily sited between Blue Shanty and Coopertown. During the development of plans and specifications, the placement of the bridge may be reevaluated, and the bridge re-sited. Appropriate NEPA documentation would be prepared to address any re-siting.

As part of the recommended plan, the Federal government will compensate FDOT for the real estate rights needed for the Tamiami Trail project. In order to obtain the perpetual right to flow water, FDOT is entitled to compensation. This right includes both conveyance and easement interests. The appropriate organizations at the Federal and State levels will develop and approve an agreement containing the details and method of implementation. It is the intention of the Federal government not to expend any more funds than necessary to construct alternate facilities for the Tamiami Trail that a future project under CERP may impact.

A Real Estate Relocation and Raising Agreement, which will include the level of compensation to FDOT as well as other items, will be finalized with FDOT during development of the construction Plans and Specifications (P&S) for the final approved plan under Mod Waters. The timeframe for P&S should coincide with the final decision on a plan for Tamiami Trail under CERP. This would allow the approved features of the two projects to be integrated so that there would not be unnecessary expenditures for features, such as elevating the pavement on portions of the highway that might ultimately include a bridge or bridges. However, FDOT would have the final decision on how these funds would be used or not used and whether Tamiami Trail should be

Table 33. Summary of Performance Measures to Assess Compliance of Each Action Alternative with Project Objectives.

Objective 1. Maximize Compatibility for Future CERP actions.

Measure	Units	No Action	Alt 1*	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3a*	Alt 3b*	Alt 4a*	Alt 4b*	Alt 5a*	Alt 5b*	Alt 5c*	Alt 6a*	Alt 6b*	Alt 7a	Alt 7b	Alt 8a	Alt 8b
PM1. Flexibility for Increased Flows, Stages, and Capacity Associated with CERP	f,p,m,n	n	n	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
PM2. Addition of Features to Achieve Full Sheet Flow)	f,p,m,n	n	n	p	p	p	p	p	p	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	p	p
PM3. Ease of Adding Features to Improve Decompartmentalization)	f,p,m,n	n	p	p	m	n	n	p	m	p	p	f	p	m	p	m	p	m
PM4. Ecological Connectivity	f,p,m,n	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	p	p	f	p	p	m	m	m	m
PM5. Potentially Degradable Linear Footage of Roadbed	linear feet	55,046	55,046	55,046	55,046	55,046	55,046	55,046	55,046	55,046	13,200	0	33,926	41,160	53,546	53,880	55,046	55,046
PM6. Minimal Retrofit Needed	f,p,m,n	n	n	p	p	p	p	p	p	f	f	f	p	p	p	p	m	m
PM7. Potential Wetland Acreage Restored	acres	0	0	0	0	42	42	0	0	66	49	66	24	19	3	1.7	0	0

Objective 2. Minimize Construction Impacts.

Measure	Units	No Action	Alt 1*	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3a*	Alt 3b*	Alt 4a*	Alt 4b*	Alt 5a*	Alt 5b*	Alt 5c*	Alt 6a*	Alt 6b*	Alt 7a	Alt 7b	Alt 8a	Alt 8b
PM1. Ability to meet MWD implementation schedule	f,p,m,n	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
PM2. Temporary Impacts of construction duration on the Miccosuckee Tribe and businesses	f,p,m,n	f	f	f	m	p	p	m	m	p	p	p	p	m	f	m	f	f
PM3. Duration of Construction	f,p,m,n	Not Applicable	18	24	24	30	30	24	24	48	48	48	30	30	24	24	24	28
PM4. Allows for Turbidity Control	f,p,m,n	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
PM5. Is Phasing of Construction needed to Avoid Impacts to Wood Storks during Nesting Season	yes/no	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
PM6. Ability to Maintain Adequate Distances from Construction to Wood Stork Primary Zones	f,p,m,n	f	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p
PM7. Ability to Maintain Distances from Construction to Wood Stork Secondary Zones	f,p,m,n	f	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p
PM8. Ability to Maintain Adequate Distances from Construction to Snail Kite Nesting Locations	f,p,m,n	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f

Objective 3. Minimize Adverse Socioeconomic Impacts.

Measure	Units	No Action	Alt 1*	Alt 2a	Alt 2b	Alt 3a*	Alt 3b*	Alt 4a*	Alt 4b*	Alt 5a*	Alt 5b*	Alt 5c*	Alt 6a*	Alt 6b*	Alt 7a	Alt 7b	Alt 8a	Alt 8b
PM1. Impacts to Businesses or Private Properties	f,p,m,n	f	f	p	p	f	f	m	m	f	f	f	p	p	f	f	p	p
PM2. Impacts on Access and Privacy at Tigertail Camp	f,p,m,n	f	f	f	f	n	n	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
PM3. Impacts on Access and Privacy at Osceola Camp	f,p,m,n	f	f	f	m	f	f	n	n	p	p	p	f	m	f	m	f	m
PM4. Noise Impacts to Tigertail Camp (FDOT Noise Approach Criteria exceeded)	yes, no	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
PM5. Noise Impacts to Osceola Camp (FDOT Noise Approach Criteria exceeded)	yes, no	no	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes

* Alts 1,3,4,5,6 were not carried forward after evaluation in the performance measure matrix and have not been considered for recommendation as the preliminary recommended plan. The rationale for their elimination in included in Section 5.10 of the GRR/SEIS.

Objective 4. Restore Ecological Function.																		
Measure	**Units**	**No Action**	**Alt 1***	**Alt 2a**	**Alt 2b**	**Alt 3a***	**Alt 3b***	**Alt 4a***	**Alt 4b***	**Alt 5a***	**Alt 5b***	**Alt 5c***	**Alt 6a***	**Alt 6b***	**Alt 7a**	**Alt 7b**	**Alt 8a**	**Alt 8b**
PM1. Wetland Functional Units	FU's (lost)	0	2.92	10.1	37.48	18.82	30.15	40.43	64.64	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	6.6	22.77	3.42	49.55	3.51	46.56
PM2. Linear Footage of North/South Ecological Connectivity	linear feet	250	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	56,496	1,500	1,500	3,000	3,000	240	400
PM3. Exotic Vegatation Removed	linear feet	0	1,450	56,496	56,496	1,450	1,450	56,496	56,496	1,450	1,450	56,496	56,496	56,496	56,496	56,496	56,496	56,496
PM4. Hydrologic Restoration of NESRS	f,p,m,n	n	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	f	f	f	p	p	p	p
PM5. Area with Affected Flow Magnitude	f,p,m,n	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	f	m	m	m	m	m	m
PM 6. Difference Between Average Velocity at Tamiami Trail and Average Velocity in the marsh south of Tamiami Trail.	f,p,m,n	n	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	f	m	m	m	m	m	m
Objective 5. Minimize Impacts to Recreation Facilities.																		
Measure	**Units**	**No Action**	**Alt 1***	**Alt 2a**	**Alt 2b**	**Alt 3a***	**Alt 3b***	**Alt 4a***	**Alt 4b***	**Alt 5a***	**Alt 5b***	**Alt 5c***	**Alt 6a***	**Alt 6b***	**Alt 7a**	**Alt 7b**	**Alt 8a**	**Alt 8b**
PM1. Access for Visitor Use	f,p,m,n	f	f	f	f	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	p	f	f	f	f
PM2. Duration of Temporary Access Restrictions	months	f	18	24	24	30	30	24	24	48	48	48	30	30	24	24	24	28
PM3. Access to Fishing from Tamiami Trail	f,p,m,n	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	m	m	m	p	p	p	p	f	f
PM4. Access to Fishing in the L-29 Canal	f,p,m,n	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
PM5. Boating Accessiblity to WCA-3B	f,p,m,n	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
Objective 6. Minimize Permanent/Temporary Wetland Loss																		
Measure	**Units**	**No Action**	**Alt 1***	**Alt 2a**	**Alt 2b**	**Alt 3a***	**Alt 3b***	**Alt 4a***	**Alt 4b***	**Alt 5a***	**Alt 5b***	**Alt 5c***	**Alt 6a***	**Alt 6b***	**Alt 7a**	**Alt 7b**	**Alt 8a**	**Alt 8b**
PM1. Wetlands Permanently Lost	acres	f	0	11.8	86.0	14.3	28.9	68.4	103.9	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	2.8	48.9	5.0	72.4	5.1	68.0
PM2. Wetlands Temporarily Lost During Construction	acres	f	4.9	4.9	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Objective 7. Formulate a Cost Effective Plan within ENP's Budget.																		
Measure	**Units**	**No Action**	**Alt 1***	**Alt 2a**	**Alt 2b**	**Alt 3a***	**Alt 3b***	**Alt 4a***	**Alt 4b***	**Alt 5a***	**Alt 5b***	**Alt 5c***	**Alt 6a***	**Alt 6b***	**Alt 7a**	**Alt 7b**	**Alt 8a**	**Alt 8b**
PM1. Construction Cost	$	Not Applicable	14,330,871	24,354,651	58,550,650	67,959,310	73,457,360	45,235,110	47,128,440	135,915,000	140,314,000	142,156,700	72,877,979	81,369,677	23,045,733	51,858,385	45,499,995	47,081,029
PM2. Annual Routine Maintenance	$	Not Applicable	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	Not Calculated	Not Calculated	Not Calculated	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
PM3. Recurring Maintenance (Resurfacing)	$	Not Applicable	13,646,872	19,153,047	32,778,010	32,881,601	35,909,171	25,462,350	26,503,665	1,386,425	1,386,425	1,386,425	12,235,870	18,942,025	16,961,032	26,865,650	14,302,117	26,338,079
PM4. Life Cycle Cost	$	Not Applicable	21,189,677	32,530,077	50,126,440	70,751,666	76,249,766	48,233,140	50,126,440	135,994,180	140,393,480	142,235,880	77,994,054	83,245,822	31,003,830	54,776,745	53,892,652	50,158,749
PM5. Average Annual Cost	$	3,150,000	1,285,269	1,947,792	2,792,014	3,859,058	3,931,658	2,176,782	2,283,261	9,128,866	9,422,807	9,847,306	5,117,010	5,558,810	1,902,379	3,632,244	3,420,381	3,319,959
Objective 8. Minimize Impacts to L-29 Canal.																		
Measure	**Units**	**No Action**	**Alt 1***	**Alt 2a**	**Alt 2b**	**Alt 3a***	**Alt 3b***	**Alt 4a***	**Alt 4b***	**Alt 5a***	**Alt 5b***	**Alt 5c***	**Alt 6a***	**Alt 6b***	**Alt 7a**	**Alt 7b**	**Alt 8a**	**Alt 8b**
PM1. L-29 Canal Capacity	f,p,m,n	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
PM2. Effects on Fish and Wildlife	f,p,m,n	f	f	f	f	p	p	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f

* Alts 1,3,4,5,6 were not carried forward after evaluation in the performance measure matrix and have not been considered for recommendation as the preliminary recommended plan. The rationale for their elimination in included in Section 5.10 of the GRR/SEIS.

f = The performance measure indicates Full Compliance with the project objective.

p = The performance measure indicates Partial Compliance with the project objective.

m = The performance measure indicates Minimal Compliance wih the project objective.

n = The project measure indicates Non Compliance with the project objective.

altered prior to CERP, as these funds are provided as compensation for giving the Corps water conveyance rights, not specifically for elevating the pavement or other measures.