Meeting of the Livable Roadways Committee
Wednesday, November 28, 2018, 9:00 a.m.

I. Call to Order

II. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

III. Approval of Minutes – October 17, 2018

IV. Action Items

A. It’s Time Tampa Bay Survey Results & Recommendations (Lisa Silva, MPO)
B. 2019 Committee & MPO Schedule (Lisa Silva, MPO)
C. Health in All Policies Resolution (Michele Ogilvie, MPO)

V. Status Reports

A. Eco District (Sean Baraoidan, REAL Building Consultants)
B. Heights Mobility Plan (Stephen Benson, FDOT)

VI. Old Business & New Business

A. LRC Next Meeting: December 19, 2018

VII. Adjournment

VIII. Addendum

A. MPO Meeting Summary & Committee Report
B. Event: Cleveland Elementary Mural, Dec. 15, 2018
C. Correspondence: FDOT Response on W. Busch Blvd. Corridor Study
D. Maydell Drive Bridge Replacement Summary Report

The full agenda packet is available on the MPO’s website, www.planhillsborough.org, or by calling (813) 272-5940.

The MPO does not discriminate in any of its programs or services. Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Learn more about our commitment to non-discrimination.

Persons needing interpreter services or accommodations for a disability in order to participate in this meeting, free of charge, are encouraged to contact Johnny Wong, 813-273-3774 x370 or wongj@plancom.org, three business days in advance of the meeting. Also, if you are only able to speak Spanish, please call the Spanish helpline at (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

Si necesita servicios de traducción, el MPO ofrece por gratis. Para registrarse por estos servicios, por favor llame a Johnny Wong directamente al (813) 273-3774, ext.
370 con tres días antes, o wongj@plancom.org de cerro electronico. También, si sólo se puede hablar en español, por favor llame a la línea de ayuda en español al (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, materials attached are for research and educational purposes, and are distributed without profit to MPO Board members, MPO staff, or related committees or subcommittees the MPO supports. The MPO has no affiliation whatsoever with the originator of attached articles nor is the MPO endorsed or sponsored by the originator. Persons wishing to use copyrighted material for purposes of their own that go beyond ‘fair use’ must first obtain permission from the copyright owner.

If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the board, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.
I. CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being established, Chair Green called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance took place. The meeting was held in the Plan Hillsborough Room on the 18th Floor of the County Center Building.

Members Present: Christopher Cochran, Melissa Collazo, June Farrell, Trent Green, Sara Hendricks, David Hey, Mark Hudson, Gus Ignas, Danni Jorgenson, Karen Kress, Michael Maurino, Anna Quinones, Carlos Ramirez, Neale Stralow, Charles White, Mike Williams

Others Present: Lisa Silva – MPO; Sharon Snyder – Planning Commission; Alex Henry – FDOT

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of the September 19, 2018 minutes (Hey - Maurino). The motion passed unanimously.

III. ACTION ITEMS

A. MPO Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for USF Campus (Brian Pessaro, Center for Urban Transportation Research)

Mr. Pessaro presented the MPO Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for the USF Campus. He began with some USF Quick Facts and presented other autonomous shuttles in, or close to, operation around the country. He discussed the three study purposes, which were to identify the areas of campus that could best be served by an autonomous shuttle, to identify any legal and insurance restrictions to operating an autonomous shuttle on campus, and to identify 2 to 3 potential service options for autonomous shuttles.

Mr. Pessaro presented the summary of outreach to students and highlights of the 3 surveys distributed to students. He discussed the transportation data and shared the existing data sources from the Bull Runner Passenger On-Off Data, SAFE Team Trip Log Data, and Share-a-Bull (Coast Bike Share) data. Combining the transportation data and survey data offered the recommended service and routes.

He also discussed the legal and insurance issues for the State and USF and presented the operational considerations. Finally, he discussed the estimated costs and potential funding sources. Basing the costs off of the Gainesville model, the estimated cost for the 12-month pilot is $700,000. He listed the potential funding sources and the next steps.

Discussions followed regarding if all current pilot projects have an attendant on board (yes, because all autonomous shuttles are overly cautious); if the estimated pilot study cost is based on one vendor (no, based on RTS from the Gainesville pilot study); if the Gainesville project is fully funded by FDOT (yes, because it will operate between campus and downtown); how ridership
is collected (the onboard attendant will track ridership); will the autonomous shuttle replace the current Bull-runner (no, it is supplemental service); how will the two shuttles operate (Mr. Pessaro reviewed the proposed routes and shuttle schedules); headways (they won't know until the vendor is chosen); can they ensure students they'll save time (unknown at this time); was the cost of the attendant factored into the costs (yes); the maximum number of passengers (average is 12-15); and will there be permanent technology at the intersections (if the autonomous shuttle becomes an additional transportation source, technology could be added to intersections).

**Motion:** Approved USF Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study (Kress – Farrell). The motion passed unanimously.

IV. STATUS REPORTS

A. Eco District (Sean Barbeau, Center for Urban Transportation Research) – Postponed until next month

B. District 7 Freight Plan, Sub Area Study & Local Freight Improvements (Brian Hunter, FDOT)

Mr. Hunter presented the District 7 Freight Plan, Sub Area Study and Local Freight Improvements. He presented the Tampa Bay Regional Strategic Freight Plan, written in 2012 before there was a statewide freight plan. It is currently being updated to reflect current freight industry practices and new local plans, including the Hillsborough-Polk FLZ Strategic Plan and the Port Tampa Bay Master Plan, and will be at [www.tampabayfreight.com](http://www.tampabayfreight.com) in the next few weeks.

He presented the Sabal Park Freight Sub Area Study, which should wrap up in 4 – 5 months, and discussed the Comprehensive Freight Improvement Database (CFID). The data base collects issues from Commercial Vehicle Operators in the region to assist with renovation of construction projects. Mr. Hunter has a budget to make minor improvements to freight roads in the County. Mr. Hunter presented the National Highway Freight Network and the National Highway Freight Program awards for FY19.

Discussions followed concerning whether the roads in the Sabal Park study area will be renovated so they can be used by large trucks (that will need to be studied further); will pedestrian safety improvements be made when making the improvements to the freight roads (yes); is the Busch Blvd. and Florida Avenue intersection funded with freight money (no); are there certain times of the day when large freight trucks are allowed on the roadways (the hours of operations have recently been updated which has compressed the time when trucks are on the roads); if the significant truck delay at I-4/I-275 will be addressed (a few years ago, it was in the Rick’s Top 100 Bottlenecks in America, but it has dropped off. MR. Hunter stated the delay is created by the interchange, not the movement); and does the National Highway Freight Network related to the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) (no, but they do overlap).

C. Multimodal Level of Service Evaluation (Wade Reynolds, MPO)

Mr. Reynolds presented the Multimodal Level of Service (MMLOS) Evaluation. The study’s purpose is to evaluate the existing MMLOS used by the MPO and update the methodology based on current best practice. The MPO currently uses FDOT’s MMLOS methodology. The process is data intensive and does not account for new innovations in multimodal infrastructure. An example is the paved shoulder on Lithia Pinecrest which is currently a LOS C bike facility, indicating an acceptable level of service, but is not comfortable for the average cyclist. The
LOS concept was developed for vehicles as a measure of inconvenience (delay) but the MPO is exploring new methods to qualify safety and comfort for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Mr. Reynolds explained the review of best practices and how the MPO is moving forward with looking at the levels of traffic stress. An MPO intern has developed an inventory of all intersections on our roadway network. The initial recommendations are segments-level evaluations to review level of traffic stress (LTS) for bicycles, adapt LTS methodology for pedestrians and intersection-level evaluation to adapt Charlotte’s (NC) pedestrian level of service (PLOS) and bicycle level of service (BLOS).

Mr. Reynolds provided a project update and explained the downtown Tampa case study. He discussed the pedestrian level of traffic stress and bicycle intersection evaluation. Mr. Reynolds explained the purpose of the bicycle facility design toolkit is to combine multiple design resources and provide best practice design guidance based on the user’s comfort. He discussed the toolkit framework and facility selection tool. The next steps are to complete the countywide evaluation and present the final results during the December Committee meetings.

Discussions followed regarding what is traffic stress (*how speed and volume of traffic affect cyclists*); will Levels of Service be assigned for each element along with an overall Level of Service (*Levels of Services would not be averaged; bicycle and pedestrian LOS would be separately assigned*); where does transit fall (*not doing transit with this project; transit is generally related to the headway times*); and is the County building the new roads for less stress in South County (*Mr. Reynolds stated the roads being built on 19th Avenue and Citrus Park Drive will have features to lower stress*).

V. OLD BUSINESS & NEW BUSINESS


B. Ms. Kress reminded members to vote on November 6th to improve safety and make roadways more livable. Ms. Farrell asked where to get yard signs. Ms. Kress replied at the All for Transportation office located in downtown, or the group will deliver. She also encouraged members to go to the All for Transportation Facebook page for more information.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:04 a.m.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
It’s TIME Tampa Bay Survey Results and Recommendations

**Presenter**
Lisa K. Silva or Committee Liaison (MPO Staff)

**Summary**
It’s TIME Tampa Bay, is a collaboration of the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) of Hillsborough, Pasco, and Pinellas counties. Federal law requires MPOs to evaluate trends, project future growth, and identify fiscally constrained multimodal transportation investments for at the next 20 years as part of their Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) update.

It’s TIME Tampa Bay represents the first tri-county planning initiative the three counties have undertaken as part of the 2045 LRTP planning process. Together, the MPOs are addressing regional mobility needs to ensure that connections to jobs, universities, healthcare, airports, state parks, and the beaches are accessible to everyone. Each MPO will utilize the results of the tri-county public outreach effort to help identify county-specific and cross-county, projects that support and enhance regional mobility.

MetroQuest, an online survey platform, was selected as the primary public outreach tool for the It’s TIME Tampa Bay initiative. The survey provided the public the opportunity to weigh in on transportation and growth priorities, exaggerated future year growth scenarios and a variety of potential roadway and transit projects, community development and funding options. The results of this survey will help the MPOs identify the best ideas, projects, and policies to evaluate further as we develop the 2045 LRTP hybrid regional scenario that will feed into the Hillsborough LRTP to be completed in 2019.

Based on the survey results, staff has drawn the following conclusions to be used as guidance for the hybrid scenario:

**Growth/Land Use Elements**
- Encourage in local government comprehensive plans
  - Reinvest in neighborhoods
  - Strengthen downtowns, create more downtown-like places
  - Minimize outward growth

**Transportation Elements - Transit**
- Consider options for incorporating rail in the 2045 Plan
  - Brightline connection to Orlando and other Florida metro areas
  - Streetcar
  - Other rail or fixed guideway transit services
o Plan should include express bus and BRT connections

Transportation Elements – Roads & Highways
- Continue to explore elevated express lane projects
  o Possible strategy for Downtown Tampa interchange (i.e. alternatives C & D)
  o Possible strategy for SR 54 / US 41 interchange area in Pasco
    - Explore connection between them via I-75 and I-4, not I-275
  o Tolls should be used for congestion management rather than raising revenue
  o New, expanded interchange ramps

Transportation Elements - Other
- Walk and bike modes are important to include and address
- Public support not present for I-275 boulevard conversion
- Demonstrate how technology advances can be implemented realistically and safely

Recommended Action
Approve Guidance for 2045 Plan “Hybrid Scenario” from the It's Time Tampa Bay Outreach

Prepared By
Lisa K. Silva, AICP, PLA (MPO Staff)

Attachments
- It's TiME Tampa Bay Survey Results and Recommendations Presentation (link)
- 2045 Tri-County Transportation Plan Survey Results Report (link)
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
2019 MPO and Committee Meeting Calendar

**Presenter**
Committee Staff

**Summary**
Staff has prepared a calendar of meetings for 2019. We ask that each MPO advisory committee review and approve its meeting dates. Upon approval by the MPO board, this calendar will be published and posted online to provide the public with ample notice of meeting schedules.

**Recommended Action**
Review and approve the 2019 MPO and Committee Meeting Calendar

**Prepared By**
Rich Clarendon, AICP, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
DRAFT 2019 MPO Meeting Calendar
## DRAFT - 2019 SCHEDULE OF MONTHLY MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MPO 9:00 AM</th>
<th>CAC 9:00 AM</th>
<th>TAC 1:30 PM</th>
<th>POLICY 9:00 AM</th>
<th>BPAC 5:30 PM</th>
<th>LRC 9:00 AM</th>
<th>ITS 1:30 PM</th>
<th>TDCB 9:30 AM</th>
<th>TMA 9:30 AM</th>
<th>TBARTA CCC 10 AM</th>
<th>TBARTA MPO DIRECTORS 1:30 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JANUARY</strong></td>
<td>3 or 8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEBRUARY</strong></td>
<td>5 or 6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8 (e)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARCH</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APRIL</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5 TBD - Pinellas</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAY</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNE</strong></td>
<td>11 (a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7 TBD - Pasco</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY</strong></td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUGUST</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPTEMBER</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (e)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCTOBER</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOVEMBER</strong></td>
<td>5 (a)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 TBD - Pinellas</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DECEMBER</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Joint Mtg. 16 @ 12 PM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 (d)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acronyms

- **BPAC**: Bicycle - Pedestrian Advisory Committee of the MPO Board
- **CAC**: Citizens Advisory Committee of the MPO Board
- **CCC**: TBARTA MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee
- **ITS**: Intelligent Transportation Systems Committee of the MPO Board
- **MPO**: Metropolitan Planning Organization Board
- **POLICY**: Policy Committee of the MPO Board
- **TAC**: Technical Advisory Committee of the MPO Board
- **TDCB**: Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board
- **LRC**: Livable Roadways Committee of the MPO Board
- **TMA**: Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group
- **STWG**: School Transportation Working Group

### Meeting Locations

- (a) BOCC Chambers, County Center, 601 East Kennedy Blvd., 2nd Floor
- (b) Plan Hillsborough Committee Room, County Center, 601 East Kennedy Blvd., 18th Floor
- (c) 26th Floor, Rooms A&B, County Center Building, 601 E. Kennedy Blvd.
- (d) Call (813) 282-8200 or www.tbarta.com for meeting location - TBARTA Office, 4350 W. Cypress St. #700, Tampa
- (e) Planning Commission Boardroom, County Center, 601 East Kennedy Blvd., 18th Floor
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Health in All Policies Resolution and Report

Presenter
Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff

Summary
Good health begins in the places where we live, learn, work and play. Although medical care is critically important, things like the quality of our schools, affordability and stability of our housing, access to good jobs with fair pay, and the safety of our neighborhoods can keep us healthy in the first place. (Robert Woods Johnson Foundation, 2015).

Public health and urban planning are quite interconnected where the urban environment clearly influences the health and wellbeing of individuals. At the beginning of the 20th Century, we learned how a series of issues including industrialization, lack of sanitation, rapid urbanization, inadequate water supplies, waste collection, high levels of pollution and lack of control measures, and inadequate housing for the poor could cause the spread of disease and unhealthy environments. Our understanding of how planning can affect health outcomes has grown to include health impacts such as obesity, asthma, cardiovascular disease and cancer.

Transportation does more than just move us around. Transportation is a critical factor that influences people’s health and the health of a community. Investments in sidewalks, bike lanes, trails, public transit, and other infrastructure that supports physical activity can result in improvements to individuals’ health and decreased health care costs.

Health in All Policies (HiAP) is an approach to planning whereby decision-makers consider how plans and policies will impact human health. Health in All Policies is a collaborative way to connect and integrate health considerations in policies or system practice.

Key HiAP principles include promoting health, equity and sustainability; supporting inter-sectoral collaboration; benefitting multiple partners; engaging stakeholders; and creating structural or procedural change. The Department of Health - Hillsborough County with the Metropolitan Planning Organization and Planning Commission staffs have developed a Transportation and Health Indicators Matrix which highlights agency cross-sectoral alignments.
At the MPO’s direction, the Department of Health, Planning Commission and MPO staff have also prepared a report analyzing the land use and transportation linkage for potential impacts of costs, growth, and other implications of the proposed Resolution.

**Recommended Action**
That the MPO adopt the Health in All Policies Resolution.

**Prepared By**
Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff

**Attachment**
Health in All Policies Resolution and Report
April 11, 2018

Commissioner Les Miller, Chairman
Metropolitan Planning Organization Board
601 E. Kennedy Blvd
Tampa, FL 33602

RE: Transportation and Health

Dear Mr. Miller and Members of the Metropolitan Planning Organization Board:

On behalf of the Florida Department of Health in Hillsborough County, we are thrilled to support the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization’s (MPO) recent work showing the links between transportation and health. Their work reflects a growing recognition that community health depends on all community partners, including partners that influence the physical and built environments in which we live.

The conditions of the places where people live, learn, work, and play that affect overall health are the social determinants of health. These social determinants include transportation factors like air quality, the availability of sidewalks, trails, crosswalks, lighting, public transit, where major and minor corridors are placed, and who has access to them or who is affected by them. In some locations, transportation policies and decisions have had major negative impacts on entire communities, affecting long-term economic opportunities and asset building, which ultimately affects health. Health outcomes that can be affected by transportation decisions include problems like poor mental health, chronic diseases like overweight and obesity, and decreased length of life, among others.

Health in All Policies is a collaborative strategy for improving the health of communities by incorporating health considerations into decision-making across sectors and policy areas. We encourage adoption of the MPO resolution establishing Health in All Policies as an approach to transportation planning. This approach, adopting the resolution, and using the supporting health indicators matrix will help planners prioritize projects that mirror other growth, sustainability, and vibrancy leaders across the country. We welcome the opportunity to continue working with the MPO on Health in All Policies projects to increase the health and livability of Hillsborough County.

Sincerely,

Douglas Holt, M.D.
Director
Florida Department of Health in Hillsborough County
RESOLUTION establishing a Health in All Policies approach to Transportation Planning.

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the designated and constituted body responsible for the transportation planning and programming process for Hillsborough County; and

WHEREAS, the MPO desires to promote, maintain and enhance the livability of unincorporated Hillsborough County, Plant City, Tampa and Temple Terrace; and

WHEREAS, policy, planning and programming decisions made by non-health agencies significantly impact social and environmental factors and health, and can have a disproportionate impact on vulnerable populations; and

WHEREAS, Health in All Policies is a cross-sector collaborative approach that incorporates health into the decision-making process of government agencies; and

WHEREAS, an individual's zip code and conditions in the environment where they live, work, learn and play have a greater impact on an individual's health and quality of life than their genetic code; and

WHEREAS, making community conditions more equitable, including roadway safety and connectivity to resources and public transportation, improves health equity; and

WHEREAS, communities of color, lower income individuals, older adults, persons with disabilities, children at risk and individuals and communities who are pedestrian, bicycle and public transportation-dependent experience higher rates of health disparities, preventable differences in health status and outcomes resulting from social and environmental factors and historic policy decisions; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization seeks to provide transportation system wide choices for all users including motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users, and to make unincorporated Hillsborough County, Plant City, Tampa and Temple Terrace more livable, healthy, and economically robust.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization that:

1. The Hillsborough County MPO will continue to work with the Florida Department of Health in Hillsborough County (DOH-Hillsborough) to implement Health in All Policies strategies taking into account the health impacts of MPO decisions that include but are not limited to chronic and acute health outcomes, mental and physical wellbeing, health behaviors such as physical activity, measures of social cohesion and community connectedness, access to healthcare, employment and educational opportunities and the physical and built environment.

2. The MPO will consider the health outcomes/impacts in the project prioritization process based on the Transportation and Health Indicators Matrix (attached)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO PRIORITY AREA</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>HEALTH PRIORITY AREA</th>
<th>MPO PROGRAM APPLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction/Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Recovery time for critical transportation links after a Category 3 storm</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regional Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Total crashes reduced, fatal crashes reduced, bicycle/pedestrian crashes reduced</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Number street lights installed in high crash corridors</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Number of miles of sidewalk present in high pedestrian crash areas/ complete network</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Pedestrian intersection improvements (example-high visibility crosswalks, ADA compliant sidewalks, median pedestrian refuge and bulb-outs) 1/4 mile from transit stops</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Minimize Congestion</td>
<td>Pedestrian friendly intersections for Communities of Concern</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Minimize Congestion</td>
<td>Population or households adjacent (500 feet) to congested or high-volume roads (30,000 ADT or a volume to capacity ratio of 1.0 or greater)</td>
<td>CD, HE, LHL</td>
<td>Regional Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. System Preservation/Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Span and frequency of transit service</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. System Preservation/Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Highway centerline miles within 1/2 miles of major healthcare (hospitals), recreation (regional parks, entertainment venues), education (universities and colleges)</td>
<td>BH, CD, HE</td>
<td>Regional Scenario; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Investment for Economic Growth/Real Choices</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage to areas of Essential Destinations (map attached)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TIP; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Investment for Economic Growth/Real Choices</td>
<td>Ratio of sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Investment for Economic Growth/Real Choices</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage to behavioral health and chronic disease services</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Miles of sidewalk and trails present within 1/4 mile of populations identified with high rates of behavioral health and chronic disease conditions</td>
<td>AC, IM, BH, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Sidewalk coverage (both side of street) within 1/4 mile of transit stops</td>
<td>LHL, HE</td>
<td>LRTP; TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Sidewalk coverage (both side of street) for block groups within 1/4 mile of restorative and social activities, e.g. parks, recreation, and community centers</td>
<td>LHL, CD, BH, HE</td>
<td>Regional Scenario; TIP; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Transit service route miles within 1/4 miles of high proportion of elderly population (over 500 per square mile)</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>LRTP; TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Percent of Environmental Justice population living within 1/4 mile of a trail/side path</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regional Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage within designated USDA Food Deserts</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Percent of Community of Concern population living within 1/4 mile of transit service (map attached)</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP; LRTP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AC- Access to Care; BH- Behavioral Health; CD- Chronic Disease; HE- Health Equity; LHL- Long Healthy Life; IM- Infant Death
DRAFT 4/16/17
Center for Urban Transportation Research (2016) - Evaluating the Distributional Effects of Regional Transportation Plans and Projects
Health in All Policies Resolution Report

INTRODUCTION

This report is in response to two motions made by first, the Policy Committee and second by the MPO Board.

1. Motion: Councilman Cohen moved to request staff work with the Health Department to research and draft health in all policies resolution, seconded by Commissioner Murman. After remarks, the motion carried five to zero. (POLICY COMMITTEE- 8/30/16)

2. After sharing potential capital/operating concerns and wanting to see municipal/County/PC feedback, Commissioner White moved to send that to the County administration, the administration of the three municipalities, and the PC, to look at the land use and transportation linkage for potential impacts of costs, growth, and any other implications, and have that resolution come back accompanied by a report on that review for the MPO’s consideration at that time, seconded by Commissioner Kemp, and carried eleven to zero. (MPO BOARD- 5/01/18)

CONTEXT

Good health begins in the places where we live, learn, work and play. Although medical care is critically important, things like the quality of our schools, affordability and stability our housing, access to good jobs with fair pay, and the safety of our neighborhoods can keep us healthy in the first place. (Robert Woods Johnson Foundation, 2015).

Public health and urban planning are quite interconnected where the urban environment clearly influences the health and wellbeing of individuals. At the beginning of the 20th Century, we learned how a series of issues including industrialization, lack of sanitation, rapid urbanization, inadequate water supplies, waste collection, high levels of pollution and lack of control measures, and inadequate housing for the poor could cause the spread of disease and unhealthy environments (Kenzer, 2000). Our understanding of how planning can affect health outcomes has grown to include health impacts such as obesity, asthma, cardiovascular disease and cancer.

Health in All Policies (HiAP) is an approach to planning whereby decision-makers consider how plans and policies will impact human health. Key HiAP principles include promoting health, equity and sustainability; supporting inter-sectoral collaboration; benefitting multiple partners; engaging stakeholders; and creating structural or procedural change (Rudolph, Caplan, Ben-Moshe, & Dillon, 2013). The Department of Health - Hillsborough County with the Metropolitan Planning Organization and Planning Commission staffs have developed a health priorities matrix which highlights agency cross-sectoral alignments from ongoing HiAP work.

DEFINITIONS:

Public Health is the science of increasing the health and safety of communities through education, policy making and research for disease and injury prevention.
Health in All Policies is a collaborative way to connect and integrate health considerations in policies or system practice.

Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.

Transportation does more than just move us around. Transportation is a critical factor that influences people’s health and the health of a community. Investments in sidewalks, bike lanes, trails, public transit, and other infrastructure that supports physical activity can result in improvements to individuals’ health and decreased health care costs.

SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH:
Social determinants of health are conditions in the environments in which people are born, live, learn, work, play, worship, and age that affect a wide range of health, functioning, and quality-of-life outcomes and risks. By working to establish policies that positively influence social and economic conditions and those that support changes in individual behavior, we can improve health for large numbers of people in ways that can be sustained over time. Improving the conditions in which we live, learn, work, and play and the quality of our relationships will create a healthier population, society, and workforce.

THE PROBLEM - TRANSPORTATION’S IMPACT ON HEALTH:
The Hillsborough County Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan reports that nearly 1/3 of the population of Hillsborough County is Transportation Disadvantaged (TD). 'Transportation disadvantaged' means those persons who because of physical or mental disability, income status, or age are unable to transport themselves or to purchase transportation and are, therefore, dependent upon others to obtain access to health care, employment, education, shopping, social activities, or other life-sustaining activities, or children who are handicapped or high-risk or at-risk as defined in Florida Statute 411.202."

Transportation systems can provide access to physical activity opportunities, improve safety, lower emotional stress, link poor people to opportunity, connect isolated disabled and older Americans to crucial services and social supports and stimulate economic development.

Elderly and disabled populations drive less and therefore must rely more on other transportation options to get around: More than 1 in 5 Americans age 65 and older do not drive. More than 50% of elderly non-drivers (3.6 million Americans) stay home on any given day in part due to lack of transportation options and more than half of this group (1.9 million) is disabled. Older non-drivers take 15% fewer trips to the doctor; 59% fewer trips to shops and restaurants; and 65%
fewer trips for family, social and religious activities than their counterparts who drive. (CITYLAB- Older People Will Need Much Better Transit, August 2017)

- Transportation costs create a barrier for many: U.S. households earning $20,000 to $35,000 and living far from employment centers, spend approximately 37% of their income on transportation, while the average U.S. household spends about 18% of its income on transportation. The more a household spends on transportation, the less it has left over for food, medical expenses, childcare, housing and other essential costs. (AARP- Waiting for a Ride: Transit and America’s Aging Population, 2011)

In Hillsborough County the concentrations of residents living in households with no vehicles are in areas greater than the median (5 percent), those that are one standard deviation above the median (15 percent), and those that are two standard deviations above the median (26 percent).

The Hillsborough County Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan reports that the lack of continuous sidewalks and bicycle facilities impact a TD individual’s ability to navigate transportation corridors in a comfortable and safe manner. Issues that impact comfortable and safe travel include:

- Overall access impacted by poles, benches, or other elements blocking the clear space on sidewalks, especially for persons who make use of wheelchairs, scooters, or other mobility aids.
- Varying widths of sidewalks and bike lanes
- Incomplete sidewalk systems and bicycle facility network.
- The mismatch of sidewalks, bike lanes, and transit stops.
- Problematic intersections due to:
  - High traffic volume,
  - Large number of turning movements at an intersection’
  - Lack of pedestrian signalization

These factors are barriers to pedestrian and bicyclist safety and put an undue stress on the TD population. These barriers were confirmed as a result of the 2016 TDSP Human Services Transportation Survey and Forum. Eighty percent of the respondents said that their clients walk and 60 percent of the respondents stated that their clients bike. It is known that every fixed-route transit rider is either a pedestrian or a bicyclist at the beginning and end of each trip. Lack
It is well established that physical activity promotes longevity and is beneficial for health (CDC, 2011; CDC, 2015b; American Heart Association [AHA], 2015). Access to an active living system can improve a community’s health through promoting physical activity and recreational activity while reducing poor health outcomes. An active living system that is used for commuting can help to reduce cardiovascular risk by 11%, increase daily steps, and increase time spent walking (American Public Health Association, 2010). Researchers have correlated communities that report higher rates of walking and cycling to work with more daily physical activity and lower rates of obesity and diabetes (Pucher, Buehler, Bassett, & Dannenberg, 2010). Cycling and walking have been recognized as an important means to promote health since they are the most common forms of physical activity as well as active transport. An increase of one-hundred minutes of cycling per week, reduces the mortality risk by 10% when compared to non-cyclists (Schepers et al., 2015). An increase of one-hundred and sixty-eight minutes of walking per week, reduces the risk of early mortality by approximately 11% (Schepers et al., 2015).

Providing safe streets for all users is an important component of a healthy and economically vibrant community. Pedestrian and bicycling infrastructure improvements (such as wayfinding, crosswalk improvements, wider sidewalks, lighting) to connect to transit and transit-oriented development can provide large but often overlooked health benefits. Studies have shown that 43 percent of people with safe places to walk within ten minutes of home achieve their daily physical activity targets, compared to just 27 percent for residents of less walkable areas achieving physical activity targets. (Littman, 2010).

Transit supportive infrastructure improvements can be achieved with the implementation of Complete Streets policies. Complete Streets is a set of policies and planning practices intended to ensure that roadways accommodate all users and uses including walking, cycling, transit and automobile travel. Complete Streets are designed with its community context- in a rural setting a Complete Street will look much different than a Complete Street in an urban setting.
Roadways traditionally have been designed primarily for motor vehicles. A personal vehicle-centric design approach potentially could pose barriers to use by pedestrians, bicyclists and public transportation users, thus limiting active transportation opportunities and potential resulting health benefits. Complete Streets policies can support planners and engineers in developing roadway designs that improve the safety of all users and provide additional opportunities for physical activity from transportation. The connections between physical activity and public health have been widely documented. Research suggests that physically active adults “have lower rates of all-cause mortality, coronary heart disease, high blood pressure, stroke, type 2 diabetes, metabolic syndrome, colon cancer, breast cancer, and depression” than their physically inactive peers (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1996). Active transportation, or trips made by walking or bicycling, was identified by Healthy People 2020 as a target for measuring progress for healthier people (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2010). Additionally, Healthy People 2020 listed “increased legislative policies for the built environment that enhance access to and availability of physical activity opportunities” as a specific travel and transportation policy.

Active transportation and physical activity is more likely to occur in places with a variety of land uses, a comprehensive network of pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation facilities, inviting street design for all users, and safety measures; and Complete Streets policies address all four of those factors (Fenton, 2012). Complete Streets also promote increased roadway connectivity, which has been shown to reduce VMT per capita (Moreland-Russell et al., 2013), and they have been found to improve safety and mobility for pedestrians and bicyclists (U.S. DOT, 2010; Handy, Tal, Boarnet, 2010).

Shifts towards using Complete Streets provide a measure of how approaches to planning and engineering are shifting over time. The focus of road design is no longer about auto-mobility but creating an overall network that serves all users (LaPlante, McCann, 2011). Complete Street policies are a component of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) transportation recommendations. Complete Streets can enhance physical activity and reduce injury. Setting a Complete Streets policy in place is a foundational step towards improving infrastructure by providing accessible, safe, and connected roadways (CDC, 2010).

A recent survey of implemented Complete Street policies suggests this type of strategy is applicable to communities that vary in geography and socio-demographic factors (Marshall, Garrick, 2011), which suggests that it can be a useful tool for various regions. Complete Streets strategies include retrofitting existing arterials to accommodate multi-modal users or building new facilities that support multi-modal transportation and complementary roadside uses. Complete Streets elements may include pedestrian and bicyclist accommodations, public transportation access, accommodations for persons with disabilities, landscape elements, and traffic calming. Controlling and reducing vehicular speed can be done through reducing the number of lanes, adding curb parking, or installing raised medians (LaPlante, McCann, 2011). Decision makers can search the National Complete Streets Coalition Policy Atlas for model language and for other assistance in developing Complete Streets policies. This is an opportunity for health and transportation professionals to work with advocates and decision makers in setting
forth policy strategies to shape the future of land use, growth, and development in ways that encourage use of alternate modes and opportunities for physical activity from transportation, while enhancing safety for all users. Enhanced health and safety of the broader population is tightly connected with the built environment and small steps now can lead to significant benefits in the future. (FHWA)

**HEALTH INDICATORS:**
A growing body of scientific evidence has shown that the built environment can have significant effects on both physical and mental health, particularly among minority and low-income populations already burdened with disproportionate rates of illness and morbidity. The combination of lack of infrastructure (e.g., sidewalks, bike paths, and parks), affordable housing, and supermarkets with access to healthy food increases the risks of both physical and mental illnesses.

The conditions of the place where people live, learn, work and play that affect overall health are the determinants of health. These social determinants include transportation factors like air quality, the availability of sidewalks, trails, crosswalks, lighting, public transit, where major and minor corridors are placed, and who has access to them or is affected by them. In some locations, transportation polices, and decisions have had major negative impacts on entire communities, affecting long term economic opportunities and asset building, which ultimately affects health. Health outcomes that can be affected by transportation decisions include problems like poor mental health, chronic diseases like overweight and obesity, and decreases length of life.

Health data can provide a picture of current health conditions, trends and disparities within any community. This information can help inform planners and community leaders on the best ‘infrastructure’ solutions for their communities and can allow them to track how changes to the built environment are helping or harming their communities.

In 2017, the Hillsborough County MPO created a Health Atlas web-based mapping tool to provide a baseline context of health and health-related indicators within Hillsborough County as well as to visualize the interconnectedness of health, transportation, economic development, and the environment.

The catalyst for the Health Atlas is the MPO’s involvement in the Healthiest Cities & Counties Challenge. The Challenge is a partnership between the Aetna Foundation, the American Public Health Association and the National Association of Counties. The partnership has “challenged” 50 cities and counties to create a positive health
impact through a small seed money grant. Hillsborough County’s Challenge project is called Garden Steps; the purpose being to establish community gardens in food deserts within Tampa, as a case study, evaluating transportation conditions surrounding sites.

The Health Atlas provides a baseline profile for obesity and chronic illness such as asthma, cardiovascular disease, and diabetes within Tampa neighborhoods, as well as demographic, transportation, health care access, food environment, emergency preparedness, and environmental indicators which span Hillsborough County. Health practitioners report that in the United States, chronic diseases such as diabetes and cardiovascular disease, are on the rise. The built environment has become an important aspect of health-promotion strategies. Health is viewed as not merely the absence of disease or infirmity, but also includes “a state of physical, mental, and social well-being”. Well planned and designed transportation investments can go beyond a primary purpose of moving people to positively influencing the future health of communities and the residents, workers, and businesses.

Ingredients of our HiAP also include aging, disability, safety and access to jobs, schools, health care, healthy food and recreation.

THE HEALTH IN ALL POLICIES MATRIX:
As part of this process, Hillsborough MPO staff worked with partners at FDOH – Hillsborough to determine a list of indicators to monitor the performance of our transportation system with regard to health outcomes and supporting healthy behaviors. This was accomplished through the comparison of FDOH – Hillsborough’s Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) and the priorities outlined in the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

In coordination with the performance measures in the 2040 LRTP, the TIP Priorities consider candidate projects that fall into one of the five investment programs, ranked in the following order per criteria established in the LRTP:

1. Preserve the System, including projects such as:
   a. Bridge repair & replacement
   b. Road resurfacing
   c. Transit vehicle replacement
2. Reduce Crashes & Vulnerability, including safety and resilience projects evaluated by their effect on:
   a. Total, fatal & bike/ped crashes
   b. Recovery time & economic impacts from flooding or major storm surge
3. Manage Congestion for Drivers & Shippers, including intersection, signalization, freeway incident management and ITS projects, evaluated by their impact on:
   a. Travel time reliability on heavily congested arterials
   b. Peak period V/C ratio
4. Real Choices When Not Driving, including alternatives such as transit, multi-use trails and services for the transportation disadvantaged, evaluated by:
   a. Density of jobs and population in 2040 within ¼ mile of proposed transit service
   b. Density of jobs and population in 2040 within ¼ mile of proposed trail/sidepath

5. Major infrastructure improvements, including road and transit capacity projects for economic growth:
   a. Key economic spaces (job clusters > 5,000)
   b. 2040 jobs served per mile of improvement
   c. 2040 delay reduced per mile of improvement

To ensure continuity with previous priorities, any project already programmed for construction funding is given priority over new candidates for funding.

The TIP also incorporates projects prioritized by the Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area (TMA, which includes the Hillsborough, Pasco and Pinellas MPOs) Leadership Group and the TBARTA CCC for inclusion in the 2040 Regional LRTP. It also includes priority projects for the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) authorized through state legislation.

The CHIP includes the six major health concerns for the county, which are:
- Access to Care
- Behavioral Health
- Chronic Diseases
- Health Equity
- Long Healthy Life
- Infant Death.

Where these priorities intersected, staff looked at models in other communities to track performance, then compared those to existing data sources available in Hillsborough County. Staff then narrowed that larger list of indicators to those that most directly impact health outcomes and where data is readily available. The result is a list of 19 indicators/performance measures. These will be tracked over time to measure the performance of transportation investments as related to the health of the community.

The measures were chosen to represent a wide cross section of the importance of transportation in health outcomes, including vulnerability to natural disasters, vehicle crashes, walkability, access to care, access to daily needs, access for vulnerable populations, and safety. These measures also include the MPO priority areas as well as in the application to the MPO’s plans and programs.
HEALTH AUDIT:

For its LRTP update, scheduled for completion in 2019, the Hillsborough MPO and Health Department staffs are interested in expanding its approach to identifying and addressing the transportation needs of the Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) in the region. The MPO staff, through their previous planning and public involvement efforts, indicated a need for a greater variety of analysis measures and methods to better define and locate TD and Community of Concern groups (COCs), as well as accessibility of pedestrians, cyclists and transit-users to jobs and services. A Community of Concern is a census block group that has a high proportion of two or more protected classes, such as racial minorities, low-income groups, persons with disabilities, and those with limited English proficiency. The MPO further indicated interest in methods to evaluate public health, safety and the distributional equity of investments.

To begin, we needed to know how do existing planning documents perform when viewed through a health lens? To answer this question, we analyzed three Imagine 2040 documents: Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Projects Prioritized for Funding, and the FY 19-23

**Table:** Transportation and Health Indicators Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO PRIORITY AREA</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>HEALTH PRIORITY AREA*</th>
<th>MPO PROGRAM APPLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction/ Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Recovery time for critical transportation links after a Category 3 storm</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Total crashes reduced, fatal crashes reduced, bicycle/pedestrian crashes reduced</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Number of miles of sidewalk installed in high crash corridors</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Number of miles of sidewalk present in high pedestrian crash areas/ complete network</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Pedestrian intersection improvements (example-high visibility crosswalks, ADA-compliant sidewalks, median pedestrian refuge and bulb-outs) 1/4 mile from transit stops</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Minimize Congestion</td>
<td>Pedestrian friendly intersections for Communities of Concern</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Minimize Congestion</td>
<td>Population or households adjacent (500 feet) to congested or high-volume roads (30,000 AADT or a volume to capacity ratio of 1.0 or greater)</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. System Preservation/Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Span and frequency of transit service</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. System Preservation/Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Highway centerline miles within 1/2 miles of major healthcare (hospitals), recreation (regional parks, entertainment venues), education (universities and colleges)</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Investment for Economic Growth/Real_choices</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage to areas of Essential Destinations (map attached)</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Investment for Economic Growth/Real_choices</td>
<td>Ratio of sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Investment for Economic Growth/Real_choices</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage to behavioral health and chronic disease services</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Miles of sidewalk and trails present within 1/4 mile of populations identified with high rates of behavioral health and chronic disease conditions</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Sidewalk coverage (both side of street) within 1/4 mile of transit stops</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Sidewalk coverage (both side of street) for block groups within 1/4 mile of restorative and social activities, e.g. parks, recreation, and community centers</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Transit service route miles within 1/4 miles of high proportion of elderly population (over 500 per square mile)</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Percent of Environmental Justice population living within 1/4 mile of a walkable neighborhood</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage within designated USDA Food Deserts</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Percent of Community of Concern population living within 1/4 mile of transit service (map attached)</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AC: Access to Care; BH: Behavioral Health; CD: Chronic Disease; HE: Health Equity; LHL: Long Healthy Life; IM: Infant Death
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Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). They were examined for how they addressed health concerns. As we pursue a Health in all Policies through transportation planning approach, this information is a baseline for measuring progress.

**Key Findings:**

**TIP:** Over $400 million will be spent in the next five years to support healthy behaviors. Over the next five years, dollars will continue to be spent to improve walking, biking. Local and state governments are implementing projects to improve safety, increase access and mobility, maintain air quality standards and promote economic development. These funds will increase walking, biking, and transit opportunities.

**Analysis of Existing Priorities Funded for Construction** shows that jurisdictions are submitting projects that increase opportunities to walk, bike, or use transit. 41 of the 54 projects advanced from the LRTP in 2018/2019 supported one or more health indicators. **HART** continues to plan for an expanded, reliable and frequent public transit system. In the current TIP, we spend $420 million on transit, which is 9.7% of total funding. To determine money spent on the transit components in the TIP, projects with a transit component were selected, including those for capital purchases, maintenance, operations, equipment, pilot projects, vanpools, and administration. This amount was then divided by the total money allocated in the TIP for all funding.

To determine funding with a pedestrian or cycling component, all projects with a pedestrian or cycling component were selected. These include trails, sidewalk programs, bridge replacements with a pedestrian or cycling component, new roads incorporating cycling and pedestrians, roadway expansions that will include multimodal facilities, enhancements to existing multimodal facilities, traffic calming projects, complete streets projects, ADA projects, and intersection projects with a pedestrian safety component. This list includes all phases of a project including, planning, engineering, design, and construction. The total was then divided by the overall TIP funding.

This study provides the MPO with potential methods and measures for identifying COCs and more systematically monitoring the long-term impacts of the regional plan and projects, using indicators related to affordability, accessibility and safety. Results of the study were presented to various MPO committees and the MPO Board to help inform future planning efforts.
Local Agency Capital Improvements

The Hillsborough MPO is now using this equity analysis to screen TIP projects for impacts and benefits to COCs. In particular, the MPO is identifying areas with low access to food and other services, such as healthcare, and using additional tools, such as health impact assessments, to prioritize projects to help COCs facing these challenges. The 2045 update to the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan and Title VI plan will include details from, and expansion of, this equity analysis. Other projects include a recently concluded Transportation Disadvantaged Summit, which brought together providers and recipients to discuss transportation disadvantaged needs.

PROJECT EVALUATION:
As an example of how this might be used in the prioritization of projects for funding in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), staff has applied the health indicators matrix performance measures to two projects already funded in the TIP. While this is not intended to replace the existing TIPP prioritization process, it can help identify projects that have health benefits.

Sulphur Springs Elementary Safe Routes to School
The Sulphur Springs Elementary Safe Routes to School project identifies a number of elements including high visibility crosswalks and filling sidewalk gaps around the school, which is also in an area of high chronic disease and has been identified as a Community of Concern. Applying the indicators in the Health Matrix to this project, the following indicators are met:

- Indicator 2 – Total crashes reduced
- Indicator 4 – Number of miles of sidewalk present
- Indicator 5 – Pedestrian Intersection Improvements
- Indicator 6 – Pedestrian friendly intersections for COCs
• Indicator 11 – Ratio of Sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area
• Indicator 13 – Miles of sidewalk present within ¼ miles of populations with high rates of chronic health conditions
• Indicator 14 – Sidewalk coverage within ¼ mile of transit stops
• Indicator 15 – Sidewalk coverage for block groups within ¼ mile of restorative and social activities
• Indicator 18 – Sidewalk coverage within designated food deserts

This total of 9 out of 19 measures could then be compared against other projects to determine which may have the greatest health benefits for the community.

Morris Bridge Road
This project is proposed to add paved shoulders, sidewalks, and a multi-use trail to connect existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities north and south of the project. It also offers safety improvements for all users including motorists and can improve active transportation options, thereby helping in the reduction of chronic diseases in the long-term. In this case, the following indicators are met:
• Indicator 2 – Total crashes reduced
• Indicator 4 – Miles of sidewalk present
• Indicator 5 – Pedestrian Intersection Improvements
• Indicator 11 – Ratio of sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area

With four out of 19 measures met, this project could be helped in prioritization by its performance on the health indicators.

LAND USE:
Transportation and land use are significant factors in the built environment that affect (a) rates of injury and death caused by traffic crashes, (b) ease and safety of physical activity, (c) air quality, (d) greenhouse gas emissions, and (e) access to key community resources such as health care and healthy food. Land-use policies pertain not only to the movement of people but also to the movement of freight and goods from ships through ports and on trucks and trains, which affects communities and workers across the country.

The FDOH staff has considered a pilot assessment for how the Tampa Comprehensive Plan (TCP) addresses health. The comprehensive plan is a locally adopted document designed to guide the future actions of a jurisdiction. It presents a vision for the future, with long-range goals, objectives and policies for all activities that affect the local government. This includes guidance on how to make decisions on public and private land development proposals. Plans are written to provide direction for future activities over a 20-year period after plan adoption.
The ChangeLab Solutions’ framework was ultimately chosen to evaluate the TCP. The Healthy Comprehensive Plan Assessment Tool (HCPAT) calls for utilizing keyword searches, within four health related domains: (1) Complete Streets, (2) Complete Neighborhoods, (3) Healthy Food Systems, and (4) Environmental Health. The FDOH staff also decided to compare the TCP to the Orlando Growth Management Plan (OGMP) as Orlando is a municipality similar in size and demographics to Tampa. The OGMP is also similarly structured with no stand-alone health element and containing approximately 600 pages and over 1,000 GOPs.

For the evaluation, two searches were conducted. The initial search identified goals, objectives and policies that contained key terms associated with the CLS health related domains. Additionally, OHE staff proposed additional terms to include in the initial search. Terms that were added by OHE staff were taken from the HiAP matrix developed during collaborative efforts between the MPO and DOH-Hillsborough previously, and relate specifically to transportation and local health priorities. The search was conducted on both the TCP and the OGMP. Terms used in the initial search from the CLS domains are included.

From this quantitative analysis, it is evident the TCP addresses health and substantiates the qualitative-findings made by Planning Commission staff earlier in 2018. Nevertheless, with the TCP format, readers are left to infer the priority of health within the plan, since it is dispersed in bits and pieces and not discussed directly as an over-arching theme or element. While it may be that integrating health throughout the TCP, as it is currently written, is preferable to authoring a stand-alone element, this format does make assessing the plan for the inclusion of health challenging. And, while certainly more is better than less, there are no established benchmarks or standards to guide planners and public health professionals on a sufficient number or ratio of health-related terms and references that are needed to address health within a plan.

In considering the TCP’s potential utility in impacting health within the community the authors conclude that it is not possible without additional methods of measurement. Other comprehensive plan analyses have performed similar quantitative assessments in the past and have noted the need for tracking effectiveness, plan performance, plan conformance, or impact over time as the true measure of a valuable comprehensive plan (Berke, Spurlock, Hes, & Band, 2013; Feitelson, Felsenstein, Razin, & Stern, 2017; Frew, Baker, & Donehue, 2016). Specifically, without understanding baseline health benchmarks or developing measurable goals, a comprehensive plan can have no real ability to deliver on its healthy vision.

In 2017 the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) released its Context Classification system. The context classification system broadly identifies the various built environments existing in Florida. FDOT’s context classification system describes the general characteristics of the land use, development patterns, and roadway connectivity along a roadway, providing cues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. List of Search Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle/Bike/Bicycling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brownfield</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connect/Connectivity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emission</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Essential Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farm</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Terms included by OHE staff**
as to the types of uses and user groups that will likely utilize the roadway. The context classification of a roadway will inform FDOT’s planning, PD&E, design, construction, and maintenance approaches to ensure that state roadways are supportive of safe and comfortable travel for their anticipated users. Identifying the context classification is a step-in planning and design, as different context classifications will have different design criteria and standards.

The context classification system supports in developing roadway designs that improve the safety of all users and provide additional opportunities for physical activity from transportation. The connections between physical activity and public health have been widely documented. Research suggests that physically active adults “have lower rates of all-cause mortality, coronary heart disease, high blood pressure, stroke, type 2 diabetes, metabolic syndrome, colon cancer, breast cancer, and depression” than their physically inactive peers (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1996).

COSTS & ECONOMIC IMPACTS:
In 2011, the American Heart Association (AHA) published a review of more than 200 studies and concluded that most cardiovascular disease can be prevented or at least delayed until old age through a combination of direct medical care and community-based prevention programs and policies. Some of the key findings included:

- Every $1 spent on building biking trails and walking paths could save approximately $3 in medical expenses.
- For every $1 spent in wellness programs, companies could save $3.27 in medical costs and $2.73 in absenteeism costs.
- Some interventions have been shown to help improve nutrition and activity habits in just one year and had a return of $1.17 for every $1 spent.
- Participants in community-based programs who focused on improving nutrition and increasing physical activity had a 58 percent reduction in incidence of type 2 diabetes compared with drug therapy, which had a 31 percent reduction.

The Trust for America’s Health (TFAH) and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) and conducted by the National Heart Forum (NHF) found that if Florida could reduce the average body mass index (BMI) of its residents by only 5 percent, the state could help prevent thousands of cases of type 2 diabetes, coronary heart disease and stroke, hypertension, cancer and arthritis, while saving millions of dollars. BMI, is used as a screening tool for overweight or obesity.
FDOT, Hillsborough County, its cities, and HART already spend considerable amounts on achieving positive health outcomes.

While walk/bike improvements are represented in the charts above as small percentages, other categories also go toward improving mobility for nonmotorized users. For example, Hillsborough County is installing modern cycling facilities such as separated trails, bike lanes with innovative intersection treatments, and sidewalks as they widen roads or extend new roads.

The City of Tampa has passed a Complete Streets policy where, as roads are resurfaced, they are evaluated for whether there is room to add bike lanes or other facilities that would benefit cyclists and pedestrians.

Even funds for bridges can contribute to these efforts, as Hillsborough County plans to add a trail with the reconstruction of the Maydell Bridge and FDOT has committed to the addition of a trail along the Howard Frankland Bridge when it is reconstructed in the coming years.

To summarize, the charts above contain greater walk/bike improvements than are documented specifically in those categories. Additional facilities are constructed using funds from the road widening, bridges and maintenance, and intersections/interchanges categories. These collectively make up 28.55% of the local agency capital improvements and 44.66% if the FDOT work program. That does not mean that nearly half of the funds spent by FDOT go toward nonmotorized improvements, but it does show a higher level of investment than the 0.77% that is identified in the FDOT work program for walk/bike improvements.

**GROWTH:**
Hillsborough County is projected to add another 1 million new residents by 2045. Robert Woods 2017 report on obesity rates shows that Florida’s rate is 27.4. The rate has been growing, and as the population grows, the trend may continue if not addressed. To accelerate progress in addressing obesity, the Trust for America’s Health (TFAH) and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation urge policymakers to:

- **Invest in community-based policies and programs**, including nutrition assistance programs such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and **transportation**, housing, and community development policies and programs that support **physical activity**.

Physical activity helps people reduce or maintain their BMI and could help prevent thousands of cases of type 2 diabetes, coronary heart disease and stroke, hypertension, cancer and arthritis, while saving millions of dollars. Our current health outlook has been examined and moving forward, well planned and designed transportation investments can go beyond a primary purpose of moving people to positively influencing the growth of future health of communities for residents, workers, and businesses.
MOVING FORWARD.
Currently, projects in the TIP are prioritized based on the 2040 Long Range Plan performance measures:

Priorities for the TIP were developed by drawing on the extensive prioritization of the County’s transportation needs defined in the Long Range Transportation Plan (known as the Imagine 2040 Plan). Prior to establishing priorities for all new projects, on-going projects - such as road projects where Right-of-Way had been acquired - were moved to the top of the priority list to ensure continuity in the project priorities and implementation. Consistent with FAST Act, projects are selected based on their ability to meet key performance measures identified in the Imagine 2040 Plan. These measures address system preservation, reducing crashes and vulnerability, minimizing traffic for drivers and shippers, providing real choices when not driving, and making investments for economic growth. These investments fund major highway reconstruction, arterial roadway and intersection improvements, maintenance and expansion of the public transit system, bicycle path construction, and improvements for pedestrians.

Active transportation is any self-propelled, human-powered mode of transportation, such as walking or bicycling. The Center for Disease Control reports that physical inactivity is a major contributor to the steady rise in rates of obesity, diabetes, heart disease, stroke, and other chronic health conditions in the United States. Many Americans view walking and bicycling within their communities as unsafe due to heavy traffic and a scarcity of sidewalks, crosswalks, and bicycle facilities. Improving these elements could encourage active transportation such as children biking to school or employees walking to work. Safe and convenient opportunities for physically active travel also expand access to transportation networks for people without cars, while also spurring investment in infrastructure to increase the comfort of the on-road experience to improve the appeal of active modes to all people. (Center for Disease Control, Transportation Health Impact Assessment Toolkit)

Regardless of their abilities, people need the ability to travel, whether for work, school, medical care and other social services, as well as to shop, visit family and friends, and otherwise pursue life’s needs and interests. Many low income or persons with a disability, including retired military, rely on public transit for these needs. The need for improved mobility for these special population groups is particularly apparent in rural and exurban areas where distances are greater, and where fixed-route bus service is limited or unavailable.
Including public health metrics in a transportation planning framework is a way to consider the health co-benefits from transportation projects. Public health performance metrics can become indicators not only of the co-benefits but of the intrinsic benefits of transportation projects. Just as transportation projects are evaluated for congestion relief, the evaluation of projects in terms of the physical activity stimulated can also be evaluated.

With the help of public health professionals, a health lens has been developed for transportation investments similar to other health interventions, to quantify how the investment helps achieve the desired health outcome. Possible considerations include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Does the project help improve recovery time for critical transportation links after a Category 3 storm?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Does the project help to reduce severe crashes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Does the project increase the number of street lights installed in high crash corridors?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Does the project increase the number of miles of sidewalk present in high pedestrian crash areas/complete network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Does the project include pedestrian intersection improvements (example-high visibility crosswalks, ADA compliant sidewalks, median pedestrian refuge and bulb-outs) 1/4 mile from transit stops?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Does the project include pedestrian friendly intersections within Communities of Concern?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Does the project reduce the population or households adjacent (500 feet) to congested or high-volume roads (30,000 ADT or a volume to capacity ratio of 1.0 or greater)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> Does the project increase the span and/or frequency of transit service?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> Does the project increase highway centerline miles within 1/2 miles of major healthcare (hospitals), recreation (regional parks, entertainment venues), education (universities and colleges)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong> Does the project improve transit and/or sidewalk coverage to areas of Essential Destinations (map attached)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong> Does the project increase the ratio of sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong> Does the project increase transit and/or sidewalk coverage to behavioral health and chronic disease services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong> Does the project increase the number of miles of sidewalk and trails present within 1/4 mile of populations identified with high rates of behavioral health and chronic disease conditions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong> Does the project increase sidewalk coverage (both sides of street) within 1/4 mile of transit stops?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Does the project increase sidewalk coverage (both side of street) for block groups within 1/4 mile of restorative and social activities, e.g. parks, recreation, and community centers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Does the project increase transit service route miles within 1/4 miles of high proportion of elderly population (over 500 per square mile)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Does the project increase the percentage of Environmental Justice population living within 1/4 mile of a trail/side path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Does the project increase transit and/or sidewalk coverage within designated USDA Food Deserts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Does the project increase the percentage of the Community of Concern population living within 1/4 mile of transit service (map attached)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NUMBER OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES ADDRESSED**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION:**

There is a rapidly growing awareness of both the positive and negative links between current transportation behavior and public health. Collaboration between transportation and public health officials is pointing towards the significant aggregate and individual benefits that can result from transportation policies that promote active transportation, reduce mobile source pollutant emissions, and improve safety for travelers.

- Local governments are implementing projects that do support good health outcomes.
- Complete Streets projects improve safety, increase access and mobility, maintain air quality standards and promote economic development.
- Every $1 spent on building biking trails and walking paths/sidewalks could save approximately $3 in medical expenses.
- The inclusion of a Health Lens would be an additional factor that would indicate our continued support of the health benefits our transportation system has to all people in Hillsborough County.
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Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
EcoDistricts

**Presenter**
Sean Baraoidan, Real Building Consultants

**Summary**
EcoDistricts is a trademarked, comprehensive strategy to accelerate sustainable development at the neighborhood scale by integrating building and infrastructure projects with community and individual action. They are an important scale to accelerate sustainability — small enough to innovate quickly and big enough to have a meaningful impact.

District-scale projects, such as district energy, green streets, smart grid, demand management and resource sharing, are well known. However, the widespread deployment of these strategies has been slow to develop due to a lack of comprehensive policy or implementation frameworks at the municipal level.

EcoDistricts (formerly Portland Sustainability Institute) launched in 2009 as an initiative to help cities remove these implementation barriers and create an enabling strategy to accelerate neighborhood-scale sustainability. Success requires a comprehensive approach that includes active community participation, assessment, new forms of capital and public policy support.

EcoDistricts can be found in metropolises such as Audubon Park Garden District in Orlando, Florida and Midtown Atlanta, Georgia.

**Recommended Action**
For discussion and comment.

**Prepared By**
Michele Ogilvie, MPO staff

**Attachments**
None
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Heights Mobility Study

**Presenter**
Stephen Benson, FDOT District 7

**Summary**
The Heights Mobility Study is an effort to improve safety and mobility in the Greater Seminole Heights/Tampa Heights area, especially, along the Florida Avenue and Tampa Street/Highland Avenue corridor between downtown Tampa and the Hillsborough River. Additionally, the Study Team will work with the community to develop a long-term vision for transportation improvements in the area. The study objectives, schedule and ways to get involved will be discussed.

**Recommended Action**
None. For information only.

**Prepared By**
Gena Torres, MPO staff

**Attachments**
Visit Heights Mobility Study website for more information.
CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & INVOCATION

Chairman Les Miller called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m., led the Pledge of Allegiance and gave the invocation. The meeting was convened on the 26th floor of the County Center.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – September 5, 2018

A motion was made by Commissioner Sandra Murman to approve the September minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilman Guido Maniscalco and carried unanimously.

Commissioner Miller read for the record a memo from Councilman Luis Viera stating that he was unable to attend due to a conflict.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Gary Cloyd, transit advocate, spoke regarding the Westshore Action Plan, the three transit initiatives, and thanked elected officials for their advocacy as projects move forward.

Mr. Jim Davison commented on the response that the MPO provided to his presentation last month on the comparison of the All for Transportation Petition Category Funding versus the Hillsborough County MPO 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Category Funding. Mr. Davison provided several handouts regarding funding scenarios and studies.

Ms. Charlotte Greenberg provided comments on the MPO’s 2045 Plan survey and stated that the MPO should distance itself from the rail tax. She expressed concerns if the proposal passes. She stated voters will see a basket full of empty promises that will never take place. Rail will eat up all of the money and there will not be enough money for operating expenses.

Ms. Sharon Calvert, with Fix Our Roads First, commented on the 2040 LRTP, and the 1% Surtax to fund transportation improvements. She stated that the proposal does not include new technology, and it is a requirement by both State and Federal Agencies. She expressed concerns regarding a presentation that MPO Executive Director, Beth Alden, made at the Tampa City Council. She felt that the presented information was misleading, and she stated that the MPO needs to be credible to the public.

Ms. Josephine Amato, with Safe Bus for Us, provided statistics on safe school bus transportation and holding the school district accountable for the hazardous walking conditions children are being subjected to. Instead of supporting the elimination of school buses, the County should help to solve the problem.

COMMITTEE REPORTS, ONLINE COMMENTS

Ms. Gena Torres, MPO staff, presented the committee reports. Committees approved and forwarded to the MPO Board the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment for the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Grant for Streetcar Free Fares. In addition, they approved the TIP Amendment for...
Transit Asset Management, Pavement & Bridge, and System Performance Measures. A couple members would like to see more aspirational, definitive plans on how to reach higher targets when the targets are reassessed in a couple of years.

The Policy Committee recommended that HART address how they are going to promote the Free Fare Program.

The Westshore Transportation Action Plan, on the Consent Agenda, was supported at the August committee meetings.

The committees also received reports on Tampa Bay Next, Tri-County Travel Market Analysis, Vision Zero, and Nebraska Avenue.

The MPO’s Attorney, Mr. Cameron Clark, spoke to the Policy Committee in response to questions about providing donated prizes for survey responses. Mr. Clark noted several examples of other public agencies in Florida who provided donated prizes.

The TBARTA MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee Staff Directors discussed the performance target setting process that is underway for all MPOs. Once the MPOs have met the requirements of coordinated target setting, discussion can take place regarding regionwide targets. The group also made plans for the December 14th meeting of the MPO Chairs and discussed the MPO Advisory Council position opposing transportation earmarks.

There were no Facebook comments. Ms. Torres summarized email comments received from citizens. Copies of emails were provided in full to board members in their meeting folders.

There were no questions following the report.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

A. Committee Appointments
B. Westshore Transportation Action Plan

A motion was made by Commissioner Murman to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Councilman Maniscalco and carried unanimously.

**ROLL-CALL VOTE: TIP Amendment for FDOT Grant for Streetcar Free Fares**

This item was discussed at the Policy Committee and brought back to the MPO Board for approval. There was no additional discussion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Murman to approve the TIP Amendment for FDOT Grant for Streetcar Free Fares. The motion was seconded by Councilman Cohen and carried with a roll-call vote (Commissioner Kemp, Commissioner Hagan, Councilman Viera, and Mrs. Cindy Stuart were not in attendance during the vote).

**ACTION ITEMS**

A. TIP Amendment – Transit Asset Management, Pavement & Bridge, and System Performance Measures

Dr. Johnny Wong, MPO staff, provided an overview of the TIP Amendment. MPOs and DOTs are required to establish performance targets for transit asset management, pavement & bridge condition, and system performance. The three rules originate from Federal Law, MAP-21 and the FAST Act. These legislative
acts relate to ensuring government accountability and a push for performance-based planning. The rules prescribe specific performance measures that DOTs and MPOs must track to establish a benchmark baseline to rate performance in three areas and monitor progress as program funding continues for specific projects. The targets are data driven. Once every four years the targets are updated and reported in the TIP.

Following the presentation, Mayor Mel Jurado inquired about Information Technology (IT) not being covered under transit asset management, and she wanted to know how it would impact future justification for system upgrades. Cyndy Zambella, HART Director of Budget, Grants, and Fixed Assets, addressed Mayor Jurado’s concerns and stated that IT was assessed in the measurements. CAD/AVL was excluded from the evaluation because HART knew that it was an imminent need and has an aggressive plan to replace their CAD/AVL system in the upcoming year.

Under pavement and bridges, Mayor Jurado wanted clarification on the logic behind setting a lower goal. If the goal for safe bridges is currently being exceeded, she is uncomfortable with lowering the metric. Dr. Wong stated the reason for supporting the statewide target established by FDOT was because the performance measures are new to the MPOs, and they are not well positioned to see how specific investments by FDOT will improve conditions in such a small geographic area. Mayor Rick Lott agreed with Mayor Jurado that setting goals less than 100% and lower than current conditions does not make sense.

Mayor Jurado inquired about reliability listed under system performance. How can travel time reliability be maintained, progressively pursued, measured and monitored? Dr. Wong stated that the performance targets for the TIP are based on the improvements that can be expected from transportation projects that were programmed in the past. This process is an initial assessment to set benchmarks. Mayor Lott confirmed that the performance measure information is based on funding decisions made five years ago.

Ms. Beth Alden attempted to provide clarification and stated that funding is already committed to many projects in the TIP to improve performance. The projects in the TIP must be able to show progress towards the MPO’s targets. Setting a higher target means that funds should be allocated differently in the TIP. The Federal Government is setting MPOs up to create an ongoing performance-based planning process, and more information will be brought back during development of the long-range transportation plan (LRTP), as required in the new Federal rules. The Hillsborough MPO was one of four MPO pilots working with FDOT to review data sets for performance measures, and the financial scenarios in the current LRTP show that there is not a lot of progress being made on the performance targets at the existing spending levels. There are a lot of deficiencies in the spending categories.

Mayor Jurado inquired about changing funding in the TIP and wanted to know if funding has been taken away from bridges. Ms. Alden asked Secretary Gwynn if the Department would have any concerns if the MPO established a higher target for bridge conditions in Hillsborough County, for bridges that are on the National Highway System (NHS) and are rated on a statewide basis and dependent on FDOT funding? Secretary Gwynn stated that he would have to check with FDOT’s Bridge Maintenance Department since it is handled statewide. Additional coordination will be done with the FDOT District office and the MPO.

Mr. Waggoner wanted to know if staff coordinated the analysis with FDOT prior to the meeting and expressed concerns about lowering performance measures. He also wanted to know if all of the roads being discussed are owned by FDOT? Secretary Gwynn stated that they are not. Mr. Waggoner wanted to know what portion of the NHS Roadway System is owned by FDOT and their ratings? He stated that this information is important to know if it is going to be used to allocate funds. He also wanted to know what funds will be allocated? Additional information would be helpful in order to make decisions on adopting measures.

Councilman Cohen agreed with the questions that were asked and stated that he would need to know
what funding difference will be made to Hillsborough County if the standards are adopted.

Dr. Wong stated there are no penalties for failing to meet the targets that are set. The targets are set based on current conditions in order to set the bar and establish the status so progress can be tracked in the future.

Commissioner Miller suggested deferring the item to the next board meeting based on numerous concerns expressed by members.

Mr. Mechanik would like to understand whether the requirements are Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) or Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA), and if there are consequences for failing to meet a standard. He would like to understand what the legal framework is before the group votes on the item. He also stated that there are red flags in the presentation. If the information is going to be useful it should be plugged into future decision-making and allocation of funding. He stated that the goal on travel time reliability for truck traffic sounds horrific.

Commissioner Miller spoke with Ms. Alden and a decision was made to postpone the action item until the next meeting. He requested an email be sent out to board members requesting their concerns and questions, so they can be answered and brought back to the next meeting for discussion.

Commissioner Kemp expressed concerns about the importance of HART’s transit operations and maintenance center needing a $40 million update.

Mr. Waggoner stated he does not understand the idea of setting a goal based on where you are going and it is below standard. How does setting a goal of failing promote making better decisions in the future?

Mayor Lott wanted to know if thirty days would be enough time for staff to answer member’s questions in preparation for the next meeting. Ms. Alden will coordinate with staff.

Commissioner White would like to see a sampling of potential budget amendments in which funding is decommitted in certain categories to enhance funding to get metrics up to speed.

Commissioner Murman agreed with comments that were made and stated we should never settle for less than 100%. She suggested a message go back to FDOT’s home office stating the standards are unrealistic and recommended a transcript of the conversation be sent to them.

**STATUS REPORTS**

**A. BRT & Economic Development: Orlando’s Experience**

Ms. Laura Minns, WSP, provided an overview of housing and commercial development around Orlando’s bus rapid transit (BRT) system. Their ridership continues to grow as the area develops.

Following the presentation, Commissioner Kemp thanked Ms. Minns for an excellent presentation and thanked Ms. Alden for scheduling the presentation. Commissioner Kemp encouraged members to visit Orlando and utilize street-level BRT.

Mr. Waggoner inquired about capital cost. Ms. Minns stated the initial investment was $20 million for the first 2½ mile line and then there was an approximate $25 million investment on the Grapefruit and Parramore BRT lines. Approximately $40 million over twenty years was spent. The City pays Lynx a little less than $3 million per year in operating costs. Annual ridership is around 700,000 - 800,000 per year.
B. Smart Cities/Integrated Corridor Management

Dr. Wong introduced Mr. Ron Chin, FDOT’s Chief Traffic Engineer, who provided information on Integrated Corridor Management and operational strategies to improve travel time reliability. Mr. Joe Bugel, FDOT’s Arterials Manager, provided information on current operations and technology that are being added. Corridors of focus include I-4 and I-275, and parallel and connecting major roads.

Commissioner Murman hopes that the technology can quickly be implemented.

Commissioner Kemp wanted to know if the integrated technology will make traffic queue-jumping possible for buses? Mr. Bugel stated it will and transit is a major component in achieving the maximum efficiency and capacity of the system.

Commissioner Kemp also wanted to know if the project includes the ability to read when a road is open and traffic light signaling. Mr. Bugel stated it addresses road maintenance and detectors that may not work properly. When the system is implemented, it will be able to address the source of issues. Sensors and detection devices will be added to the infrastructure so they will have the capability of knowing where volume is.

Mr. Klug wanted to know if there was any way that Port Tampa Bay could coordinate with FDOT on the current project for integrated activity for their trucks. Mr. Chin stated that Port Tampa Bay is a partner on the project.

Mr. Waggoner thanked FDOT for contributing to their connected and automated vehicle pilot project.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Ms. Alden thanked Mr. Eric Hill with MetroPlan Orlando for attending the meeting. MetroPlan has reached out to other MPOs to collaborate on a mega-regional program to expand Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) practice, with a focus on supporting the I-4 Corridor effort and linking the three districts along the I-4 Corridor.

The next board meeting will be held Tuesday, October 30th on the 26th floor of the County Center.

The next Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group (TMA) will take place on November 2nd and will be held at the Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority. The TMA has decided to have a rotating chairperson beginning at the November meeting. The group will discuss options for creating a voting structure at the tri-county level.

Outreach was wrapped up on the tri-county survey for It’s Time Tampa Bay. A national record was broken for a MetroQuest-platform survey, with more than 9,600 survey responses. Ms. Alden thanked staff in the audience who conducted outreach at 84 different community meetings and events over the last month. There were over 8,700 attendees at the events.

Ms. Alden also thanked the Tampa Bay Times for donating online impressions and matching the MPO’s by donating $2,000 in print ads. In addition, Florida’s Largest Home Show provided complimentary exhibit space during Labor Day weekend. The Beasley Media Group provided two talk show broadcasts, 30-second public service announcements, distributed rack cards at station events, and donated the Lightning tickets that were raffled off. They also featured the department on their website in several social media campaigns. Ms. Alden also thanked the Property Appraiser’s Office for allowing the insert into their mailers at cost.

She thanked MPO Board members and their local staff for their support during the outreach effort.
The responses to the surveys will be summarized, and the information will be provided to the MPO’s advisory committees in November. Ms. Alden will schedule discussions with board members and then the information will be on the agenda for the December Board meeting with recommendations on how to synthesize public preferences into the LRTP update.

Following meeting adjournment, the drawing took place for winners of the donated Lighting tickets.

**OLD & NEW BUSINESS**

Commissioner Kemp invited members to attend a community conversation event that she is hosting on Monday, October 8th from 6:00 to 7:30 p.m. at the Saunders Library, located at 1505 North Nebraska Avenue in Tampa. Dr. Beverly Ward and Professor Taryn Sabia are scheduled to present.

**ADJOURNMENT**

A quorum was maintained for the duration of the meeting. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:51 a.m.
Committee Reports

Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) on October 10
The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ TIP Amendments for the Bloomingdale Ave/US 301 intersection and for the HART CAD/AVL bus equipment replacement, by a unanimous vote
✓ The Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for the USF Campus for acceptance as a concept, by a vote of 10 to 2. The nay votes were due to concerns about impacting bicycling, cost-effectiveness versus Bull-Runner bus service and how to pay for such an autonomous transit service.

The CAC also received reports on:
  o The North Alexander Street Corridor Land Use and Marketing Study
  o The Brightline Proposal for Rail to Orlando and Miami
  o Long Range Transportation Plan Goals
  o After an inquiry from the CAC, the Florida Turnpike Enterprise sent a letter stating that they expect to implement dynamic toll pricing following the completion of improvements at the I-275/SR 60/Veterans interchange, which is anticipated by the summer of 2019.

Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on October 22
The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ TIP Amendments for the Bloomingdale Ave/US 301 intersection and for the HART CAD/AVL bus equipment replacement – The committee wanted to ensure bicycle facilities and signage would be included in the Bloomingdale/US301 project, and was concerned if there would be a delay in replacing aging buses.
✓ Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for USF Campus – Interest was sparked as to whether the cost estimate included signal upgrades, and if students living just beyond campus boundaries would be served.

The TAC also received reports on:
  o Brightline Proposal for Rail – The committee was interested in the increasing ridership numbers, speeds attained, if the technology was compatible with existing tracks, and the development opportunities.
  o MLK Boulevard Operational Improvements (40th Street to I-4) – The committee agreed with the FDOT design ideas to complete sidewalks, add bike lanes, extend turn lanes and reconfigure two intersections. There was interest in having
refuge islands, since medians were not recommended along the two-way left turn section.

- District 7 Freight Plan, Sub Area Study & Local Freight Improvements – Questions arose on how to improve intersection turning radii for trucks without compromising pedestrian safety.
- Long Range Transportation Plan goals update
- SouthShore Transit Study Reevaluation

Meeting of the Policy Committee on October 23
The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- ✓ TIP Amendments for the Bloomingdale Ave/US 301 intersection and for the HART CAD/AVL bus equipment replacement
- ✓ Renewal of the interlocal agreement with TBARTA for organizational and administrative services for the MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee
- ✓ Board positions on federal performance measures, with the request that HART send a letter or representative to the board meeting

The Policy Committee also received reports on:
- Long Range Transportation Plan goals update

Meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on October 10
The committee approved a motion supporting the reconstruction of the Maydell Ave. Bridge as previously supported by the committee.

The BPAC received reports on:
- Long Range Transportation Plan goals update – Committee members expressed interest in understanding how air quality and pollution are addressed.
- Eco Districts
- Multimodal Level of Service Evaluation
- Vision Zero Quarterly Report and Nebraska Ave

The committee discussed several ways that they might be able to better advocate for the interests of pedestrians and cyclists. Committee members suggested that submitting questions to the MPO Board about priorities might be an effective path.

Public comment on the Green Artery Trail was submitted by Brad Hissing of Riverside Heights who questioned the route through that neighborhood.

Meeting of the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Committee on October 11
The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- ✓ TIP Amendments for the Bloomingdale Ave/US 301 intersection and for the HART CAD/AVL bus equipment replacement
- ✓ MPO Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for USF Campus

The committee also received reports on:
- Connected Traveler Initiative
Meeting of the Livable Roadways Committee (LRC) on October 17

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for USF Campus – Interest was sparked as to whether the cost estimate included signal upgrades, and if students living just beyond campus boundaries would be served.

The LRC also received reports on:
- District 7 Freight Plan, Sub Area Study & Local Freight Improvements
- Multimodal Level of Service Evaluation

Meeting of School Transportation Working Group (STWG) on October 24

The working group agreed to recess this month.

Meeting of the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board on October 26

A verbal report will be provided at the board meeting.

Meeting of the TBARTA MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee (CCC) Staff Directors on October 19

The MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee will meet on Friday, December 14, over lunch, at a facility near the I-75/University Pkwy interchange, arranged and hosted by the Sarasota/Manatee MPO. Box lunches will be available for a small charge, and RSVP information will be provided.

The CCC is scheduled to make minor adjustments to the regional priority lists for Multi-Use Trails, the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP), and major regional projects for discretionary funding.

The staff directors also briefly discussed arrangements for the 2019 Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit, the October 2019 public workshop for the Regional Planning Best Practices Study and confirmed support for renewal of the TBARTA Staff Services Agreement which is on today’s agenda.
CLEVELAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

MURAL PAINTING DAY!

Join us as we paint the winning student's mural design on the street in front of the school!

Sat. December 15th
10 AM - NOON
723 E. Hamilton Ave.

Refreshments and snacks will be provided.

For further information please contact
torresg@plancom.org
October 17, 2018

Ms. Beth Alden, AICP
MPO Executive Director
Plan Hillsborough
601 E Kennedy Blvd, 18th Floor
Tampa FL 33602

Re: West Busch Boulevard Corridor Study (WBCS) (FPN 435908-1-22-01)

Dear Ms. Alden,

I'm in receipt of your letter of September 5, 2018 on the referenced corridor study. Thank you for the feedback as well as the assistance of your staff during this project.

Please allow me to address each of the issues raised in your letter:

Design Alternatives
The WBCS includes numerous design alternatives. The purpose of the study is to provide a comprehensive set of feasible options. As a planning exercise, the study will include alternatives that are feasible.

Please note that none of the design alternatives are identified as "recommended", "preferred" or "suggested". This signifies that no design decisions have been made; and therefore, the cross-sections and their components are open to revision.

Level of Service (LOS)
Current economic and demographic projections indicate increased travel demand in the study area. We anticipate greater peak period congestion as a result. Vehicular LOS is primarily experienced as delay at traffic signals. That is why the study focused on improvements at signalized intersections. Technical advances may yet provide additional LOS progress.

The study does include Multimodal LOS analyses performed according to FDOT Q/LOS guidelines. I refer you to the Corridor Alternatives and Strategies Report, Appendix G.
Speeds and Context Classification

We fully recognize the connection between vehicle speed, fatalities and injury severity. Safety for all roadway users is the top priority for FDOT.

The WBBCS includes design options based upon a 35-mph posted speed limit. Corridor speed reduction is a subject of active internal discussion. Given the corridor’s safety history, we are looking at implementation strategies.

The Context Classification designations are based upon FDOT Complete Streets policy criteria. Both the “Suburban Residential” (C3R) and “Urban General” (C4) designations permit a 35-mph speed zone. If the goal is speed reduction, reconsideration of the designations is unnecessary.

Land Use and Stormwater

As you suggested, we will coordinate with city and county staff concerning land use and stormwater issues throughout the project.

Beth, thank you again for your input and assistance. We’ll continue working with the MPO to create a safer corridor.

Sincerely,

Richard Moss, P.E.
Director of Development
Florida Department of Transportation
Introduction to Programming Screen Summary Report

The Programming Screen Summary Report shown below is a read-only version of information contained in the Programming Screen Summary Report generated by the ETDM Coordinator for the selected project after completion of the ETAT Programming Screen review. The purpose of the Programming Screen Summary Report is to summarize the results of the ETAT Programming Screen review of the project; provide details concerning agency comments about potential effects to natural, cultural, and community resources; and provide additional documentation of activities related to the Programming Phase for the project. Available information for a Programming Screen Summary Report includes:

- Screening Summary Report chart
- Project Description information (including a summary description of the project, a summary of public comments on the project, and community-desired features identified during public involvement activities)
- Purpose and Need information (including the Purpose and Need Statement and the results of agency reviews of the project Purpose and Need)
- Alternative-specific information, consisting of descriptions of each alternative and associated road segments; an overview of ETAT Programming Screen reviews for each alternative; and agency comments concerning potential effects and degree of effect, by issue, to natural, cultural, and community resources.
- Project Scope information, consisting of general project recommendations resulting from the ETAT Programming Screen review, permits, and technical studies required (if any)
- Class of Action determined for the project
- Dispute Resolution Activity Log (if any)

The legend for the Degree of Effect chart is provided in an appendix to the report.

For complete documentation of the project record, also see the GIS Analysis Results Report published on the same date as the Programming Screen Summary Report.

The Florida Department of Transportation may adopt this planning product into the environmental review process, pursuant to Title 23 Sec. USC 168(4)(d) or the state project development process.
#14344 Maydell Drive Bridge Replacement

**District:** District 7  
**County:** Hillsborough  
**Planning Organization:** FDOT District 7  
**Plan ID:** Not Available  
**Federal Involvement:** FHWA Funding Other Federal Permit USCG Bridge Permit  
**LAP Agency** Hillsborough County  
**Agency Preparing NEPA Document:** Local Agency (with FDOT oversight)  
**Contact Information:** Nicole Christine Selly (813) 975-6455 Nicole.Selly@dot.state.fl.us  
**Snapshot Data From:** Programming Screen Summary Report Re-published on 10/22/2018 by Wendy Lasher

Issues and Categories are reflective of what was in place at the time of the screening event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative #1 - Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement From: North of Murrhee Rd. To: North of SR 618 Re-Published: 10/22/2018 Reviewed from 04/06/2018 to 05/21/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social and Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social and Economic**  
- Land Use Changes  
- Aesthetic Effects  
- Economic  
- Mobility  

**Cultural**  
- Section 4(f) Potential  
- Historic and Archaeological Sites  
- Recreation Areas  

**Natural**  
- Wetlands and Surface Waters  
- Water Quality and Quantity  
- Floodplains  
- Wildlife and Habitat  
- Coastal and Marine  

**Physical**  
- Noise  
- Air Quality  
- Contamination  
- Infrastructure  
- Navigation  
- Special Designations
**Purpose and Need**

**Purpose**
The purpose of this project is to address the structural and geometric deficiencies of the existing Maydell Drive bridge. The existing bridge structure was constructed in 1968 and is considered structurally deficient by the Florida Department of Transportation. It is currently closed to vehicular and pedestrian traffic as a result of structural deficiencies. Consequently, the existing bridge structure is scheduled for replacement.

**Need**
The Maydell Drive Bridge provides an important connection between the neighborhoods south of the Palm River and SR 60 to the north. The improvements in this project are needed to address the structural deficiencies of the existing Maydell Drive bridge and restore local connectivity across Palm River. Additionally, the existing structure does not provide shoulders as required by 2018 Florida Department of Transportation Design Manual (FDM), therefore, the improvements are also needed to address this geometric deficiency. Further, the project is also needed to accommodate the wide sidewalks planned for Maydell Drive in the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Greenways and Trails Plan.

**Project Status**
This project is not listed in the Hillsborough County MPO 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan because no additional traffic capacity is being added. The Maydell Drive Bridge Replacement project is funded for preliminary engineering in FY 2018 and funded for construction in FY 2022.

**Project Description**
This project will replace the existing Maydell Drive Bridge (No. 105604) in Hillsborough County, Florida. The project limits are from north of Murrhee Road to north of SR 618 (Lee Roy Selmon Crosstown Expressway), a distance of approximately 1,000 feet. The existing Maydell Drive bridge and adjacent roadway is a two-lane undivided facility with no shoulders and four-foot sidewalks. The Maydell Drive replacement bridge structure will accommodate a two-lane undivided facility with 11-foot travel lanes, eight-foot shoulders, and a barrier separated five-foot sidewalk and ten-foot trail.

**Summary of Public Comments**
Summary of Public Comments is not available at this time.

**Planning Consistency Status**
Are the limits consistent with the plans? Yes

Currently Adopted CFP-LRTP? Hillsborough County will update the LRTP accordingly.

MPOs Hillsborough County MPO

**Attachments**
STIP Pages - https://www.fla-etat.org/est/servlet/blobViewer?blobID=24154

**Federal Consistency Determination**
**Date of Determination:** 05/30/2018 by Chris Stahl

**FDEP Clearinghouse Determination:** CONSISTENT, WITH COMMENTS with Coastal Zone Management Program.

**Comment:** The Southwest Florida Water Management District has provided comments regarding the proposed project.

**Lead Agency**
 Participating and Cooperating Agencies

Cooperating Agencies
- US Coast Guard

Participating Agencies
No Participating Agencies have been identified.

Exempted Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Forest Service</td>
<td>There are no USFS resources.</td>
<td>03/19/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Rail Administration</td>
<td>No railway crossings involved.</td>
<td>03/19/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>There are no NPS resources.</td>
<td>03/19/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>FTA has requested to be exempt from reviewing any non-transit projects.</td>
<td>10/17/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Desired Features
No desired features have been entered into the database. This does not necessarily imply that none have been identified.

User Defined Communities Within 500 Feet
- Greater Palm River

Census Places Within 500 Feet
- Palm River-Clair Mel
- Tampa

Purpose and Need Reviews

FDOT Office of Environmental Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgment</th>
<th>Date Reviewed</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>05/10/2018</td>
<td>Thu-Huong Clark (<a href="mailto:thu-huong.clark@dot.state.fl.us">thu-huong.clark@dot.state.fl.us</a>)</td>
<td>No Purpose and Need comments found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FL Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgment</th>
<th>Date Reviewed</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td>04/20/2018</td>
<td>Steve Bohl (<a href="mailto:Steve.Bohl@freshfromflorida.com">Steve.Bohl@freshfromflorida.com</a>)</td>
<td>No Purpose and Need comments found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FL Department of Economic Opportunity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgment</th>
<th>Date Reviewed</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td>05/21/2018</td>
<td>Matt Preston (<a href="mailto:matt.preston@deo.myflorida.com">matt.preston@deo.myflorida.com</a>)</td>
<td>No Purpose and Need comments found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FL Department of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgment</th>
<th>Date Reviewed</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td>04/09/2018</td>
<td>Alyssa McManus (<a href="mailto:alyssa.mcmanus@dos.myflorida.com">alyssa.mcmanus@dos.myflorida.com</a>)</td>
<td>No Purpose and Need comments found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FL Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgment</th>
<th>Date Reviewed</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td>05/17/2018</td>
<td>Fritz Wettstein (<a href="mailto:fritz.wettstein@myfwc.com">fritz.wettstein@myfwc.com</a>)</td>
<td>No Purpose and Need comments found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hillsborough County MPO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgment</th>
<th>Date Reviewed</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td>05/21/2018</td>
<td>Allison Yeh (<a href="mailto:yeha@plancom.org">yeha@plancom.org</a>)</td>
<td>No Purpose and Need comments found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following organizations were notified but did not submit a review of the Purpose and Need:
- FL Department of Environmental Protection
- Natural Resources Conservation Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgment</th>
<th>Date Reviewed</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
<td>David Rydene (<a href="mailto:David.Rydene@noaa.gov">David.Rydene@noaa.gov</a>)</td>
<td>No Purpose and Need comments found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td>05/01/2018</td>
<td>Victoria Menchaca (<a href="mailto:victoriamenchaca@semitribe.com">victoriamenchaca@semitribe.com</a>)</td>
<td>No Purpose and Need comments found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td>05/15/2018</td>
<td>Monte Ritter (<a href="mailto:Monte.Ritter@swfwm.d.state.fl.us">Monte.Ritter@swfwm.d.state.fl.us</a>)</td>
<td>No Purpose and Need comments found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td>05/11/2018</td>
<td>Lisa Lovvorn (<a href="mailto:Lisa.S.Lovvorn@usace.army.mil">Lisa.S.Lovvorn@usace.army.mil</a>)</td>
<td>Understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td>05/11/2018</td>
<td>Randall Overton (<a href="mailto:randall.d.overton@uscg.mil">randall.d.overton@uscg.mil</a>)</td>
<td>No Purpose and Need comments found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td>05/08/2018</td>
<td>Kim Gates (<a href="mailto:gates.kim@epa.gov">gates.kim@epa.gov</a>)</td>
<td>The USEPA has no Purpose and Need comments at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td>04/10/2018</td>
<td>Zakia Williams (<a href="mailto:zakia_williams@fws.gov">zakia_williams@fws.gov</a>)</td>
<td>No Purpose and Need comments found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Alternative #1 - Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement

#### Alternative Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Total Length</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Modes</th>
<th>SIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>North of Murrhee Rd.</td>
<td>North of SR 618</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>ETAT Review Complete</td>
<td>0.2 mi.</td>
<td>$6,900,000.00</td>
<td>Roadway Bicycle Pedestrian</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Effects Overview for Alternative #1 - Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Degree of Effect</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Date Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social and Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Changes</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>FL Department of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>05/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Changes</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>Hillsborough County MPO</td>
<td>05/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>US Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>05/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>Hillsborough County MPO</td>
<td>05/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Potential</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>Hillsborough County MPO</td>
<td>05/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Effects</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>Hillsborough County MPO</td>
<td>05/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>FL Department of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>05/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>Hillsborough County MPO</td>
<td>05/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>Hillsborough County MPO</td>
<td>05/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Archaeological Sites</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Southwest Florida Water Management District</td>
<td>05/15/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Archaeological Sites</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Seminole Tribe of Florida</td>
<td>05/01/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Archaeological Sites</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>FL Department of State</td>
<td>04/10/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Areas</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Southwest Florida Water Management District</td>
<td>05/15/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>05/14/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands and Surface Waters</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>US Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>05/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands and Surface Waters</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Southwest Florida Water Management District</td>
<td>05/15/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands and Surface Waters</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>05/11/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands and Surface Waters</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>05/09/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands and Surface Waters</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>National Marine Fisheries Service</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality and Quantity</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>US Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>05/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality and Quantity</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Southwest Florida Water Management District</td>
<td>05/15/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplains</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Southwest Florida Water Management District</td>
<td>05/15/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife and Habitat</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>FL Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission</td>
<td>05/17/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ETAT Reviews and Coordinator Summary: Social and Economic

Land Use Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
MPO DOE: Enhanced
FDEO DOE: Enhanced
FDOT Recommended DOE: **Enhanced**

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (FDEO) and recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of Enhanced.

During the Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis, the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) 2011 Florida Land Use and Land Cover screening identified five land uses within the 500-foot project buffer area. The four major existing land uses are Streams and Waterways (17.27 acres - 31.82%), Residential Medium Density (2-5 Dwelling Units) (16.19 acres - 29.81%), Transportation (8.13 acres - 14.98%), and Industrial (10.20 acres - 18.79%).

The Hillsborough County Adopted 2025 Future Land Use Map (Effective: April 12, 2018) indicates the project corridor from Murrhee Road to the Palm River traverses Residential land use. From the Palm River to the project’s terminus, the City of Tampa Adopted 2040 Future Land Use Map (Effective: May 10, 2018) indicates the project corridor traverses Water, Right-of-Way or Otherwise Not Classified, and Heavy Industrial land uses.

The Hillsborough County MPO stated that the project is directly related to their multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update. They also stated that the MPO’s Livable Roadways Committee was presented with the project at their May 16, 2018 meeting and was generally supportive of the project.

The FDEO commented that the project is compatible with the County’s development goals and Comprehensive Plan. The FDEO also stated that the project is included in the Hillsborough County MPO’s Greenways and Trail Plan and stated that there are no City or County parks with a quarter mile of the project. The FDEO noted that portions of the project are located within the Coastal High
Hazard Area.

The proposed replacement bridge will be constructed at the same location as the existing bridge and will have a similar profile as the existing structure. No overall impacts to surrounding land uses are anticipated.

Degree of Effect: Enhanced assigned 05/21/2018 by Matt Preston, FL Department of Economic Opportunity

Coordination Document: No Involvement

Direct Effects

Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
Comprehensive Plan(s) Reviewed:
*imagine 2040: Tampa 2040 Comprehensive Plan, adopted on January 7, 2016; and,

Comments on Effects to Resources:
Compatibility with Community Development Goals and Comprehensive Plan:
The proposed project is compatible with applicable City and County development goals and consistent with both comprehensive plans.

Future Transportation Map:
The project is included on the Hillsborough MPO's Greenways and Trail Plan Update.

Land Uses:
Future land uses surrounding all three alternatives for the project include: Right of Way (ROW) and Heavy Industrial (City of Tampa). Residential-9 (Hillsborough County).

Parks:
The project is not located within a quarter mile of any City or County parks.

Area of Critical State Concern (ACSC), Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA), and Military Bases:
The project is not located within an Area of Critical State Concern, nor does it encroach on any military installations. The proposed project is located within the CHHA.

Other Planning-Related Items:
N/A.

Contact Information:
Allison Yeh (Hillsborough County) - Phone Number: (813) 273-3774 ext. 351. Peter Maass (FDOT) - Phone Number: (813) 975-6425.

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Additional Comments (optional):

CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects

Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Degree of Effect: Enhanced assigned 05/21/2018 by Allison Yeh, Hillsborough County MPO

Coordination Document: To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required

Coordination Document Comments:
This project is directly related to the MPO's multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update. Please note that the Hillsborough County Public works is indicating that construction on Maydell Bridge will start December 2019 (FY2020). This is generally consistent with the documentation provided in the AN package, but additional
coordination may be needed as the project progresses.

Direct Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
This project is consistent with the MPO's multi-modal planning efforts, in particular, the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update and is not anticipated to add lanes or traffic capacity to the exiting roadways. However it will reopen traffic to Maydell Bridge and a 10 foot trail on the west side and a 5 foot sidewalk on the east side. This will enhance the operational and multi-modal options in this area.

Comments on Effects to Resources:
The MPO's Livable Roadways Committee was presented with the project at their May 16, 2018 meeting was generally supportive of the project.

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Additional Comments (optional):
This project is directly related to the MPO's multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update. Please note that the Hillsborough County Public works is indicating that construction on Maydell Bridge will start December 2019 (FY2020). This is generally consistent with the documentation provided in the AN package, but additional coordination may be needed as the project progresses.

CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Social
Project Effects

Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect: 3 Moderate assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

Comments:
USEPA DOE: Moderate
MPO DOE: Enhanced
FDOT Recommended DOE: Moderate

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of Moderate.

Information regarding social resources may be found under the specific Infrastructure, Special Designations, Historic and Archaeological Sites, Recreational Areas, Mobility, and Economic DOEs.

A Sociocultural Effects (SCE) Evaluation was conducted and will be further updated during the PD&E Study. Information from the SCE Evaluation is as follows:

The Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Sociocultural Data Report (SDR) was used for demographic data (the SDR can be found within the Community Coordination of the EST). The SDR uses the Census 2016 American Community Survey (ACS) data and reflects the approximation of the population based on area of the 500-foot buffer intersecting the census block groups along the project corridor. Using the 500-foot buffer, the SDR identified the following demographics:

Population and Income
The SDR identified 36 households with a population of 92 people. The median family income is $26,318, with 25.00% of households below poverty level and 2.78% of households receive public assistance income.

**Race and Ethnicity**

The minority population makes up 80.43% of the total population, and is comprised of "Black or African American Alone" (29 persons - 31.52%), "Some Other Race Alone" (16 persons - 17.39%), "Claimed 2 or More Races" (1 person - 1.09%). There are 49 persons (53.26%) that have a "Hispanic or Latino of Any Race" ethnicity.

To conduct a detailed analysis of minority totals within the Census Block Groups the 2010 US Census Block Data was utilized since it provides more information than the SDR for this dataset. This data gives totals for the entire Census block group and does not reflect the approximation of the population based on the 500-foot buffer area intersecting the Census block groups. This data identified 4 block groups with a total population of 6,356 people that have a minority population of 40.67%.

**Age and Disability**

The median age is 44 and persons 65 and over comprise 11.96% of the population.

**Housing**

There are 38 housing units. The housing consists of single family units (40%), mobile home units (40%), and multi-family units (18%). These units are owner occupied (40%), renter occupied (53%), and vacant units (5%).

**Language**

There are 7 people (7.87%) that speak English "not at all" and 13 people (14.61%) that speak English "not well". Based on US DOT Policy Guidance, the FDOT has identified four factors to help determine if Limited English Proficiency (LEP) services would be required as listed in the FDOT PD&E Manual, Part 1, Chapter 11, Section 11.2.4. Based on a review of these factors and the fact that LEP population accounts for 22.47% of the population for this project, LEP services may be required. Refinement of the LEP population totals and requirements will be further evaluated in Project Development as part of the public involvement efforts.

**Community Features:**

According to the EST, the following types of facilities are located within the project area:

**Additional Resources within the 100-foot Project Buffer Area**

None

**Additional Resource within the 200-foot Project Buffer Area**

None

**Additional Resources within the 500-foot Project Buffer Area**

None

**Additional Resources within the 1,320-foot Project Buffer Area**

None

**Additional Resources within the 1-mile Project Buffer Area**

Knights of Columbus 5092 (Community Center)
Boys & Girls Club of Tampa (Community Center)
78th Street Community Library (Cultural Center)
Blessed Sacrament Church (Religious Centers)
Wat Mongkolratanaram (Religious Centers)
New Bethel Temple of Deliverance (Religious Centers)
First Baptist Church (Religious Centers)
Mission Marrantha Church (Religious Centers)
Broadway Baptist Church (Religious Centers)
Palm River Church of God (Religious Centers)
Church of Christ of Southside (Religious Centers)
Bethany Missionary Baptist Church (Religious Centers)
The USEPA stated that demolition of the existing bridge and construction of its replacement may have a disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effect on minority, low income, and poorly educated populations. They support the inclusion of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) accommodations during public involvement efforts, and endorse conducting a Noise Study to determine if predicted noise levels will approach or exceed Noise Abatement Criterion. All potential impacts to residents in the project area should be identified and measures to avoid and minimize these impacts need to be evaluated and implemented.

The Hillsborough County MPO stated that the project is directly related to their multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update. It will reopen traffic to Maydell Bridge and a 10-foot trail on the west side and a 5-foot sidewalk on the east side will enhance the operational and multi-modal options in the area. They also stated that the MPO’s Livable Roadways Committee was presented with the project at their May 16, 2018 meeting and was generally supportive of the project.

This project will be developed in accordance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Civil Rights Act of 1968, along with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice), which ensures that minority and/or low-income households are neither disproportionally adversely impacted by major transportation projects, nor denied reasonable access to them by excessive costs or physical barriers (US Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA], 1994).

Hillsborough County will further analyze sociocultural effects during the PD&E study. A proactive public involvement approach will be implemented for the project to ensure that opportunity is given to all residents and businesses along the corridor to provide input into this project.

**Degree of Effect:** 3 *Moderate* assigned 05/21/2018 by Kim Gates, US Environmental Protection Agency

**Coordination Document:** PD&E Support Document As Per PD&E Manual

**Coordination Document Comments:**
The USEPA would like to review the following PD&E support documents:

- Air Quality Technical Memorandum (PD&E Manual, Part 2, Chapter 19), and
- Noise Study Report (Part 2, Chapter 18)

**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

A social impact can be defined as any action or activity that affects how people live, work, play, relate to one another, organize to meet their needs, and function as individuals and/or society. In particular, transportation actions can impact community cohesion, goals, and mobility, as well as the everyday quality of life of its citizens.

In the *Agency Operating and Funding Agreement for Continuing Participation in the Efficient Transportation Decision Making and Transportation Project Development Processes between United States Environmental Protection Agency and Federal Highway Administration and Florida Department of Transportation*, January 23, 2015, FDOT requested the USEPA’s focus on environmental justice considerations for this issue. Therefore, the resources of particular concern are minority, elderly, low-income, disabled, and other special populations.

Historically, these special populations were underrepresented in transportation project planning processes due to inadequate opportunities for involvement. However, federal laws enacted since 1964 now protect their civil rights, including:

- Civil Rights Act of 1964;
- Rehabilitation Act of 1973;
- Age Discrimination Act of 1975;
- Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1978; and

The federal government has also established policies to ensure transportation agencies take action to overcome potential linguistic, institutional, cultural, economic, historical, or other barriers that may impede the public's ability to understand the information provided and become involved in the decision-making process. These policies include:

- Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* [February 11, 1994]; and

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**

FDO'T's PD&E Manual (Part 2, Chapter 4) prescribes use of a 1/4 mile buffer area for evaluating social impacts in urban areas, and FDOT's Sociocultural Effects Evaluation Handbook explains that "[the] 1/4 Mile buffer is the preferred buffer for SCE evaluations to allow for the inclusion of community facilities and address connectivity" (see page 6-11, [http://www.fdot.gov/environment/pubs/sce/SCE-Handbook-2005.pdf](http://www.fdot.gov/environment/pubs/sce/SCE-Handbook-2005.pdf)). The USEPA's online EJSCREEN* tool ([http://www2.epa.gov/ejscreen](http://www2.epa.gov/ejscreen)) generated the following demographics for the 0.25-mile buffer.

Approximate Total Population = 264  
Minority Population = **73%** [County Average** = 49.7%, State Average = 44%]  
Low Income Population = **57%** [County Average = 15%, State Average = 38%]  
Linguistically Isolated Population = 8% [County Average = 28%, State Average = 7%]  
Population with Less than High School Education = **31%** [County Average = 12.2%, State Average = 13%]  
Population Under 5 Years of Age = **7%** [County Average = 6.4%, State Average = 6%]  
Population Over 64 Years of Age = 13% [County Average = 13.7%, State Average = 19%]

Based on this data, it appears demolition of the existing bridge and construction of its replacement may have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority, low income, and poorly educated populations.

* Although use of EJSCREEN is discussed in USEPA policy ([https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-05/documents/052216_ej_2020_strategic_plan_final_0.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-05/documents/052216_ej_2020_strategic_plan_final_0.pdf)), it is a pre-decisional screening tool. It was not designed to be the basis for agency decision-making or determinations regarding the existence or absence of EJ concerns, nor should it be used to identify or label an area as an "EJ Community." Rather, EJSCREEN highlights locations that may be candidates for further review and/or outreach. EJSCREEN data needs to be supported by community-specific demographic information and local knowledge. ([https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-05/documents/ejscreen_technical_document_20150505.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-05/documents/ejscreen_technical_document_20150505.pdf))

**Source:** U.S. Census, [https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/hillsboroughcountyflorida/PST120216](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/hillsboroughcountyflorida/PST120216)

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

The USEPA supports the inclusion of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) accommodations during public involvement efforts. We also endorse conducting a Noise Study to determine if predicted noise levels will approach or exceed the Noise Abatement Criterion. All potential impacts on residents in the project vicinity from demolition and construction activities should be identified, including air emissions (i.e., exhaust emissions from diesel-powered construction equipment, fugitive dust from bridge demolition/construction and earth-moving operations, etc.), noise and vibration (from blasting, jackhammering, concrete cutting, drilling, heavy equipment movement, pile driving, compaction of embankments, etc.). Moreover, measures to avoid and minimize these impacts consistent with applicable state and local regulations and the *FDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction* need to be evaluated and implemented.

**Additional Comments (optional):**

The USEPA would like to review the following PD&E support documents:

Air Quality Technical Memorandum (PD&E Manual, Part 2, Chapter 19), and  
Noise Study Report (Part 2, Chapter 18)

**CLC Recommendations:**

**Indirect Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Degree of Effect: Enhanced assigned 05/21/2018 by Allison Yeh, Hillsborough County MPO

Coordination Document: To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required

Coordination Document Comments:
This project is directly related to the MPO’s multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update. Please note that the Hillsborough County Public Works is indicating that construction on Maydell Bridge will start December 2019 (FY2020). This is generally consistent with the documentation provided in the AN package, but additional coordination may be needed as the project progresses.

Direct Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
This project is consistent with the MPO’s multi-modal planning efforts, in particular, the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update and is not anticipated to add lanes or traffic capacity to the exiting roadways. However, it will reopen traffic to Maydell Bridge and a 10 foot trail on the west side and a 5 foot sidewalk on the east side. This will enhance the operational and multi-modal options in this area.

Comments on Effects to Resources:
The MPO’s Livable Roadways Committee was presented with the project at their May 16, 2018 meeting was generally supportive of the project.

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Additional Comments (optional):
This project is directly related to the MPO’s multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update. Please note that the Hillsborough County Public Works is indicating that construction on Maydell Bridge will start December 2019 (FY2020). This is generally consistent with the documentation provided in the AN package, but additional coordination may be needed as the project progresses.

CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Relocation Potential

Project Effects

Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect: N/A / No Involvement assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

Comments:
MPO DOE: Enhanced
FDOT Recommended DOE: N/A / No Involvement

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of N/A / No Involvement.

During the Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis, the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) 2011 Florida Land Use and Land Cover screening identified four major existing land uses within the project’s 500-foot buffer area; Streams and Waterways, Residential Medium Density (2-5 Dwelling Units), Transportation, and Industrial.
Residential Land Uses within the 100-foot Project Buffer Area:
Medium Density (2-5 Dwelling Units) - 2.85 acres (30.25%)

Commercial and Services Land Use within the 100-foot Project Buffer Area:
N/A

Residential Land Uses within the 200-foot Project Buffer Area:
Medium Density (2-5 Dwelling Units) - 5.76 acres (31.15%)

Commercial and Services Land Use within the 200-foot Project Buffer
N/A

Residential Land Uses within the 500-foot Project Buffer Area
Medium Density (2-5 Dwelling Units) - 16.19 acres (29.81%)

Commercial and Services Land Use within the 500-foot Project Buffer Area
N/A

The Hillsborough County MPO stated that the project is directly related to their multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails master Plan Update. They also stated that the MPO's Livable Roadways Committee was presented with the project at their May 16, 2018 meeting and was generally supportive of the project.

As replacement of the existing bridge over the Palm River will occur at the existing location and all project construction will occur within existing right-of-way, no residences or business are expected to be relocated.

**Degree of Effect:** Enhanced assigned 05/21/2018 by Allison Yeh, Hillsborough County MPO

**Coordination Document:** To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required

**Coordination Document Comments:**
This project is directly related to the MPO’s multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update. Please note that the Hillsborough County Public works is indicating that construction on Maydell Bridge will start December 2019 (FY2020). This is generally consistent with the documentation provided in the AN package, but additional coordination may be needed as the project progresses.

**Direct Effects**
**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
This project is consistent with the MPO's multi-modal planning efforts, in particular, the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update and is not anticipated to add lanes or traffic capacity to the exiting roadways. However it will reopen traffic to Maydell Bridge and a 10 foot trail on the west side and a 5 foot sidewalk on the east side. This will enhance the operational and multi-modal options in this area.

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
The MPO's Livable Roadways Committee was presented with the project at their May 16, 2018 meeting was generally supportive of the project.

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

**Additional Comments (optional):**
This project is directly related to the MPO's multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update. Please note that the Hillsborough County Public works is indicating that construction on Maydell Bridge will start December 2019 (FY2020). This is generally consistent with the documentation provided in the AN package, but additional coordination may be needed as the project progresses.

**CLC Recommendations:**

**Indirect Effects**
**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
Farmlands
Project Effects

Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect: N/A / No Involvement assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

Comments:
FDOT Recommended DOE: N/A / No Involvement
No agency comments were received for the Farmlands issue. Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) recommend a Degree of Effect (DOE) of N/A / No Involvement.

The Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis identified 2.81 acres (29.82%), 5.80 acres (31.38%), and 18.01 acres (33.17%) of Prime Farmland within the 100-, 200-, and 500-foot project buffer areas, respectively. The project is located in the Tampa urbanized areas.

The project is located within a developed urban environment, and according to the Tampa 2040 Future Land Use Map, the areas north of the proposed project are identified as supporting light and heavy industrial land uses. In addition, the Hillsborough County 2040 Future Land Use Map identifies areas south of the proposed project as supporting medium-density residential development. For these reasons, no involvement regarding farmlands is anticipated as a result of the Build Alternative.

None found
The following organization(s) were expected to but did not submit a review of the Farmlands issue for this alternative: Natural Resources Conservation Service

Aesthetic Effects
Project Effects

Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect: Minimal assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

Comments:
MPO: DOE: Enhanced
FDOT Recommended DOE: Minimal
Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of Minimal.

The Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis 2011 Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) Florida Land Use and Land Cover dataset identified Streams and waterways, Residential Medium Density, Transportation, and Industrial as the four major existing land uses within the 500-foot project buffer area.

Existing Residential Land Uses within the 500-foot Project Buffer Area:
Residential Medium Density (2-5 Dwelling Units) (16.19 acres - 29.81%),
Source: 2011 SWFWMD Florida Land Use and Land Cover

Maydell Drive Bridge will be replaced with a similar structure at its existing location as part of this project. Overall, the proposed project appears to be consistent with the future land use vision and aesthetic character of the corridor. Given this information, the aesthetics effects in the Build Alternative are expected to be minimal. Aesthetic resources and will be analyzed in detail during Project Development.

Hillsborough County will conduct public outreach to solicit opinions and preferences from residents and businesses on potential project effects and general design concepts related to aesthetics.

Degree of Effect: Enhanced assigned 05/21/2018 by Allison Yeh, Hillsborough County MPO
Coordination Document: To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required
**Coordination Document Comments:**
This project is directly related to the MPO’s multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update. Please note that the Hillsborough County Public works is indicating that construction on Maydell Bridge will start December 2019 (FY2020). This is generally consistent with the documentation provided in the AN package, but additional coordination may be needed as the project progresses.

**Direct Effects**
**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
This project is consistent with the MPO’s multi-modal planning efforts, in particular, the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update and is not anticipated to add lanes or traffic capacity to the exiting roadways. However it will reopen traffic to Maydell Bridge and a 10 foot trail on the west side and a 5 foot sidewalk on the east side. This will enhance the operational and multi-modal options in this area.

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
The MPO's Livable Roadways Committee was presented with the project at their May 16, 2018 meeting was generally supportive of the project.

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

**Additional Comments (optional):**
This project is directly related to the MPO’s multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update. Please note that the Hillsborough County Public works is indicating that construction on Maydell Bridge will start December 2019 (FY2020). This is generally consistent with the documentation provided in the AN package, but additional coordination may be needed as the project progresses.

**CLC Recommendations:**

**Indirect Effects**
**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

---

**Economic**
**Project Effects**

**Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect:** 0 None assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

**Comments:**
- MPO DOE: Enhanced
- FDEO DOE: N/A No Involvement
- FDOT Recommended DOE: None

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (FDEO), and recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of None.

A review of the Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis data indicates that there are no Development of Regional Impact (DRI) and no Planned Unit Developments (PUD) within the 500-foot project buffer area.

The University of Florida's Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) projects that Hillsborough County, with a current population of 1,379,302, is projected to grow to 1,901,400 by 2040 with medium population growth, which is an increase of approximately 38%. As the population increases, roadway volumes are projected to increase as well.

According to the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization's 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, population and employment growth is projected to occur within the project area through 2040. Hillsborough County is expected to have an increase
in financial activities and professional/business services. Additionally, based on the City of Tampa 2040 Future Land Use Map, areas north of the alternative are anticipated to support light and heavy industrial land uses, while the Hillsborough County 2040 Future Land Use Map identifies areas south of the alternative as supporting medium-density residential development. Because the proposed project will not result in an increase in traffic capacity on the existing roadway, it is not anticipated to result in a significant change in economic conditions of the area.

Degree of Effect: N/A N/A / No Involvement assigned 05/21/2018 by Matt Preston, FL Department of Economic Opportunity

Coordination Document: No Involvement

**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

Comprehensive Plan(s) Reviewed:

*imagine 2040: Tampa 2040 Comprehensive Plan*, adopted on January 7, 2016; and,


**Comments on Effects to Resources:**

The project is not located within a Rural Area of Opportunity.

The project has very little potential to attract new development, but could potentially provide additional short-term, construction-related employment opportunities.

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

Additional Comments (optional):

**CLC Recommendations:**

**Indirect Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

---

Degree of Effect: 🟢 Enhanced assigned 05/21/2018 by Allison Yeh, Hillsborough County MPO

Coordination Document: To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required

Coordination Document Comments:

This project is directly related to the MPO’s multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update. Please note that the Hillsborough County Public works is indicating that construction on Maydell Bridge will start December 2019 (FY2020). This is generally consistent with the documentation provided in the AN package, but additional coordination may be needed as the project progresses.

**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

This project is consistent with the MPO’s multi-modal planning efforts, in particular, the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update and is not anticipated to add lanes or traffic capacity to the exiting roadways. However it will reopen traffic to Maydell Bridge and a 10 foot trail on the west side and a 5 foot sidewalk on the east side. This will enhance the operational and multi-modal options in this area.

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**

The MPO’s Livable Roadways Committee was presented with the project at their May 16, 2018 meeting was generally supportive of the project.

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

Additional Comments (optional):

This project is directly related to the MPO’s multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails
Mobility Project Effects

Master Plan Update. Please note that the Hillsborough County Public works is indicating that construction on Maydell Bridge will start December 2019 (FY2020). This is generally consistent with the documentation provided in the AN package, but additional coordination may be needed as the project progresses.

CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects

Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Mobility

Project Effects

Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect: 🟠 Enhanced assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

Comments:

MPO DOE: Enhanced
FDOT Recommended DOE: Enhanced

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of Enhanced.

The Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis identified:

100-foot Project Buffer Area
- Pasco County to Tampa Bypass Canal Corridor
- South Coast Greenway Corridor
- Selmon Greenway Connector

Additional Resources within the 200-foot Project Buffer Area
None

Additional Resources within the 500-foot Project Buffer Area
None

Based on the Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART) service schedules and maps, there are no bus transit routes that service the project area.

The proposed project will not result in an increase in travel lanes or in the traffic capacity of the existing bridge structure. The existing Maydell Drive Bridge is presently closed to through traffic due to structural deficiencies (closed December 2015). When the Maydell Drive Bridge is in service, Maydell Drive serves as a connecting link between the unincorporated Palm River-Clair Mel area and the City of Tampa. The proposed project will also provide both a sidewalk and a multiuse trail across the new bridge structure.

The Hillsborough County MPO stated that the project is directly related to their multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update. They also stated that the MPO's Livable Roadways Committee was presented with the project at their May 16, 2018 meeting and was generally supportive of the project.

Hillsborough County will evaluate the addition and connectivity of pedestrian and bicycle facilities within the project corridor as part of the PD&E study. Coordination with Hillsborough County will occur during all project phases to coordinate pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the project area.

Degree of Effect: 🟠 Enhanced assigned 05/21/2018 by Allison Yeh, Hillsborough County MPO

Coordination Document: To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required
Coordination Document Comments:
This project is directly related to the MPO’s multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update. Please note that the Hillsborough County Public works is indicating that construction on Maydell Bridge will start December 2019 (FY2020). This is generally consistent with the documentation provided in the AN package, but additional coordination may be needed as the project progresses.

Direct Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
This project is consistent with the MPO’s multi-modal planning efforts, in particular, the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update and is not anticipated to add lanes or traffic capacity to the exiting roadways. However it will reopen traffic to Maydell Bridge and a 10 foot trail on the west side and a 5 foot sidewalk on the east side. This will enhance the operational and multi-modal options in this area.

Comments on Effects to Resources:
The MPO’s Livable Roadways Committee was presented with the project at their May 16, 2018 meeting was generally supportive of the project.

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Additional Comments (optional):
This project is directly related to the MPO’s multi-modal planning efforts in particular the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan Update. Please note that the Hillsborough County Public works is indicating that construction on Maydell Bridge will start December 2019 (FY2020). This is generally consistent with the documentation provided in the AN package, but additional coordination may be needed as the project progresses.

CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

---

ETAT Reviews and Coordinator Summary: Cultural Section 4(f) Potential

Project Effects

Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect:  N/A  N/A  / No Involvement  assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

Comments:
FDOT Recommended DOE:  N/A  / No Involvement

No agency comments were received for the Section 4(f) Potential issue. Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of N/A / No Involvement.

There are no Section 4(f) resources located within the 200-foot buffer. From review of the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Greenways and Trails Plan update, there are two top countywide priority projects located within the Alternative 1 corridor. These projects are the Selmon Greenway Connector, which would cross the project area in a west to east direction north of the Palm River, and the South County Connector, which would cross over the proposed replacement bridge and continue south through the project corridor. While these projects have not been funded for construction, the propose replacement bridge will include a 10-foot multiuse trail on the west side and a 5-foot sidewalk on the east side in order to accommodate future construction of these trails.

As all project construction will occur within existing right-of-way, no direct impacts to historic resources are expected. A Cultural Resources Assessment Survey will be included in the Hillsborough County Project Development and Environment Study scoping recommendations. For these reasons, no involvement regarding Section 4(f) is anticipated.
Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the Florida Department of State - State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Seminole Tribe of Florida, and the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) and recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of Minimal.

The Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis did not identify any significant historic or archaeological resources within the 500-foot project buffer area.

There have been nine Cultural Resource Assessment Surveys (CRAS) conducted in the general area, but none specific to this PD&E Study. The project location is primarily residential and commercial, and the project crosses over the Tampa Bypass Canal. There is one residential structure and the existing Maydell Drive Bridge within the project 500-foot buffer which were constructed prior to 1970, these structures will need to be identified, recorded and evaluated. However, the bridge type is not unique and there does not appear to be any unique features associated with the structure. In addition, the Tampa Bypass Canal (8HI12135) was constructed in the late 1960s and segments of the canal located outside of the project area were previously assessed. These segments were assessed by the SHPO in 2015 as having insufficient information to make a determination of eligibility.

The SHPO noted that there are no recorded resources within a reasonable APE for the project. A CRAS should be performed to identify and evaluate any unrecorded resources. Once a CRAS has been prepared and submitted for review, an effects finding may be made.

The Seminole Tribe of Florida stated that the project area should be assessed for any unknown buried cultural resources.

The SWFWMD stated that portions of the District owned lands, Tampa Bypass Canal - Section One - extend into the existing up to the right-of-way of Maydell Drive. Any work within the limits of District owned lands will require additional communication and coordination with the Operations & Land Management Bureau.

As all project construction will occur within existing right-of-way, no direct impacts to historic resources are expected. A CRAS will be prepared for this project and will include archaeological and historic resources field survey.

Degree of Effect: Minimal assigned 05/15/2018 by Monte Ritter, Southwest Florida Water Management District

Coordination Document: Permit Required

Coordination Document Comments:

Pursuant to Subsection 10.2.3.6 of the Environmental Resource Permit Applicant's Handbook Volume I, work proposed in, on, or over wetlands and/or surface water will require communications from the Department of Historical Resources (DHR) indicating there will be no impacts to significant historical or archaeological resources. "The applicant may be required to perform an archeological survey and to develop and implement a plan as necessary to demarcate and protect the significant historical or archeological resources, if such resources are reasonable expected to be impacted by the regulated activity." [Subsection 10.2.3.6 ERP AP Vol. I].
proper authorization. Also, coordination with the District's Land Management Bureau, regarding the permitting required with USCG for navigational changes to the Tampa Bypass Canal, which will be necessary due to the alteration of the bridge structure and the need for the District to confirm if a USCG permit is needed.

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**
Bridge replacement within the vicinity of the Tampa Bypass-Section One will result in impacts to District owned lands. Additional coordination with District staff in the Land Management Bureau will be required during the permitting process.

**Additional Comments (optional):**
Pursuant to Subsection 10.2.3.6 of the Environmental Resource Permit Applicant's Handbook Volume I, work proposed in, on, or over wetlands and/or surface water will require communications from the Department of Historical Resources (DHR) indicating there will be no impacts to significant historical or archaeological resources. "The applicant may be required to perform an archaeologial survey and to develop and implement a plan as necessary to demarcate and protect the significant historical or archeological resources, if such resources are evolutionary expected to be impacted by the regulated activity." [Subsection 10.2.3.6 ERP AP Vol. I].

**CLC Recommendations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
<th>Identified Resources and Level of Importance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
None

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**
None

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Effect:</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>assigned 05/01/2018 by Victoria Menchaca, Seminole Tribe of Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Document:</td>
<td>No Involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Identified Resources and Level of Importance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown buried cultural resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments on Effects to Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown buried cultural resources could be disturbed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

**Additional Comments (optional):**

**CLC Recommendations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
<th>Identified Resources and Level of Importance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Effect:</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>assigned 04/10/2018 by Alyssa McManus, FL Department of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Document:</td>
<td>To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Identified Resources and Level of Importance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no recorded resources within a reasonable APE for the project. A CRAS will be performed to identify and evaluate and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recreation Areas
Project Effects

Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect:  
Minimal assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

Comments:
SWFWMD DOE: Minimal
NPS DOE: N/A No Involvement
FDOT Recommended DOE: Minimal

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) and the National Park Service (NPS) and recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of Minimal.

The Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis identified the following recreational opportunities.

Additional Resources within the 100-foot Project Buffer Area
Pasco County to Tampa Bypass Canal Corridor
South Coast Greenway Corridor
Selmon Greenway Connector

Additional Resources within the 200-foot Project Buffer Area
None

Additional Resources within the 500-foot Project Buffer Area
None

While these trail projects have not been funded for construction, the propose replacement bridge will include a 10-foot multiuse trail along its west side in order to accommodate future construction of these trails.

The SWFWMD stated that construction outside of the existing right-of-way has the potential to result in impacts to SWFWMD owned lands - Tampa Bypass Canal - Section One. Any work within the limits of these SWFWMD owned lands will require additional communication and coordination with the Operations & Land Management Bureau. The SWFWMD also stated that the replacement of the Maydell Drive Bridge has the potential to impact recreation areas and recreation trails but did not identify these resources.

The NPS provided a DOA of N/A No Involvement but did not provide any comments.

Hillsborough County will take all measures to develop avoidance alternatives and/or measures to minimize harm to any recreational
resources to the greatest extent practicable.

Degree of Effect: Minimal assigned 05/15/2018 by Monte Ritter, Southwest Florida Water Management District

Coordination Document: Permit Required

Coordination Document Comments:
Replacement of the Maydell Drive Bridge has the potential to impact recreation areas and recreation trails. Coordination with District staff of the Land Management Bureau for impacts within the portions of the Tampa Bypass Canal- Section One is required due to the fact the proposed work is within the limits of District owned land. Impacts to non-District owned recreation areas are also considered during the permitting process as part of the public interest criteria addressed within the Environmental Resource Permit Applicant's Handbook Volume I.

Direct Effects

Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
SWFWMD's responsibility in the ETDM review process is to identify only those recreational areas located on District owned/controlled lands. Review of the GIS Analysis, done on February 6, 2018, indicates there are 4.29-acres of District Owned Lands and 3.63-acres of District Owned Easement associated with the Tampa Bypass Canal- Section One.

It should also be noted, that impacts to all recreation areas shall be considered in evaluation of the application for an environmental resource permit.

Comments on Effects to Resources:
None

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
None

Additional Comments (optional):
Replacement of the Maydell Drive Bridge has the potential to impact recreation areas and recreation trails. Coordination with District staff of the Land Management Bureau for impacts within the portions of the Tampa Bypass Canal- Section One is required due to the fact the proposed work is within the limits of District owned land. Impacts to non-District owned recreation areas are also considered during the permitting process as part of the public interest criteria addressed within the Environmental Resource Permit Applicant's Handbook Volume I.

CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects

Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
None

Comments on Effects to Resources:
None

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
None

Degree of Effect: N/A N/A / No Involvement assigned 05/14/2018 by Anita Barnett, National Park Service

Coordination Document: No Involvement

Direct Effects

Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Additional Comments (optional):

CLC Recommendations:
Indirect Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

The following organization(s) were expected to but did not submit a review of the Recreation Areas issue for this alternative: FL Department of Environmental Protection

---

**ETAT Reviews and Coordinator Summary: Natural**

**Wetlands and Surface Waters**

**Project Effects**

**Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect:** 3 Moderate assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

**Comments:**

- NMFS DOE: Moderate
- USACE DOE: Minimal
- USFWS DOE: Minimal
- USEPA DOE: Minimal
- SWFWMD DOE: Minimal
- FDOT Recommended DOE: Moderate

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) and recommends a Degree of Effect of Moderate.

The National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) dataset of the Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis identified 0.1 acres (1.34%) of palustrine wetlands and 3.7 acres (39.13%) of estuarine wetlands at the 100-foot project buffer area, 0.4 acres (1.91%) of palustrine wetlands and 6.66 acres (36.03%) of estuarine wetlands at the 200-foot project buffer area, and 1.0 acres (1.76%) of palustrine wetlands and 16.2 acres (29.74%) of estuarine wetlands within the 500-foot project buffer area. The SWFWMD Wetlands 2011 dataset identifies the wetlands in this area to be Streams and Waterways. These wetlands consist primarily of the open water areas of the Palm River which will be crossed by the proposed replacement bridge structure. These wetlands and surface waters are associated with the Tampa Bypass Canal sub-basin of the Hillsborough River watershed.

In addition, sovereign submerged lands exist within the vicinity of the bridge; therefore, proprietary authorization from the Division of State Lands will need to be obtained and Public Interest Criteria will need to be addressed.

The NMFS noted that the project includes mangroves located adjacent to the bridge abutments in the Palm River and that these habitats are utilized by federally managed fish species and their prey. NMFS staff conducted a site inspection of the project area on April 13, 2018, to assess potential concerns related to living marine resources within the Palm River and Tampa Bay. Certain estuarine habitats within the project area are designated as essential fish habitat (EFH) as identified in the 2005 generic amendment of the Fishery Management Plans for the Gulf of Mexico. The generic amendment was prepared by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council as required by the 1996 amendment to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act). Estuarine habitats, which exist in the project area, have been identified as EFH for juvenile and adult red drum, juvenile goliath grouper, and juvenile and adult gray snapper by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council under provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Also, a number of other species using these habitats are prey species for federally-managed species. Mangroves, estuarine water column, and mud, sand, shell, and rock substrates are specific categories of EFH that may be directly impacted by the project. If mangrove impacts are anticipated due to the project, then NMFS requests that an EFH Assessment be prepared and included in the Natural Resources Evaluation (NRE) Report. The NMFS provided information that should be included in the EFH assessment.

The USACE provided information about the wetlands and aquatic resources in the project area. The Corps recommends a continued emphasis on wetland avoidance and minimization opportunities throughout the planning process. A wetland survey should be conducted within the study area to identify the wetlands and a jurisdictional determination should be completed. A review of the
Corps Regulatory In lieu fee and Bank Information Tracking System (RIBITS) indicates that the proposed project corridor would traverse the geographical service areas of a federally approved mitigation bank, i.e. Tampa Bay Mitigation Bank. The proposed project may have to be permitted using a Standard Individual Permit review (due to possible impacts to tidal waters). There is a possibility that a Nationwide 3 (Maintenance) or/and a Nationwide 15 (U.S. Coast Guard Approved Bridges) could be used as the project development and planning moves forward.

The USFWS noted the importance of wetlands as habitat for fish and wildlife and recommend that the project be designed to avoid these valuable resources to the greatest extent practicable. If impacts to wetlands are unavoidable, we recommend that mitigation that fully compensates for the loss of wetland resources be provided.

The USEPA stated that the project should avoid and minimize, to the maximum extent practicable, placement of dredged or fill material in jurisdictional waters of the United States and any wetland losses need to be mitigated. To prevent sediment mobilization during construction, the USEPA recommends using turbidity barriers with weighted skirts around all work areas in the Palm River.

The SWFWMD assigned their DOE based on the potential need for increased coordination or effort associated with the SWFWMD’s proprietary or regulatory interests and obligations. For this project, a DOE of “Minimal” was assigned to this issue due to the fact the wetlands will need to be delineated, quantified, and labeled on the construction plans as part of the permit review. However, the expected permitting effort should be straightforward and a normal effort is expected on the part of SWFWMD’s regulatory staff. For ETDM #14344 the District has assigned a pre-application file (PA# 405549) for the purpose of tracking its participation in the ETDM review of this project. Please refer to this pre-application file whenever contacting District regulatory staff regarding this project.

The SWFWMD also stated that surface water impacts associated with replacement of the Maydell Drive Bridge may have a de minimis impact on fish and wildlife habitat; therefore, wetland mitigation may not be required to offset the impacts. For the wetlands, an analysis utilizing the Uniform Mitigation Assessment Method (UMAM) to determine the wetland mitigation required to offset the wetland impacts will be required. This project is located within the Tampa Bay and Coastal Areas Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) Basin. Mitigation banks located within this basin may be used to offset wetland impacts. The project appears to be located within the service areas for Nature Coast Mitigation Bank (43042778.000), Mangrove Point Mitigation Bank (43035355.002), and Tampa Bay Mitigation Bank (43020546.042). Wetland mitigation should be offset within the watershed basin where the wetland impact is located unless a cumulative impact analysis is accepted by the District. The SWFWMD recommended that the FDOT submit a Formal Wetland Determination Petition prior to the ERP application submittal.

The SWFWMD added the construction of the bridge has the potential to impact the 25-foot defined wetland buffer as they relate to the wetlands adjacent to and within the existing/proposed ROW. Construction of stormwater ponds to accommodate the roadway widening may result in construction outside of the 200-foot buffer. This programming screen utilized the 200-foot buffer for the basis of review; therefore, dredging and grading of a stormwater management system may require additional review of wetlands and surface waters once the pond locations are determined during the design phase. Coordination with the SWFWMD is recommended to eliminate wetland and/or surface water impacts during this phase. The construction/alteration of stormwater facilities adjacent to wetlands, particularly forested wetlands, could intercept groundwater and surface water that has historically maintained wetland hydroperiods. Such wetlands may be dewatered and altered, with impacts to wetland vegetation communities, habitat, and wildlife populations.

Avoidance and minimization measures will be incorporated into the project’s design, best management practices will be utilized during project construction activities, and compensatory mitigation will be provided for any unavoidable adverse wetland impacts resulting from construction of the proposed project. The wetlands and EFH analyzes will be documented in a NRE Report that will be prepared in accordance with Part 2, Chapters 9 and 17 of the FDOT PD&E Manual. The NRE will summarize the assessment efforts based on the location, type, and quality of wetland areas as well as estimate the anticipated impacts. The NRE for this project will be coordinated with the USACE, USFWS, NMFS, and other federal and/or state resource/regulatory agencies as applicable. Also, Hillsborough County will coordinate with the Port of Tampa concerning sovereign submerged lands.

Degree of Effect:  Minimal assigned 05/21/2018 by Kim Gates, US Environmental Protection Agency


Coordination Document Comments:
The USEPA would like to review the following PD&E support document:

Natural Resource Evaluation (PD&E Manual, Part 2, Chapter 9)

Direct Effects

Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
Wetlands and other surface waters provide important and beneficial functions, including providing essential fish and wildlife habitat, buffering water quality impacts, storing floodwaters, and maintaining surface water flow during dry periods. However, "[a]s development increased and more paved areas covered the land, stormwater runoff became the primary source of pollution to surface waters in Florida" (http://www.swfwmd.state.fl.us/publications/files/stormwater_systems.pdf). The most common contaminants in highway runoff are heavy metals, inorganic salts, volatile organics, petroleum hydrocarbons, bacteria, pesticides/herbicides, and suspended solids that accumulate on the road surface as a result of regular highway operation and maintenance activities.

Various federal, state, and local laws have been enacted to protect surface water resources. The Clean Water Act (CWA) established the basic structure for regulating discharges of pollutants into the waters of the United States (including coastal fringe wetlands) and provides statutory authority for various regulatory programs. Section 402 of the CWA requires permitting of all municipal, industrial and commercial facilities that discharge wastewater or stormwater directly from a point source. CWA Section 404, which is administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in coordination with the USEPA, governs the discharge of dredged or fill material into surface waters.

Furthermore, pursuant to Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands, issued in May 1977, the USDOT developed a policy, Preservation of the Nation’s Wetlands (USDOT Order 5660.1A), dated August 24, 1978, requiring all federally-funded highway projects to protect wetlands to the fullest extent possible.

Comments on Effects to Resources:
The project is located in the tidally-influenced Palm River segment (WBID 1536E) of the Tampa Bypass Canal (https://ofmpub.epa.gov/waters10/attains_impaired_waters.show_tmdl_document?p_tmdl_doc_blobs_id=61100), which is contiguous with the McKay Bay portion of the Tampa Bay estuary (https://web.archive.org/web/20100303021650/http://www.protectingourwater.org/watersheds/map/tampa_bay/).

As described in the Preliminary Environmental Discussion Comments Report (PED), the National Wetlands Inventory dataset in the EST reported 6.66 acres of estuarine and 0.35 acres palustrine wetlands within the 200-foot project buffer. Although not specified in the PED, both the approved 2017 FDOT Mitigation Plan (https://www.swfwmd.state.fl.us/files/database/site_file_sets/1389/2017_FDOT_Mitigation_Plan-Board_Approved_Plan.pdf) and the draft 2018 FDOT Mitigation Plan (https://www.swfwmd.state.fl.us/files/database/site_file_sets/1389/2018_FDOT Mit_Plan-DRAFT-Jan2018.pdf) indicated that a wetland area of 0.5 acre will be impacted by the project. In addition, Hillsborough County’s Scope of Services for the bridge design contract (BPA CPA 218204588, http://pubrec6.hillsclerk.com/PAV/hillsboroughKWSearch.aspx?appname=BRCONTRACTCERTIFIEDDOCUMENTS&cnum=199) states that a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) 404 Dredge and Fill Permit is expected for this project.

The project has the potential to mobilize contaminants in sediments. Sampling conducted by Hillsborough County during the period 1995-2000 revealed widespread PAH, organochlorine pesticide, PCB, and metal contamination in Palm River sediments (Benthic Habitat Status of Lower Hillsborough, Palm, Alafia & Little Manatee Rivers: 1995-2000, Hillsborough County EPC, March 2002, http://www.epchc.org/home/showdocument?id=160). In particular, PCBs "were detected at concentrations likely to be toxic to aquatic life."

Resuspension of bottom sediments could also aggravate the dissolved oxygen problem in Palm River. Organic materials in these sediments remain only partially decomposed due to lack of oxygen. When resuspended and exposed to dissolved oxygen, decomposition will resume further depressing oxygen levels. Consequently, some fish and bottom-dwelling organisms could be killed in the project vicinity.

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
Consistent with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, the project should avoid and minimize, to the maximum extent practicable, placement of dredged or fill material in jurisdictional waters of the United States, including Palm River and adjacent wetlands. Furthermore, any wetland losses allowed under a Corps Section 404 permit need to be mitigated (https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-08/documents/mitigation_rule_factsheet.pdf).

With regard to sediment mobilization, the USEPA recommends using turbidity barriers with weighted skirts around all work areas in Palm River. These barriers should remain in place until project completion.

Additional Comments (optional):
The USEPA would like to review the following PD&E support document:

Natural Resource Evaluation (PD&E Manual, Part 2, Chapter 9)
CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

---

Degree of Effect: 2 Minimal assigned 05/15/2018 by Monte Ritter, Southwest Florida Water Management District

Coordination Document: Permit Required

Coordination Document Comments:
The SWFWMD has assigned a Degree of Effect based on the potential need for increased coordination or effort associated with the SWFWMD’s proprietary or regulatory interests and obligations. For this project, a DOE of “Minimal” was assigned to this issue due to the fact the wetlands will need to be delineated, quantified, and labeled on the construction plans as part of the permit review. However, the expected permitting effort by FDOT should be straightforward and a normal effort is expected on the part of SWFWMD’s regulatory staff.

The surface water impacts may have a de minimis impact on fish and wildlife habitat; therefore, wetland mitigation may not be required to offset the impacts. For the wetlands, an analysis utilizing the Uniform Mitigation Assessment Method (UMAM) to determine the wetland mitigation required to offset the wetland impacts will be required. This project is located within the Tampa Bay and Coastal Areas ERP Basin. Mitigation banks located within this basin may be used to offset wetland impacts. The project appears to be located within the service areas for Nature Coast Mitigation Bank (43042778.000), Mangrove Point Mitigation Bank (43035355.002), and Tampa Bay Mitigation Bank (43020546.042). Wetland mitigation should be offset within the watershed basin where the wetland impact is located unless a cumulative impact analysis is accepted by the District.

The District will require a delineation of the landward extent of wetland and surface water features by a qualified environmental scientist, pursuant to Chapter 62-340, F.A.C, as located within the defined project limits. The District recommends that the FDOT submit a Formal Wetland Determination Petition prior to the ERP application submittal.

An Environmental Resource Permit is required for the proposed bridge replacement. However, the final determination of the type of permit will depend upon the final design configuration.

For ETDM #14344 the District has assigned a pre-application file (PA# 405549) for the purpose of tracking its participation in the ETDM review of this project. Please refer to this pre-application file whenever contacting District regulatory staff regarding this project.

---

Direct Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Review of the EST (run February 6, 2018) indicates there are two wetland systems totaling 7.01-acres, the majority of which are classified as estuarine wetlands. The SWFWMD Wetland layer (2011) doesn’t indicate there are any wetlands located within the proposed project area; however, the SWFWMD Wetland Layer does not account for the surface water acreages that may fall within the 200-foot buffer, as utilized for this Programming Screen. The highest percentage of defined Land Use in the 200-foot buffer for the proposed bridge replacement is high impact urban (40.66%).

Comments on Effects to Resources:
Replacement of the Maydell Drive Bridge has the potential to impact wetlands and surface waters. Review of the District’s ArcMap indicates several wetlands and surface waters that extend outside of the limits of the proposed bridge replacement. It appears the proposed bridge replacement may meet the requirements for the General Permit for the Florida Department of Transportation, Counties, and Municipalities for Minor Bridge Alteration, Placement, Replacement, Removal, Maintenance, and Operation (Rule 62-330.443, F.A.C.). Under this general permit there is a restriction of no more than 0.50-acre of dredge and filling in wetlands and other surface waters, both temporary and permanent. The general permit also allows for up to 0.50-acre of channel clearing and shaping to facilitate maximum hydraulic efficiency.

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
Below comments apply only if the proposed bridge replacement does not meet the requirements associated with Rule 62-330.443,
This project is located within the Tampa Bay and Coastal Areas ERP Basin. Mitigation banks located within this basin may be used to offset wetland impacts, if applicable. The project appears to be located within the service areas for Nature Coast Mitigation Bank (43042778.000), Mangrove Point Mitigation Bank (43035355.002), and Tampa Bay Mitigation Bank (43020546.042). Wetland mitigation should be offset within the watershed basin where the wetland impact is located unless a cumulative impact analysis is accepted by the District.

Additional Comments (optional):
The SWFWMD has assigned a Degree of Effect based on the potential need for increased coordination or effort associated with the SWFWMD's proprietary or regulatory interests and obligations. For this project, a DOE of "Minimal" was assigned to this issue due to the fact the wetlands will need to be delineated, quantified, and labeled on the construction plans as part of the permit review. However, the expected permitting effort by FDOT should be straight forward and a normal effort is expected on the part of SWFWMD's regulatory staff.

The surface water impacts may have a de minimis impact on fish and wildlife habitat; therefore, wetland mitigation may not be required to offset the impacts. For the wetlands, an analysis utilizing the Uniform Mitigation Assessment Method (UMAM) to determine the wetland mitigation required to offset the wetland impacts will be required. This project is located within the Tampa Bay and Coastal Areas ERP Basin. Mitigation banks located within this basin may be used to offset wetland impacts. The project appears to be located within the service areas for Nature Coast Mitigation Bank (43042778.000), Mangrove Point Mitigation Bank (43035355.002), and Tampa Bay Mitigation Bank (43020546.042). Wetland mitigation should be offset within the watershed basin where the wetland impact is located unless a cumulative impact analysis is accepted by the District.

The District will require a delineation of the landward extent of wetland and surface water features by a qualified environmental scientist, pursuant to Chapter 62-340, F.A.C, as located within the defined project limits. The District recommends that the FDOT submit a Formal Wetland Determination Petition prior to the ERP application submittal.

An Environmental Resource Permit is required for the proposed bridge replacement. However, the final determination of the type of permit will depend upon the final design configuration.

For ETDM #14344 the District has assigned a pre-application file (PA# 405549) for the purpose of tracking its participation in the ETDM review of this project. Please refer to this pre-application file whenever contacting District regulatory staff regarding this project.

CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
This programming screen utilized a 200-foot buffer from the proposed bridge replacement. While there are wetlands and surface waters located within the 200-foot buffer, there are additional wetlands that are located outside of that buffer. The National Wetland Index layer, run February 6, 2018, indicates there are 17.10-acres of wetlands and/or surface waters located within the 500-foot buffer.

Comments on Effects to Resources:
Below comments apply only if the proposed bridge replacement does not meet the requirements associated with Rule 62-330.443, F.A.C.:

Construction of the stormwater management system may require ponds to be constructed outside of the reviewed buffer as utilized through this report. Coordination with the District is recommended to eliminate wetland and/or surface water impacts during this phase.

The construction / alteration of stormwater facilities adjacent to wetlands, particularly forested wetlands, could intercept groundwater and surface water that has historically maintained wetland hydroperiods. Such wetlands may be dewatered and altered, with impacts to wetland vegetation communities, habitat, and wildlife populations.

The construction of the bridge replacement has the potential to impact the 25-foot defined wetland buffer as they relate to the wetlands adjacent to and within the existing / proposed Right Of Way (ROW). The removal of the wetland buffer increases the possibility for secondary impacts to occur to the wetlands during and post-construction.
Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
Below comments apply only if the proposed bridge replacement does not meet the requirements associated with Rule 62-330.443, F.A.C.:

Construction of the stormwater management system may require ponds to be constructed outside of the reviewed buffer as utilized through this report. Coordination with the District is recommended to eliminate wetland and/or surface water impacts during this phase.

The construction / alteration of stormwater facilities adjacent to wetlands, particularly forested wetlands, could intercept groundwater and surface water that has historically maintained wetland hydroperiods. Such wetlands may be dewatered and altered, with impacts to wetland vegetation communities, habitat, and wildlife populations.

The bridge replacement has the potential to impact the 25-foot defined wetland buffer as they relate to the wetlands adjacent to and within the existing / proposed Right Of Way (ROW). The removal of the wetland buffer increases the possibility for secondary impacts to occur to the wetlands during and post-construction.

Degree of Effect: Minimal 05/11/2018 by Lisa Lovvorn, US Army Corps of Engineers
Coordination Document: To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required
Coordination Document Comments:
The proposed project would require a Department of the Army (DA) authorization for impacts to any waters of the U.S. (wetlands) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The proposed project would not require any DA authorization for structures or work under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. A Standard Individual Permit review would be applicable for any estuarine wetland impacts associated with the bridge replacement construction. There is a possibility that a Nationwide 3 (Maintenance) or/and a Nationwide 15 (U.S. Coast Guard Approved Bridges) could be used as the project development and planning moves forward.

Direct Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
Waters of the U.S. include 16.15 acres of estuarine wetlands and 0.95 acre of palustrine wetlands within a 500 foot buffer; 6.66 acres of estuarine wetlands and 0.35 acre of palustrine wetlands within a 200 foot buffer; and 3.69 acres of estuarine wetlands and 0.13 acre of palustrine wetlands exist within a 100 foot buffer. The level of importance would be minimal for a bridge replacement across the Palm River and wetland fill associated with the bridge replacement, roadway improvements along the approaches and causeway construction.

Comments on Effects to Resources:
Any estuarine and palustrine wetlands in the project area deemed to be jurisdictional along the existing two-lane undivided facility with no shoulders and four foot sidewalks. The shoreline is hardened at the location where the bridge connects to land. Given the existing project corridor conditions, any impacts to these resources will be minimal.

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
The Corps recommends a continued emphasis on wetland avoidance and minimization opportunities throughout the planning process. A wetland survey should be conducted within the study area to identify the wetlands and a jurisdictional determination should be completed. A review of the Corps RIBITS indicates that the proposed project corridor would traverse the geographical service areas of a federally approved mitigation bank, i.e. Tampa Bay Mitigation Bank. The proposed project may have to be permitted using a Standard Individual Permit review (due to possible impacts to tidal waters). There is a possibility that a Nationwide 3 (Maintenance) or/and a Nationwide 15 (U.S. Coast Guard Approved Bridges) could be used as the project development and planning moves forward.

Additional Comments (optional):
The proposed project would require a Department of the Army (DA) authorization for impacts to any waters of the U.S. (wetlands) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The proposed project would not require any DA authorization for structures or work under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. A Standard Individual Permit review would be applicable for any estuarine wetland impacts associated with the bridge replacement construction. There is a possibility that a Nationwide 3 (Maintenance) or/and a Nationwide 15 (U.S. Coast Guard Approved Bridges) could be used as the project development and planning moves forward.

CLC Recommendations:
**Indirect Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

See comments for direct effects.

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**

Additional secondary impacts would include bridge shading to adjacent wetlands and surface waters.

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

See comments for direct effects.

---

**Degree of Effect:** 2 Minimal assigned 05/09/2018 by Zakia Williams, US Fish and Wildlife Service

**Coordination Document:** PD&E Support Document As Per PD&E Manual

---

**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

Woodstorks

The surrounding area is roadways, residential developments and mostly estuarine and palustrine wetlands. The action area 200-foot buffer falls within the Core Foraging Area (CFA) of the woodstork. The project is not located close to any wood stork nesting colonies. Although the project area falls within the CFA it is unlikely that wood storks are utilizing this area for foraging.

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**

Woodstorks

Dependent upon the design of the project direct impacts should be avoided. To minimize adverse effects to the wood stork and other wetland dependent species, we recommend that impacts to suitable foraging habitat be avoided. If avoidance is not possible, minimization measure should be employed and best management practices to avoid further degradation of the site. Mitigation for wetland impacts should be discussed with USFWS and will require further coordination. Please refer to the North Florida Field Office website for WOST colony locations. [http://www.fws.gov/northflorida](http://www.fws.gov/northflorida)

Coordination with the Office of Migratory birds will be needed for all projects involving migratory birds and eagles, please contact Ulgonda Kilpatrick in our Migratory Birds office.

Surveys for all federally listed plants found in Hillsborough County (the list can be found on our website northflorida.fws.gov) should be conducted by a trained botanist during the appropriate time of year.

**Wetlands**

Wetlands provide important habitat for fish and wildlife. Best Management Practices (BMPs) should be used to prevent degradation of wetland and other aquatic resources from erosion, siltation, and nutrient discharges associated with the project site. We recommend that the project be designed to avoid these valuable resources to the greatest extent practicable. If impacts to wetlands are unavoidable, we recommend that the FDOT provides mitigation that fully compensates for the loss of wetland resources.

Dependent upon the alternative(s) selected, the proposed project is expected to result in minimal to moderate involvement with wildlife and habitat resources. If it is determined the project will affect and federally listed species and/or their habitat, the Department will initiate consultation with FWS during the Project Development process.

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

---

**Additional Comments (optional):**

---

**CLC Recommendations:**

---

**Indirect Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**
Direct Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
Resources of concern include mangroves that occur adjacent to the existing bridge abutments in the Palm River. These habitats are utilized by federally-managed fish species and their prey.

Comments on Effects to Resources:
NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has reviewed the information contained in the Environmental Screening Tool for ETDM Project # 14344. The Florida Department of Transportation District 7 proposes the replacement of the structurally-deficient Maydell Drive Bridge that spans the Palm River in Hillsborough County, Florida. The project will be an in-kind bridge replacement, but with better pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The existing bridge is presently closed to traffic because of its unsafe condition and it will remain closed during the replacement process.

NMFS staff conducted a site inspection of the project area on April 13, 2018, to assess potential concerns related to living marine resources within the Palm River and Tampa Bay. Certain estuarine habitats within the project area are designated as EFH as identified in the 2005 generic amendment of the Fishery Management Plans for the Gulf of Mexico. The generic amendment was prepared by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council as required by the 1996 amendment to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act). Estuarine habitats, which exist in the project area, have been identified as EFH for juvenile and adult red drum, juvenile goliath grouper, and juvenile and adult gray snapper by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council under provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Also, a number of other species using these habitats are prey species for federally-managed species. Mangroves, estuarine water column, and mud, sand, shell, and rock substrates are specific categories of EFH that may be directly impacted by the project. If mangrove impacts are anticipated due to the project, then NMFS requests that an EFH Assessment be prepared and included in the Natural Resources Evaluation Report.

Also, mangroves, seagrasses, and salt marshes downstream of the project in Tampa Bay may be indirectly affected by the project once completed. Replacement of the bridge could result in increased use and an increase in the amount of sediment, oil and grease, metals and other pollutants reaching downstream estuarine habitats utilized by marine fishery resources in Tampa Bay. Therefore, NMFS recommends that the bridge be designed to direct stormwater off the bridge for treatment before it is discharged into the Palm River. In addition, best management practices should be employed during bridge construction to prevent sedimentation of estuarine and marine habitats.

Federal agencies which permit, fund, or undertake activities which may adversely impact EFH are required to consult with NMFS and, as a part of the consultation process, an EFH assessment must be prepared to accompany the consultation request. Regulations require that EFH assessments include:

1. A description of the proposed action;

2. a scientific analysis of the effects, including cumulative effects, of the proposed action on EFH, the managed fish species, and associated species, such as major prey species.

3. the Federal agency’s views regarding the effects of the action on EFH; and,

4. proposed mitigation, if applicable (50 CFR 600.920 (g) [2]).

Provisions of the EFH regulations [50 CFR 600.920(c)] allow consultation responsibility to be formally delegated from federal to state agencies, such as FDOT. Whether EFH consultation is undertaken by the Federal Highway Administration or a designated state agency, it should be initiated as soon as specific project design and construction impact information are available. EFH consultation can be initiated independent of other project review tasks or can be incorporated in environmental planning documents. Upon review of the EFH Assessment, NMFS will determine if it is necessary to provide EFH Conservation Recommendations on the project.

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Additional Comments (optional):
NMFS requests that an EFH Assessment be included in the NRE if mangrove impacts are anticipated.
CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

The following organization(s) were expected to but did not submit a review of the Wetlands and Surface Waters issue for this alternative: FL Department of Environmental Protection

Water Quality and Quantity
Project Effects

Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect: Moderate assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

Comments:
SWFWMD DOE: Moderate
USEPA DOE: Minimal
FDOT Recommended DOE: Moderate

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) and the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of Moderate.

The Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis identified 51 USEPA water quality data monitoring stations and no Limited Use Drinking Water Wells within the 100-foot project buffer area along with 151 additional USEPA water quality data monitoring station and no Limited Use Drinking Water Wells within the 500-foot project buffer area.

The EST GIS analysis also identified one waterbody within the 100-foot project buffer area: Palm River. From this waterbody there are three instances of Verified Impaired Florida Waters within the 500-foot project buffer area: Nutrients (Historic Chlorophyll-A and Chlorophyll - A) and Dissolved Oxygen. No Outstanding Florida Waters (OFW) and are within the 100-foot project buffer area.

Additionally, Principal Aquifers of the State of Florida lists Floridan Aquifer System as 100.00% within the 500-foot project buffer area. The Recharge Areas of the Floridan Aquifer shows a "Discharge of Greater Than 5" as 100.00% within the 500-foot project buffer area. The project is within the jurisdiction of the SWFWMD. Potential contamination facilities are listed under Contamination.

The SWFWMD stated that a DOE of "moderate" was assigned to this issue due to the present belief that future ERP permitting is expected to be non-routine for: discharges to the verified impaired waters within WBID 1536E, and potential floodplain/floodway storage and conveyance impacts. However, the expected permitting effort by FDOT should be straightforward and a normal effort is expected on the part of SWFWMD's regulatory staff. For ETDM #14344, the SWFWMD has assigned a pre-application file (PA #405549) for the purpose of tracking its participation in the ETDM review of this project. Impacts to existing permitted stormwater management systems may decrease performance in terms of flood management and stormwater treatment. The SWFWMD provided information on publications and handbook, and listed permits in the project vicinity. See the EST for details.

The SWFWMD stated that as of April, 2018, Palm River (WBID 1536E) is classified as impaired for nutrient related pollutants by FDEP. The SWFWMD commented that the proposed bridge replacement project has the potential to delay the recovery of Impaired Waters as a result of untreated or undertreated stormwater runoff during and after construction. As applicable, the SWFWM will require that stormwater management systems that discharge directly or indirectly into waters not meeting standards, including impaired waters, provide a net improvement condition in the water body in terms of the pollutants that contribute to the water body's impairment. If applicable, reductions in pollutant loading from stormwater runoff via stormwater treatment facilities or other BMPs will be required to implement future TMDLs and BMAPs should they be finalized and adopted. The SWFWMD provided additional details in their EST comment concerning stormwater quality treatment.

The USEPA commented that given existing federal requirements, the additional stormwater that will be generated by the wider replacement bridge, and the well-documented impacts of contaminated stormwater on the Tampa Bay estuary, stormwater runoff and its potential impact on water quality need to be properly evaluated and addressed. In accordance with FDOT's process for
complying with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as documented in the PD&E Manual, the USEPA recommends completing a Water Quality Impact Evaluation (WQIE) Checklist. The following information is needed to demonstrate compliance with federal and state MS4 requirements:

- whether the project discharges to surface waters and verified impaired waterbodies;
- pollutants of concern in the verified impaired waterbodies;
- applicable Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs);
- the project's location in permitted MS4s;
- applicable water quality requirements, including Waste Load Allocations (WLAs) in the TMDLs and MS4 permit conditions; and
- direct effects associated with project construction and operation.

As the proposed bridge replacement will not result in an increase in bridge or roadway travel lanes, or traffic capacity, runoff from the roadway and new structure will be discharged to the Palm River in a similar manner. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) will be implemented (as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit) to control the effects of stormwater runoff during construction. The potential impact the proposed project will have on water quality will be examined and documented according to Part 2, Chapter 11 of the FDOT PD&E Manual. Hillsborough County will include an evaluation of existing area stormwater treatment adequacy and details on the future stormwater treatment facilities. The project will be designed to meet state water quality and quantity requirements and the Hillsborough County will implement proper BMPs during construction to ensure there are no violations to water quality standards.

A Location Hydraulics Report will be prepared for the project along with a Water Quality Impact Evaluation.

**Degree of Effect:** Minimal assigned 05/21/2018 by Kim Gates, US Environmental Protection Agency

**Coordination Document:** PD&E Support Document As Per PD&E Manual

**Coordination Document Comments:**
The USEPA would like to review the following PD&E support document:


**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
Stormwater from impervious surfaces in urban environments, including roadways, conveys contaminants to surface water bodies, wetlands, and groundwater. The most common pollutants in highway runoff are heavy metals, inorganic salts, volatile organics, petroleum hydrocarbons, bacteria, pesticides/herbicides, and suspended solids that accumulate on the road surface as a result of regular highway operation and maintenance activities.

The principal law governing pollution of the nation's surface waters is the Clean Water Act (CWA), previously known as the Water Pollution Control Act. Amendments in 1972 established the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting program for wastes discharged from discrete sources, such as pipes from manufacturing facilities and wastewater treatment plants (i.e., point sources). Recognizing the need to address stormwater pollution (i.e., nonpoint sources), the U.S. Congress amended the CWA's NPDES provisions in 1987. The USEPA promulgated regulations for medium to large Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) in 1990 and small MS4s in 1999. In October 2000, theUSEPA delegated authority to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) to implement the MS4 programs. FDEP's regulatory requirements for MS4 permits are set forth in Chapter 62-624, F.A.C. ([http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/stormwater/npdes/MS4_1.htm](http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/stormwater/npdes/MS4_1.htm)).

The State also administers its own Environmental Resource Permitting (ERP) program for activities involving the alteration of surface water flows ([http://www.dep.state.fl.us/WATER/wetlands/erp/index.htm](http://www.dep.state.fl.us/WATER/wetlands/erp/index.htm)). The ERP program, which is implemented by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) and the five Water Management Districts, is wholly separate from the federal MS4 permit program and has no underpinning federal requirements.

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
According to the Preliminary Environmental Discussion Comments Report (PED), "[s]tormwater on the existing Maydell Drive Bridge structure is discharged directly from the bridge to the Palm River via scuppers located on the structure. As the proposed bridge replacement will not result in an increase in bridge or roadway travel lanes, or traffic capacity, runoff from the roadway and new structure will be discharged to the Palm River in a similar manner." The PED also acknowledged the Palm River's dissolved oxygen (DO) and nutrients impairments. However, no mention was made of the USEPA's Final DO and Nutrients TMDLs for McKay Bay (WBID 1584B), Palm River (WBID 1536E), and Ybor City Drain (WBID 1584A) issued in March 2013 ([https://ofmpub.epa.gov/waters10/attains_impaired_waters.show_tmdl_document?p_tmdl_doc_blobs_id=61100](https://ofmpub.epa.gov/waters10/attains_impaired_waters.show_tmdl_document?p_tmdl_doc_blobs_id=61100)) or the implementing
Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
Given existing federal requirements, the additional stormwater that will be generated by the wider replacement bridge, and the well-documented impacts of contaminated stormwater on the Tampa Bay estuary (http://baysoundings.com/regional-report-card-highlights-impacts-to-tampa-bay/), stormwater runoff and its potential impact on water quality need to be properly evaluated and addressed during construction and throughout the project's operational life.

In accordance with FDOT's process for complying with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as documented in the PD&E Manual, the USEPA recommends completing a Water Quality Impact Evaluation (WQIE) Checklist. The following information is needed to demonstrate compliance with federal and state MS4 requirements:

- whether the project discharges to surface waters and verified impaired waterbodies;
- pollutants of concern in the verified impaired waterbodies;
- applicable TMDLs;
- the project's location in permitted MS4s;
- applicable water quality requirements, including Waste Load Allocations (WLAs) in the TMDLs and MS4 permit conditions; and
- direct effects associated with project construction and operation.

Additional Comments (optional):
The USEPA would like to review the following PD&E support document:


CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Degree of Effect: 3 Moderate assigned 05/15/2018 by Monte Ritter, Southwest Florida Water Management District

Coordination Document: Permit Required

Coordination Document Comments:
The SWFWMD has assigned a Degree of Effect (DOE) based on the potential need for increased coordination or effort associated with the SWFWMD's proprietary or regulatory interests and obligations. For this project, a DOE of “moderate” was assigned to this issue due to the present belief that future ERP permitting is expected to be non-routine for:
- Discharges to the verified impaired waters within WBID 1536E.
- Potential floodplain/floodway storage and conveyance impacts.

However, the expected permitting effort by FDOT should be straight forward and a normal effort is expected on the part of SWFWMD's regulatory staff.

Depending upon the construction methods for the proposed replacement bridge, the project may qualify under Rule 62-330.443, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.) "General Permit to the Florida Department of Transportation, Counties and Municipalities for Minor Bridge Alteration, Placement, Replacement, Removal, Maintenance and Operation". If applicable, reductions in pollutant loading from stormwater runoff via BMPs will be required to implement future TMDLs and BMAPs should they be finalized and adopted.

Impacts to existing permitted stormwater management systems may decrease performance in terms of flood management and stormwater treatment. Information on Environmental Resource Permits (ERPs), Storm Water Permits, Dredge & Fill Permits and Works of the District Permits is now available in the EST under Water Quality & Quantity > Permits. Useful (but limited) information includes the permit number, a short description of the project, name of the permittee, project acreage and an approximate location of the project (shown graphically).
As of April, 2018, the SWFWMD GIS indicated six (6) ERP’s have been applied for within 200 feet of this project. Similar information can be obtained from the SWFWMD’s Permits Map Viewer and Environmental Resource Permit Search websites as follows:
http://www8.swfwmd.state.fl.us/ExternalPermitting/
http://www18.swfwmd.state.fl.us/erp/erp/search/ERPSearch.aspx

Previous permits that may be of interest to FDOT in the future design phases of the proposed bridge replacement project are as follows:

Environmental Resource Permits (4):

- 05066.000 - MAYER ELECTRIC COMPANY
- 05066.001 - Mayer Electric - Phase 2 Expansion
- 07072.002 - ADAMO SQUARE
- 19654.001 - Hills Co - Selmon Expressway
- 19654.007 - Selmon Expressway - Open Road Tolling

For ETDM #14344, the District has assigned a pre-application file **(PA #405549)** for the purpose of tracking its participation in the ETDM review of this project. File **PA #405549** is maintained as part of the Water Management Information System (WMIS) available through the SWFWMD, [www.watermatters.org](http://www.watermatters.org). Please refer to this pre-application file whenever contacting District regulatory staff regarding this project.

**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

**Water Quality:**

The following information was obtained from the SWFWMD’s Geographic Information System (GIS) and supplemented with information from the FDOT’s Environmental Screening Tool (EST) and FDEP’s Statewide Comprehensive Verified List of Impaired Waters and Statewide Comprehensive Delist List, accessible at:

http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/watersheds/assessment/a-lists.htm

The project occupies one (1) drainage basin within the 200-foot buffer: Palm River (WBID 1536E). An approximate (graphical) location of this WBID can be viewed within the EST. As of April, 2018, the referenced waterbody is classified as impaired for nutrient related pollutants by FDEP.

**Water Quantity:**

Floodplain issues for this roadway overpass project were addressed in a previous section of this document.

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**

**Water Quality:**

The proposed bridge replacement project has the potential to delay the recovery of Impaired Waters as a result of untreated or undertreated stormwater runoff during and after construction.

**Water Quantity:**

Due to the minor amount of additional impervious surface proposed for this bridge replacement project, stormwater quantity issues will be primarily centered on floodplain/floodway storage and conveyance impacts. Without proper conveyance design and compensation for any floodplain/floodway encroachment, localized flooding and down-gradient scour erosion could occur.

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

As applicable, the SWFWMD will require that stormwater management systems that discharge directly or indirectly into waters not meeting standards, including impaired waters, provide a net improvement condition in the water body in terms of the pollutants that contribute to the water body’s impairment. A higher level of treatment may be necessary (Reference: Section 4.1.g of the District’s “Applicant’s Handbook Volume II”, available at http://www.swfwmd.state.fl.us/permits/rules). If applicable, reductions in pollutant loading from stormwater runoff via stormwater treatment facilities or other BMPs will be required to implement future TMDLs and BMAPs should they be finalized and adopted.

If equivalent stormwater quality treatment is to be considered, the FDOT must reasonably demonstrate the following:

- The alternate, contributing areas are hydrologically equivalent to the new and existing, directly-connected impervious watershed areas that would otherwise contribute to the treatment system;
- The pollution source and loading characteristics are reasonably equivalent, and
- The treatment benefits occur in the same receiving waters and in the same general locality as the existing point(s) of discharge from the new project area.
It is recommended that the FDOT consider stormwater quality treatment together with water quality impacts to wetlands and other surface waters when designing the stormwater water management, components of this project.

As applicable, water quantity concerns must be addressed for the project in accordance with Part III of the SWFWMD's Applicant Handbook Volume II. This includes making provisions to allow runoff from up-gradient areas to be conveyed to down-gradient areas without adversely affecting the stage point or manner of discharge and without degrading water quality (refer to Section 3.8 of the SWFWMD's Applicant Handbook II, available at http://www.swfwmd.state.fl.us/permits/rules/).

Additional Comments (optional):
The SWFWMD has assigned a Degree of Effect (DOE) based on the potential need for increased coordination or effort associated with the SWFWMD's proprietary or regulatory interests and obligations. For this project, a DOE of "moderate" was assigned to this issue due to the present belief that future ERP permitting is expected to be non-routine for:
- Discharges to the verified impaired waters within WBID 1536E.
- Potential floodplain/floodway storage and conveyance impacts.

However, the expected permitting effort by FDOT should be straight forward and a normal effort is expected on the part of SWFWMD's regulatory staff.

Depending upon the construction methods for the proposed replacement bridge, the project may qualify under Rule 62-330.443, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.) "General Permit to the Florida Department of Transportation, Counties and Municipalities for Minor Bridge Alteration, Placement, Replacement, Removal, Maintenance and Operation". If applicable, reductions in pollutant loading from stormwater runoff via BMPs will be required to implement future TMDLs and BMAPs should they be finalized and adopted.

Impacts to existing permitted stormwater management systems may decrease performance in terms of flood management and stormwater treatment. Information on Environmental Resource Permits (ERPs), Storm Water Permits, Dredge & Fill Permits and Works of the District Permits is now available in the EST under Water Quality & Quantity > Permits. Useful (but limited) information includes the permit number, a short description of the project, name of the permittee, project acreage and an approximate location of the project (shown graphically).

As of April, 2018, the SWFWMD GIS indicated six (6) ERP's have been applied for within 200 feet of this project. Similar information can be obtained from the SWFWMD's Permits Map Viewer and Environmental Resource Permit Search web sites as follows: http://www8.swfwmd.state.fl.us/ExternalPermitting/ http://www18.swfwmd.state.fl.us/erp/erp/search/ERPSearch.aspx

Previous permits that may be of interest to FDOT in the future design phases of the proposed bridge replacement project are as follows:

Environmental Resource Permits (4):
- 05066.000 - MAYER ELECTRIC COMPANY
- 05066.001 - Mayer Electric - Phase 2 Expansion
- 07072.002 - ADAMO SQUARE
- 19654.001 - Hills Co - Selmon Expressway
- 19654.007 - Selmon Expressway - Open Road Tolling

For ETDM #14344, the District has assigned a pre-application file (PA #405549) for the purpose of tracking its participation in the ETDM review of this project. File PA# 405549 is maintained as part of the Water Management Information System (WMIS) available through the SWFWMD, www.watermatters.org. Please refer to this pre-application file whenever contacting District regulatory staff regarding this project.

CLC Recommendations:

**Indirect Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
None

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
None

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**
None

The following organization(s) were expected to but did not submit a review of the Water Quality and Quantity issue for this alternative: FL Department of Environmental Protection

---

**Floodplains**

**Project Effects**

**Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect:** 3 *Moderate* assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

**Comments:**

SWFWMD DOE: Moderate

FDOT Recommended DOE: Moderate

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) and recommends a Degree of Effect of Moderate.

The Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis identified:

**Within the 100-foot Project Buffer Area**

D-FIRM 100-Year Floodplain identifies Flood Zone AE with 8.3 acres (88.52%)

**Within the 200-foot Project Buffer Area**

D-FIRM 100-Year Floodplain identifies Flood Zone AE with 15.3 acres (82.89%)

**500-foot Project Buffer Area**

D-FIRM 100-Year Floodplain identifies Flood Zone AE with 40.7 acres (74.97%)

The proposed replacement bridge structure will span the Palm River and only fill associated with bridge piles and abutment construction will occur within the 100-year floodplain. In addition, the project is located within a tidal segment of the Palm River.

The SWFWMD commented that a DOE of "Moderate" was assigned to this issue due to the present belief that future Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) permitting is expected to be non-routine for expected impacts to future Zone A and AE floodplains and historic basin storage areas within the proposed areas of: alterations of existing surface water storage and conveyance facilities, and new stormwater management ponds (if applicable). However, the final determination of the type of permit will depend upon the final design configuration.

The SWFWMD stated that the results of the Watershed Management Model for the Hillsborough River / Tampa Bypass Canal indicate a moderate portion of the proposed bridge replacement project will be located within the 100-year floodplain. The SWFWMD recommended that the FDOT utilize data from these flood studies in preference to generalized information on flows and stages. FDOT should coordinate with District Engineering & Watershed Management Section staff in Brooksville regarding the status & data availability of these Watershed Management Models.

The SWFWMD noted that encroachment within any floodplain, floodway or historic basin storage area may decrease stormwater storage which could increase flooding depth and duration. The SWFWMD may require compensation for fill (or other encroachments) into floodplains, floodways and historic basin storage areas up to the 100-year event if such encroachment(s) will adversely affect conveyance, storage, water quality or adjacent lands.

The SWFWMD stated that the FDOT may reduce the degree of effect for flooding by restricting the filling / encroachment into floodplain, floodway and historic basin storage areas to only those areas that are necessary;
- constructing stormwater treatment ponds outside floodplain, floodway and historic basin storage areas;
- providing equivalent compensation for lost floodplain, floodway and historic basin storage.

Any specific floodplain impacts as a result of construction of the proposed project will be analyzed in accordance with Part 2,
Chapter 13 of the FDOT PD&E Manual. A Location Hydraulics Report will be prepared as part of the PD&E Study. An evaluation of floodplain impacts and alternatives to avoid adverse effects and incompatible development in the floodplains will be undertaken. Efforts will be made to avoid or minimize impacts to floodplain resources and functions. Engineering design features and hydrological drainage structures will be designed such that stormwater transport, flow, and discharge meet or exceed flood control requirements.

**Degree of Effect: 3 Moderate** assigned 05/15/2018 by Monte Ritter, Southwest Florida Water Management District

**Coordination Document:** Permit Required

**Coordination Document Comments:**
The SWFWMD has assigned a Degree of Effect based on the potential need for increased coordination or effort associated with the SWFWMD's proprietary or regulatory interests and obligations. For this project, a DOE of "Moderate" was assigned to this issue due to the present belief that future Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) permitting is expected to be non-routine for expected impacts to future Zone A and AE floodplains and historic basin storage areas within the proposed areas of:
- Alterations of existing surface water storage and conveyance facilities.
- New stormwater management ponds (if applicable).

An Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) will be required for this project. However, the final determination of the type of permit will depend upon the final design configuration.

**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
The following information was obtained from the FDOT’s Environmental Screening Tool (EST) and supplemented with information from the SWFWMD’s Geographic Information System (GIS):

Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map (DFIRM) areas of interest include the following:
- Outside 100 Year Floodplain: representing approximately 17% of the project area within the 200-foot buffer.
- 100 Year Floodplain: representing approximately 83% of the project area within the 200-foot buffer.

Approximate locations of DFIRM Zones can be viewed within the EST under the "Floodplains" map and > Water Resource > Flood Zones > DFIRM 100 Year Floodplain layer. Of particular interest are the wetlands & water bodies within the Palm River (WBID 1536E) watershed.

As of April, 2018, the following FIRM Panel Numbers for the proposed project can be obtained from the FEMA Map Service Center at: https://msc.fema.gov/portal

Panel # 12057C0359H: Effective Date - 08/28/2008

Within the 200-foot buffer, the proposed project is within the limits of a SWFWMD supported Watershed Management Model for the Hillsborough River / Tampa Bypass Canal. The results of this model indicate a moderate portion of the proposed bridge replacement project will be located within the 100-year floodplain. SWFWMD supported Watershed Management Models are generally based on more recent land cover and topographic information and are considered the most accurate information available for establishing floodplains. The SWFWMD recommends that the FDOT utilize data from these flood studies in preference to generalized information on flows and stages. FDOT should coordinate with District Engineering & Watershed Management Section staff in Brooksville regarding the status & data availability of these Watershed Management Models. Information on the Hillsborough River / Tampa Bypass Canal Watershed Management Model is included below:

Watershed Name: Hillsborough River/Tampa Bypass Canal
Project Status: Ongoing
SWFWMD Contact: Ms. Robin Bailey

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
Potential impacts for the proposed project will depend upon the required filling, encroachment or alteration of existing (or future) Zone A and AE Floodplains, Historic Basin Storage areas and (if applicable) Floodways.

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**
Encroachment within any floodplain, floodway or historic basin storage area may decrease stormwater storage which could increase flooding depth and duration. The SWFWMD may require compensation for fill (or other encroachments) into floodplains, floodways
and historic basin storage areas up to the 100-year event if such encroachment(s) will adversely affect conveyance, storage, water quality or adjacent lands (Reference: Sections 3.3 and 3.7 of the District's "Applicant's Handbook Volume II", available at http://www.swfwmd.state.fl.us/permits/rules).

The FDOT may reduce the degree of effect for flooding by:
- restricting the filling / encroachment into floodplain, floodway and historic basin storage areas to only those areas that are necessary;
- constructing stormwater treatment ponds outside floodplain, floodway and historic basin storage areas;
- providing equivalent compensation for lost floodplain, floodway and historic basin storage.

Additional Comments (optional):
The SWFWMD has assigned a Degree of Effect based on the potential need for increased coordination or effort associated with the SWFWMD's proprietary or regulatory interests and obligations. For this project, a DOE of "Moderate" was assigned to this issue due to the present belief that future Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) permitting is expected to be non-routine for expected impacts to future Zone A and AE floodplains and historic basin storage areas within the proposed areas of:
- Alterations of existing surface water storage and conveyance facilities.
- New stormwater management ponds (if applicable).

An Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) will be required for this project. However, the final determination of the type of permit will depend upon the final design configuration.

CLC Recommendations:

**Indirect Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

None

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**

None

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

None

---

**Wildlife and Habitat**

**Project Effects**

**Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect:** Minimal assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

**Comments:**

USFWS DOE: Minimal
FWC DOE: Minimal
SWFWMD DOE: Minimal
FDACS DOE: None

FDOT Recommended DOE: **Minimal**

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC), Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD), and Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and recommends a Degree of Effect of Minimal.

The Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis identifies the project as located within the Greater Tampa Bay Ecological Management Area and a watershed (Palm River) containing one Rare and Imperiled Fish (Ironcolor Shiner). The project lies within Wood stock Core Foraging Area (CFA). There are no Florida Areas Natural Inventory (FNAI) Element Occurrences within the 500-foot project buffer area. Given the relatively low number of wildlife and habitat resources reported within the vicinity of the alternative and the fact that the alternative is located within a developing urban environment, minimal involvement regarding wildlife and habitat resources is anticipated.

The USFWS noted that the project's 200-foot buffer falls within the Core Foraging Area (CFA) of the wood stork, however, the
The FWC stated that based on range, and preferred habitat type, the following species listed by the Federal Endangered Species Act and the state of Florida as Federally Endangered (FE), Federally Threatened (FT), or State Threatened (ST) have the potential to occur within the project area: Gulf sturgeon (FT), smalltooth sawfish (FE), green sea turtle (FT), Kemp's Ridley sea turtle (FE), loggerhead sea turtle (FT), piping plover (FT), red knot (FT), wood stork (FT), Florida manatee (FT), black skimmer (ST), American oystercatcher (ST), least tern (ST), snowy plover (ST), reddish egret (ST), little blue heron (ST), tricolored heron (ST), and the roseate spoonbill (ST). The FWC also noted that the project is within the CFA of one wood stork colony. Also, the Florida black bear is also documented as occasionally occurring in the project area.

The FWC stated that their primary wildlife issues and impacts associated with this project include: potential loss or adverse impact to coastal saltmarsh and mangrove vegetation resulting from project works; potential for injury to manatees, sea turtles, and other aquatic life during in-water construction operations; potential adverse effects to a number of species listed by the Federal Endangered Species Act as Endangered or Threatened, or by the State of Florida as Threatened; and potential for water quality impacts involving sedimentation during construction. They believe that adverse impacts of this project could be minor if: wetland impacts are avoided or appropriately mitigated; special manatee and sea turtle protection measures are adopted for any in-water work; and Best Management Practices (BMPs) are included in the project design to avoid water quality degradation, especially due to siltation and fine sediment turbidity. The FWC also noted in their EST comments measures for conserving fish and wildlife and habitat resources.

The SWFWMD assigned a Degree of Effect of "Minimal" for this issue due to the fact there may need to be some additional coordination with the FWC. An Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) will be required for this project. However, the final determination of the type of permit will depend upon the final design configuration. For ETDM #14344, the SWFWMD has assigned a pre-application file (PA# 405549) for the purpose of tracking its participation in the ETDM review of this project. Please refer to this pre-application file whenever contacting District regulatory staff regarding this project.

The SWFWMD noted that the Florida Manatee has been observed in Tampa Bay. The Florida Manatee is a listed threatened species and will require additional measures to be in place in order to protect this mammal during the construction process for this site. A Specific Condition will be used in the ERP outlining the standard operating procedure during the demolition of the old bridge and construction of the replacement bridge. Please be advised that stormwater outfall pipes and structures extending below the Mean High Water Line, exceeding 8 inches in diameter, will require manatee grating to be installed over the waterward end to ensure no manatees can become entrapped.

A Natural Resources Evaluation (NRE) Report will be prepared for this project and will include documentation of any involvement with wildlife and habitat resources.

**Degree of Effect:** Minimal assigned 05/17/2018 by Fritz Wettstein, FL Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

**Coordination Document:** To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required

**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) staff has reviewed ETDM #14344, Hillsborough County, and provides the following comments related to potential effects to fish and wildlife resources on this Programming Phase project.

The Project Description Summary states that this project involves the replacement of the structurally deficient Maydell Drive Bridge over the Palm River in Hillsborough County which is located immediately adjacent to Tampa Bay. The new bridge is a similar two-lane structure and the total project limits extend 1,000 feet from Murree Road to north of the Lee Roy Selmon Crosstown Expressway (SR-618). The new roadway design includes two 11-foot travel lanes with eight-foot shoulders and a barrier separating five-foot sidewalks and a ten-foot trail.

An assessment of the project area was performed on lands within 500 feet of the proposed alignment to determine potential impacts to habitat which supports listed species and other fish and wildlife resources. Our inventory included a review of aerial and ground-level photography, various wildlife observation and landcover data bases, along with coordination with FWC biologists and other State and Federal agencies. A GIS analysis was performed using the Florida Department of Transportation’s (FDOT) Environmental
Screening Tool to determine the potential quality and extent of upland and wetland habitat, and other wildlife and fisheries resource information. We have reviewed the Preliminary Environmental Discussion Comments Report provided by the FDOT, and offer the following comments and recommendations.

Our review shows that the project area is on the Palm River just east of McKay Bay and Hillsborough Bay, and is located on the boundary of the City Limits of downtown Tampa and the developed area of the Palm River Clair Mel community. Lands in and around the project area are characterized by medium-density residential developments, roadways, and industrial land uses, and native landcover within the assessment area is moderately to highly disturbed. Our review also shows that a total of 19.4 acres or 35.7 percent of the lands within 500 feet of the project area is either owned, or under easement to the Southwest Florida Water Management District.

The waters of the Palm River are documented as impaired for dissolved oxygen and excess nutrients, and portions of the river upstream outside of the project area are channelized. Landcover within the assessment area consists primarily of High and Low Impact Urban land (30.7 acres (56.6%), estuarine wetlands and open water (18.8 acres (34.5%), and upland forests (1.5 acres (2.8%). Upland plant community types include upland hardwood forests (0.2 acres, 0.4%), pinelands (0.9 acres, 1.6%), and mixed hardwood - pine forests (0.4 acres, .8%), while wetlands are represented by coastal salt marsh 4.6 acres, (8.4%), mangrove swamp 0.2 acres, 0.4%), and open water 14.0 acres, (25.7%).

Based on range, and preferred habitat type, the following species listed by the Federal Endangered Species Act and the state of Florida as Federally Endangered (FE), Federally Threatened (FT), or State Threatened (ST) have the potential to occur within the project area which is immediately adjacent to Tampa Bay: Gulf sturgeon (FT), smalltooth sawfish (FE), green sea turtle (FT), Kemp’s ridley sea turtle (FE), loggerhead sea turtle (FT), piping plover (FT), red knot (FT), wood stork (FT), Florida manatee (FT), black skimmer (ST), American oystercatcher (ST), least tern (ST), snowy plover (ST), reddish egret (ST), little blue heron (ST), tricolored heron (ST), and the roseate spoonbill (ST).

FWC's Integrated Wildlife Habitat Ranking systems ranks habitat in the project area as low quality, however the project is also within the Core Foraging Area of a wood stork rookery. The Palm River is documented as a verified impaired Florida water in 2013 in terms of high levels of nutrients and low levels of dissolved oxygen. However, FWC’s Reclassification of Wetland Habitats of High Priority to Endangered and Threatened Species in Florida shows that 34.5 percent of the project area can support 4 to 6 focal species in wetland areas. In addition, The Rare and Imperiled Fish data base shows that Palm River supports the ironcolor shiner. The Florida black bear is also documented as occasionally occurring in the project area.

Comments on Effects to Resources:
Primary wildlife issues and impacts associated with this project include: potential loss or adverse impact to coastal saltmarsh and mangrove vegetation resulting from project works; potential for injury to manatees, sea turtles, and other aquatic life during in-water construction operations; potential adverse effects to a number of species listed by the Federal Endangered Species Act as Endangered or Threatened, or by the State of Florida as Threatened; and potential for water quality impacts involving sedimentation during construction. Based on the project information provided, we believe that adverse impacts of this project could be minor if: wetland impacts are avoided or appropriately mitigated; special manatee and sea turtle protection measures are adopted for any in-water work; and Best Management Practices are included in the project design to avoid water quality degradation, especially due to siltation and fine sediment turbidity.

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
We recommend that the Project Development and Environment Study address natural resources by including the following measures for conserving fish and wildlife and habitat resources that may occur within and adjacent to the project area:

1. The Preliminary Environmental Discussion Comments Report referenced FDOT’s commitment to prepare a Natural Resources Evaluation (NRE). This should include plant community mapping and wildlife surveys for the occurrence of wildlife species listed by the Federal Endangered Species Act as Endangered or Threatened, or by the State of Florida as Threatened, and should be performed along the right-of-way and within sites proposed for equipment staging. Basic guidance for conducting wildlife surveys may be found in the FWC’s Florida Wildlife Conservation Guide at [http://myfwc.com/conservation/value/fwcp/](http://myfwc.com/conservation/value/fwcp/).

2. Based on the survey results, a plan should be developed to address direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the project on wildlife and habitat resources, including listed species. Avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures should also be formulated and implemented. Equipment staging areas should be located in previously disturbed sites to avoid habitat destruction or degradation. The plan should address specific habitat needs which are biologically compatible with the recovery of the target species. For guidance in this effort, FWC’s Draft Species Action Plans should be consulted at [http://myfwc.com/wildlifehabitats/imperiled/species-action-plans/](http://myfwc.com/wildlifehabitats/imperiled/species-action-plans/).
3. Since no information was provided on any required in-water work, including the seasonality, and length or duration of project work, methods of construction, and whether dredging and filling will be utilized, it would be premature for us to recommend specific avoidance and minimization measures for manatees and sea turtles at this time. However, based on the information currently available, protection measures that may be needed include, but are not limited to, Standard Manatee Conditions for In-Water Work, monitoring of turbidity barriers, presence of manatee/sea turtle observers during in-water work, no in-water work between November and March, and no nighttime work. Further coordination with our agency will be necessary to determine specific measures for this project. For technical assistance and coordination on manatees and sea turtles, please contact our Imperiled Species Management Section in Tallahassee at imperiledspecies@myfwc.com or (850) 922-4330 early in the planning process.

4. The proposed project is located in an area where smalltooth sawfish and Gulf sturgeon may occur. The potential "take" of these species associated with this project may only be authorized by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and/or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The FWC defers to the NMFS and USFWS, and requests that FDOT take into consideration any project-specific permit conditions, comments, recommendations and Biological Opinions regarding smalltooth sawfish and Gulf sturgeon that NMFS and/or USFWS may provide for federal permitting activities associated with this project.

5. For impacts to other state-listed species, refer to the permitting guidelines in the FWC's Species Action Plans. Specifically, the permitting guidelines include methods for avoidance as well as options and state requirements for minimizing and mitigating potential impacts.

6. A compensatory mitigation plan should include the replacement of any wetland, upland, or aquatic habitat functional values for listed species which are lost as a result of the project. Replacement habitat for mitigation should be type for type, and as productive, and equal to or of higher functional value. Please notify us immediately if the design, extent, or footprint of the current project is modified, as we may choose to provide additional comments and/or recommendations.

7. Mitigation for seagrass impacts should be determined via interagency coordination. Seagrass planting projects frequently yield less than the desired results, often because of avoidable problems with project design. The FWC's Fish and Wildlife Research Institute has evaluated seagrass restoration techniques, and can provide technical assistance in the design of a mitigation project. The Seagrass Research Team in St. Petersburg can be contacted at (727) 896-8626, for technical assistance.

8. The use of clean concrete bridge material for offshore artificial reef construction has been a highly successful program in Florida for providing reef fish habitat enhancement and offshore recreational fishing and diving opportunities. If this is being considered for the Maydell Drive Bridge, early coordination with our agency and our county partners is essential due to required permitting, scheduling for the reef site selection and approval process, coordination with potential contractors for selection and transport of material, and to ensure that special conditions and standards are defined and adhered to, such as removal of any exposed steel rebar from bridge reef material to ensure public safety, minimize loss of fishing gear, and avoid entanglement hazards for marine life. Pinellas County has active permitted offshore artificial reef sites located in the Gulf of Mexico available to accept concrete bridge material. For further coordination on artificial reef development, and input on the protection of marine resources, please contact Christine Kittle at Christine.Kittle@MyFWC.com of our Artificial Reef Program within the Division of Marine Fisheries Management in Tallahassee.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide input on highway design and the conservation of fish and wildlife resources. Please contact Terry Gilbert at (850) 728-1103 or email terry.gilbert@MyFWC.com to initiate the process for further overall coordination on this project.

Additional Comments (optional):

CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
Degree of Effect: Minimal assigned 05/15/2018 by Monte Ritter, Southwest Florida Water Management District

Coordination Document: Permit Required

Coordination Document Comments:
A Degree of Effect of "Minimal" was assigned to this issue due to the fact there may need to be some additional coordination with FFWCC.

An Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) will be required for this project. However, the final determination of the type of permit will depend upon the final design configuration.

For ETDM #14344, the District has assigned a pre-application file (PA# 405549) for the purpose of tracking its participation in the ETDM review of this project. Please refer to this pre-application file whenever contacting District regulatory staff regarding this project.

**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
The replacement of the bridge on Maydell Drive may result in surface water and wetland impacts, which will result in additional noticing being sent to FFWCC for their comments.

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
The Florida Manatee has been observed in Tampa Bay. The Florida Manatee is a listed threatened species and will require additional measures to be in place in order to protect this mammal during the construction process for this site. A Specific Condition will be used in the ERP outlining the standard operating procedure during the demolition of the old bridge and construction of the replacement bridge. Please be advised that stormwater outfall pipes and structures extending below the Mean High Water Line, exceeding 8 inches in diameter, will require manatee grating to be installed over the waterward end to ensure no manatees can become entrapped. [FWC "Grates and Other Manatee Exclusion Devices for Culverts and Pipes (February 2011)"
http://myfwc.com/media/415238/manatee_grates.pdf]

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**
None

**Additional Comments (optional):**
A Degree of Effect of "Minimal" was assigned to this issue due to the fact there may need to be some additional coordination with FFWCC.

An Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) will be required for this project. However, the final determination of the type of permit will depend upon the final design configuration.

For ETDM #14344, the District has assigned a pre-application file (PA# 405549) for the purpose of tracking its participation in the ETDM review of this project. Please refer to this pre-application file whenever contacting District regulatory staff regarding this project.

**CLC Recommendations:**

**Indirect Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
None

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
None

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**
None

Degree of Effect: Minimal assigned 05/09/2018 by Zakia Williams, US Fish and Wildlife Service

**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

**Woodstorks**

The surrounding area is roadways, residential developments and mostly estuarine and palustrine wetlands. The action area 200-foot buffer falls within the Core Foraging Area (CFA) of the woodstork. The project is not located close to any wood stork nesting colonies. Although the project area falls within the CFA it is unlikely that wood storks are utilizing this area for foraging.

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**

**Woodstorks**

Dependent upon the design of the project direct impacts should be avoided. To minimize adverse effects to the wood stork and other wetland dependent species, we recommend that impacts to suitable foraging habitat be avoided. If avoidance is not possible, minimization measure should be employed and best management practices to avoid further degradation of the site. Mitigation for wetland impacts should be discussed with USFWS and will require further coordination. Please refer to the North Florida Field Office website for WOST colony locations. [http://www.fws.gov/northflorida](http://www.fws.gov/northflorida)

Coordination with the Office of Migratory birds will be needed for all projects involving migratory birds and eagles, please contact Ulgonda Kilpatrick in our Migratory Birds office.

Surveys for all federally listed plants found in Hillsborough County (the list can be found on our website northflorida.fws.gov) should be conducted by a trained botanist during the appropriate time of year.

**Wetlands**

Wetlands provide important habitat for fish and wildlife. Best Management Practices (BMPs) should be used to prevent degradation of wetland and other aquatic resources from erosion, siltation, and nutrient discharges associated with the project site. We recommend that the project be designed to avoid these valuable resources to the greatest extent practicable. If impacts to wetlands are unavoidable, we recommend that the FDOT provides mitigation that fully compensates for the loss of wetland resources. Dependent upon the alternative(s) selected, the proposed project is expected to result in minimal to moderate involvement with wildlife and habitat resources. If it is determined the project will affect and federally listed species and/or their habitat, the Department will initiate consultation with FWS during the Project Development process.

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

**Additional Comments (optional):**

**CLC Recommendations:**

---

**Indirect Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

---

**Degree of Effect:** 0  
**None assigned 04/20/2018 by Steve Bohl, FL Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Coordination Document:** No Involvement
Coastal and Marine Project Effects

Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect: 3 Moderate assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

Comments:
NMFS DOE: Moderate
SWFWMD DOE: Minimal
FDOT Recommended DOE: Moderate

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the Southwest Florida Water Management District and recommends a Degree of Effect of Moderate.

The Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis identified the Coastal Assessment Framework of the Tampa Bay estuarine drainage area (EDA) within the 100-foot project buffer area as 4.0 acres (42.79%), within the 200-foot project buffer area as 8.9 acres (48.24%) and within the 500-foot project buffer area as 32.3 acres (59.53%). The Palm River is a navigable waterway within the 100-foot project buffer area. Environmentally Sensitive Shorelines within the 100-foot project buffer area consist of 10D/9B: Scrub-Shrub Wetlands/Vegetated Low Banks 341 linear feet, 3A: Fine- to Medium- Grained Sand Beach 29 linear feet, 8B: Sheltered Solid Man-made Structures 184 linear feet, and 9B Vegetated Low Banks 50 linear feet. Within the 200-foot project buffer area Environmentally Sensitive Shorelines consist of 10D/9B: Scrub-Shrub Wetlands 588 linear feet, 3A: Fine-to Medium- Grained Sand Beaches 135 linear feet, 8B: Sheltered Solid Man-Made Structures 184 linear feet, and 9B: Vegetated Low Banks 154 linear feet. Within the 500-foot project buffer area Environmentally Sensitive Shorelines consist of 10A/9B: Scrub-shrub Wetlands/Vegetated Low Banks 1088 linear feet, 10D: Scrub-shrub Wetlands 41 linear feet, 3A: Fine- to Medium- Grained Sand Beaches 480 feet, 8B: Sheltered Solid Man-Made Structures 323 linear feet, and 9B: Vegetated Low Banks 456 linear feet.

The NMFS staff conducted a site inspection of the project area on April 13, 2018, to assess potential concerns related to living marine resources within the Palm River and Tampa Bay. Certain estuarine habitats within the project area are designated as essential fish habitat (EFH) as identified in the 2005 generic amendment of the Fishery Management Plans for the Gulf of Mexico. The generic amendment was prepared by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council as required by the 1996 amendment to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act). Estuarine habitats, which exist in the project area, have been identified as EFH for juvenile and adult red drum, juvenile goliath grouper, and juvenile and adult gray snapper by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council under provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Also, a number of other species using these habitats are prey species for federally-managed species. Mangroves, estuarine water column, and mud, sand, shell, and rock substrates are specific categories of EFH that may be directly impacted by the project. If mangrove impacts are anticipated due to the project, then NMFS requests that an EFH Assessment be prepared and included in the Natural Resources Evaluation (NRE) Report.

Also, mangroves, seagrasses, and salt marshes downstream of the project in Tampa Bay may be indirectly affected by the project once completed. Replacement of the bridge could result in increased use and an increase in the amount of sediment, oil and grease, metals and other pollutants reaching downstream estuarine habitats utilized by marine fishery resources in Tampa Bay. Therefore, NMFS recommends that the bridge be designed to direct stormwater off the bridge for treatment before it is discharged into the Palm River. In addition, best management practices should be employed during bridge construction to prevent sedimentation of estuarine and marine habitats.

The SWFWMD noted that Hillsborough County is listed as a coastal county under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The SWFWMD noted that impacts to wetlands and/or surface waters located within the project boundaries will require additional noticing to be sent to coordinating agencies, such as Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, and Department of State, Division of Historic Resources. This noticing will be completed by the District upon initial receipt of the application. Should one of the coordinating agencies request additional information as part of the permitting process, this information will become a completeness item and may require final CZM noticing once the permit application is deemed complete by District.
The proposed project will not result in an increase in roadway travel lanes or traffic capacity, and will not result in an increase in stormwater pollutant runoff. In addition, best management practices will be utilized during construction to prevent impacts to down-gradient estuarine and marine habitats associated with Tampa Bay. Hillsborough County will coordinate with the NMFS during the PD&E Study and an EFH assessment will be included in the project’s NRE Report.

Degree of Effect: 2 Minimal assigned 05/15/2018 by Monte Ritter, Southwest Florida Water Management District
Coordination Document: Permit Required
Coordination Document Comments:
SWFWMD has assigned a Degree of Effect (DOE) of "Minimal" based upon the routine nature associated with permitting requirements for the proposed bridge replacement.

Impacts to wetlands and/or surface waters located within the project boundaries will require additional noticing to be sent to coordinating agencies, such as Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, and Department of State, Division of Historic Resources. This noticing will be completed by the District upon initial receipt of the application. Should one of the coordinating agencies request additional information as part of the permitting process, this information will become a completeness item and may require final CZM noticing once the permit application is deemed complete by District staff.

Direct Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
Hillsborough County is listed as a coastal county under the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Comments on Effects to Resources:
None

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
None

Additional Comments (optional):
SWFWMD has assigned a Degree of Effect (DOE) of "Minimal" based upon the routine nature associated with permitting requirements for the proposed bridge replacement.

Impacts to wetlands and/or surface waters located within the project boundaries will require additional noticing to be sent to coordinating agencies, such as Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, and Department of State, Division of Historic Resources. This noticing will be completed by the District upon initial receipt of the application. Should one of the coordinating agencies request additional information as part of the permitting process, this information will become a completeness item and may require final CZM noticing once the permit application is deemed complete by District staff.

CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
None

Comments on Effects to Resources:
None

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
None

Degree of Effect: 3 Moderate assigned 05/04/2018 by David A. Rydene, National Marine Fisheries Service
Coordination Document Comments:
NMFS requests that an EFH Assessment be included in the NRE if mangrove impacts are anticipated.
**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
Resources of concern include mangroves that occur adjacent to the existing bridge abutments in the Palm River. These habitats are utilized by federally-managed fish species and their prey.

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has reviewed the information contained in the Environmental Screening Tool for ETDM Project # 14344. The Florida Department of Transportation District 7 proposes the replacement of the structurally-deficient Maydell Drive Bridge that spans the Palm River in Hillsborough County, Florida. The project will be an in-kind bridge replacement, but with better pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The existing bridge is presently closed to traffic because of its unsafe condition and it will remain closed during the replacement process.

NMFS staff conducted a site inspection of the project area on April 13, 2018, to assess potential concerns related to living marine resources within the Palm River and Tampa Bay. Certain estuarine habitats within the project area are designated as EFH as identified in the 2005 generic amendment of the Fishery Management Plans for the Gulf of Mexico. The generic amendment was prepared by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council as required by the 1996 amendment to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act). Estuarine habitats, which exist in the project area, have been identified as EFH for juvenile and adult red drum, juvenile goliath grouper, and juvenile and adult gray snapper by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council under provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Also, a number of other species using these habitats are prey species for federally-managed species. Mangroves, estuarine water column, and mud, sand, shell, and rock substrates are specific categories of EFH that may be directly impacted by the project. If mangrove impacts are anticipated due to the project, then NMFS requests that an EFH Assessment be prepared and included in the Natural Resources Evaluation Report.

Also, mangroves, seagrasses, and salt marshes downstream of the project in Tampa Bay may be indirectly affected by the project once completed. Replacement of the bridge could result in increased use and an increase in the amount of sediment, oil and grease, metals and other pollutants reaching downstream estuarine habitats utilized by marine fishery resources in Tampa Bay. Therefore, NMFS recommends that the bridge be designed to direct stormwater off the bridge for treatment before it is discharged into the Palm River. In addition, best management practices should be employed during bridge construction to prevent sedimentation of estuarine and marine habitats.

Federal agencies which permit, fund, or undertake activities which may adversely impact EFH are required to consult with NMFS and, as a part of the consultation process, an EFH assessment must be prepared to accompany the consultation request. Regulations require that EFH assessments include:

1. A description of the proposed action;
2. A scientific analysis of the effects, including cumulative effects, of the proposed action on EFH, the managed fish species, and associated species, such as major prey species.
3. The Federal agency's views regarding the effects of the action on EFH; and,
4. Proposed mitigation, if applicable (50 CFR 600.920 (g) [2]).

Provisions of the EFH regulations [50 CFR 600.920(c)] allow consultation responsibility to be formally delegated from federal to state agencies, such as FDOT. Whether EFH consultation is undertaken by the Federal Highway Administration or a designated state agency, it should be initiated as soon as specific project design and construction impact information are available. EFH consultation can be initiated independent of other project review tasks or can be incorporated in environmental planning documents. Upon review of the EFH Assessment, NMFS will determine if it is necessary to provide EFH Conservation Recommendations on the project.

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

**Additional Comments (optional):**
NMFS requests that an EFH Assessment be included in the NRE if mangrove impacts are anticipated.

**CLC Recommendations:**

**Indirect Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

---

**ETAT Reviews and Coordinator Summary: Physical**

**Noise**

**Project Effects**

**Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect:** 2 *Minimal* assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

**Comments:**

FDOT Recommended DOE: *Minimal*

No agency comments were received for the Noise issue. Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of Minimal.

During the Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis, the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) 2011 Florida Land Use and Land Cover screening identified five land uses within the 500-foot project buffer area. The four major existing land uses are Streams and Waterways, Residential Medium Density (2-5 Dwelling Units), Transportation, and Industrial. Residential land uses in the project area are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Land Uses within the 100-foot Project Buffer Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density (2-5 Dwelling Units) - 2.9 acre (30.25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Land Uses within the 200-foot Project Buffer Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density (2-5 Dwelling Units) - 5.8 acre (32.29%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Land Uses within the 500-foot Project Buffer Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density (2-5 Dwelling Units) - 16.2 acre (29.81%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no existing noise barriers. The EST GIS analysis also identified numerous community features which may be sensitive to potential noise effects. These are listed by buffer area under the Social DOE. Community features reported within the 200-foot buffer of the project that may be sensitive to noise and vibration effects include residential developments located adjacent to the project corridor on the south side of the Palm River. While the proposed project may result in increased noise levels during construction, the proposed bridge replacement will not result in an increase in travel lanes or traffic capacity. In addition, the proposed replacement bridge will be constructed at the same location as the existing bridge and will have a similar profile as the existing structure. As a result, potential noise and vibration related impacts are anticipated to be minimal.

The noise analysis will be documented in the Noise Study Memorandum as part of the PD&E study in accordance with Part 2, Chapter 18 of the FDOT PD&E Manual.

None found

---

**Air Quality**

**Project Effects**

**Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect:** 2 *Minimal* assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

**Comments:**

USEPA DOE: Minimal

FDOT Recommended DOE: *Minimal*

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of Minimal.

The EST GIS data indicate the project is located in an Air Quality Maintenance Area, Tampa Airshed. There are 1.1 acres (11.89%), 2.8 acres (15.30%), and 10.2 acres (18.79%) of Industrial area within the 100-, 200-, and 500-foot project buffer areas, respectively. There are no USEPA Regulated Air Emission Facility within the 500-foot project buffer area.
The project is located in an area which is designated attainment for all of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards under the criteria provided in the Clean Air Act and subsequent amendments. Therefore, the Clean Air Act conformity requirements do not apply to the project.

The USEPA recommended implementing measures to reduce diesel emissions during construction, such as switching to cleaner fuels, retrofitting current equipment with emission reduction technologies, repowering older engines with newer cleaner engines, replacing older vehicles, and reducing idling through operator training and/or contracting policies. In addition, based on the age of the existing bridge, asbestos-containing material and/or lead-based paint may be present. A site assessment should be conducted prior to demolition. If hazardous substances are detected, appropriate safety measures will be needed during demolition and for waste transport and disposal.

Because the replacement of the Maydell Drive Bridge will not increase the capacity of the roadway nor result in the travel lanes being closer to the air quality sensitive land uses within the project area, no permanent effects to air quality are anticipated. Minimal, localized impacts to air quality could occur as a result of fugitive dust and exhaust emissions generated from equipment during project construction. The project evaluation will include an air quality analysis. The air quality analysis will be documented in the Air Quality Report, in accordance with Part 2, Chapter 19 of the FDOT PD&E Manual.

**Degree of Effect:** Minimal assigned 05/08/2018 by Kim Gates, US Environmental Protection Agency

**Coordination Document:** PD&E Support Document As Per PD&E Manual

**Coordination Document Comments:**
The USEPA would like to review the following PD&E support document:

Air Quality Technical Memorandum (PD&E Manual, Part 2, Chapter 19)

**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
Resource: Air quality that complies with standards established by the USEPA pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act.

Level of Importance: To protect public health and welfare nationwide, the USEPA has established National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for six "criteria pollutants": particulate matter, ozone, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, and lead. States are required to adopt enforceable plans to achieve and maintain air quality that meets these standards. The USEPA has also established National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs) for pollutants known or suspected to cause serious health effects, including lead.

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
The project area is currently in attainment with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and the EPA does not anticipate emissions from the project being significant enough to impact the area's attainment status. However, as noted in the Preliminary Environmental Discussion Comments Report (PED), "localized impacts to air quality could occur as a result of fugitive dust and exhaust emissions generated from equipment during project construction."

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**
The USEPA recommends implementing measures to reduce diesel emissions during construction, such as switching to cleaner fuels, retrofitting current equipment with emission reduction technologies, repowering older engines with newer cleaner engines, replacing older vehicles, and reducing idling through operator training and/or contracting policies.

Based on the age of the existing bridge, asbestos-containing material and/or lead-based paint may be present (https://www.depts.ttu.edu/techmrtweb/reports/complete_reports/0-5884-1.pdf). Consequently, a site assessment should be conducted prior to demolition. If hazardous substances are detected, appropriate safety measures will be needed during demolition and for waste transport and disposal.

**Additional Comments (optional):**
The USEPA would like to review the following PD&E support document:

Air Quality Technical Memorandum (PD&E Manual, Part 2, Chapter 19)

**CLC Recommendations:**
Contamination
Project Effects

Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect: 3 Moderate assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

Comments:
USEPA DOE: Moderate SWFWMD DOE: Minimal
FDOT Recommended DOE: Moderate

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) and recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of Moderate.

Contamination resources that the Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis identified are:

100-foot Project Buffer Area
Onsite Sewage (1)

Additional Resources within the 200-foot Project Buffer Area
None

Additional Resources within the 500-foot Project Buffer Area
None

The USEPA noted that the nearest Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) facility, Hugo Schmidt & Co., is located approximately 660 feet north-north-east of the project’s northern terminus and that available documents indicate the company has or had one 1000-gallon underground petroleum storage tank. Sampling conducted by Hillsborough County during the period 1995-2000 revealed widespread PAH, organochlorine pesticide, PCB, and metal contamination in Palm River sediments. In particular, PCBs "were detected at concentrations likely to be toxic to aquatic life." As a result, the project has the potential to mobilize contaminants in sediments.

The USEPA supports conducting a Contamination Screening Evaluation to identify unreported sources of sub-surface contamination within the project right-of-way and where additional right-of-way is required. With regard to contaminated sediments, the USEPA recommended using turbidity barriers with weighted skirts around all work areas in Palm River. These barriers should remain in place until project completion.

Also, the USEPA noted in the comment for the air quality issue that based on the age of the existing bridge, asbestos-containing material and/or lead-based paint may be present. A site assessment should be conducted prior to demolition. If hazardous substances are detected, appropriate safety measures will be needed during demolition and for waste transport and disposal.

The SWFWMD has assigned a Degree of Effect (DOE) based on the potential need for increased coordination or effort associated with the SWFWMD’s proprietary or regulatory interests and obligations. For this project, a DOE of "Minimal" was assigned to these issues due to the belief that little or no adverse impacts from Contaminated Sites are expected. Future permitting should involve routine interaction with the SWFWMD’s regulatory staff.

The SWFWMD added that if encountered and disturbed during construction, any contaminated site could result in surface and/or groundwater water pollution. While the proposed bridge replacement footprint may not directly impact contaminated sites, proposed storm water management systems (if applicable) and other project construction activities should avoid these areas. The SWFWMD also provided actions to follow to minimize groundwater and surface water pollution potential. These actions are listed in the EST.

A contamination screening evaluation will be conducted in Project Development and a CSER will be prepared. The CSER will include...
additional regulatory analysis, limited field reviews, and selected review of regulatory agency files to obtain a better understanding of the nature and severity of the potential contamination sites. Impacts to contaminated sites will be avoided or minimized to the greatest extent practicable. Any source identified will be assessed to determine the need for remediation during construction.

**Degree of Effect:** 3 *Moderate* assigned 05/21/2018 by Kim Gates, US Environmental Protection Agency

**Coordination Document:** PD&E Support Document As Per PD&E Manual

**Coordination Document Comments:**
The USEPA would like to review the following PD&E support document:

Contamination Screening Evaluation Report (PD&E Manual, Part 2, Chapter 20)

**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**

FDOT defines a contaminated site as "Any contiguous land, sediment, surface water, or groundwater areas that contain contaminants that may be harmful to human health or the environment" (PD&E Manual, Part 2, Chapter 20). To address potential impacts, major federal laws govern the remediation of contaminated sites, including the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA), as amended; and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended. RCRA provides the foundation for three distinct, yet interrelated, regulatory programs: hazardous waste management (Subtitle C), solid waste management (Subtitle D), and the Underground Storage Tank program (Subtitle I). [See Basics of RCRA, https://www.epa.gov/enforcement/resource-conservation-and-recovery-act-rcra-and-federal-facilities] CERCLA established requirements for cleaning up uncontrolled or abandoned hazardous-waste sites, as well as accidents, spills, and other emergency releases of pollutants and contaminants into the environment, using a federal “Superfund” financed by a tax on the chemical and petroleum industries. CERCLA was amended in 2002 by the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act, which codified the USEPA's practices, policies and guidance for cleaning up and redeveloping sites. A brownfield is defined as "a property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant." [See Overview of the Brownfields Program, https://www.epa.gov/brownfields/overview-brownfields-program]

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**

Based on information in the USEPA's NEPAssist (https://www.epa.gov/nepa/nepassist) and Cleanups in My Community (https://www.epa.gov/cleanup/cleanup-mycity) online mapping tools, there are no federal Superfund sites or Brownfields sites where federal grant monies have been expended within 1 mile of the project.

In light of inaccuracies found in the EST database by FDOT contractors (e.g., see the Contamination Screening Technical Memo for ETDM Project #14324, page 3, http://www.swflroads.com/sr60/over-csx/documents_publications.html) and the USEPA (e.g., see our comments on ETDM Projects #14311 and #14322), FDEP's Map Direct: Contamination Locator online mapping tool (http://ca.dep.state.fl.us/mapdirect/?focus=contamlocator) was utilized to identify RCRA-regulated facilities in the project corridor. The nearest RCRA facility, Hugo Schmidt & Co., is located approximately 660 feet north-north-east of the project's northern terminus. Available documents (http://prodenv.dep.state.fl.us/DepNexus/public/electronic-documents/8521256/gis-facility/search) indicate that the company has or had one 1000-gallon underground petroleum storage tank.

The project has the potential to mobilize contaminants in sediments. Sampling conducted by Hillsborough County during the period 1995-2000 revealed widespread PAH, organochlorine pesticide, PCB, and metal contamination in Palm River sediments (Benthic Habitat Status of Lower Hillsborough, Palm, Alafia & Little Manatee Rivers: 1995-2000, Hillsborough County EPC, March 2002, http://www.epchc.org/home/showdocument?id=160). In particular, PCBs "were detected at concentrations likely to be toxic to aquatic life."

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

The USEPA supports conducting a Contamination Screening Evaluation to identify unreported sources of sub-surface contamination within the project right-of-way and where additional right-of-way is required. Potential issues relating to contaminated sites on land include leaking underground petroleum storage tanks, leaking above ground storage tanks, improper storage and/or disposal of hazardous materials, spills and/or leaks from transportation vehicles (e.g., trucks, trains, etc.). If encountered and disturbed during construction, a contaminated site on land could result in surface and/or groundwater water pollution. Additionally, while the project footprint may not directly impact contaminated sites, proposed stormwater management systems and other project construction activities should avoid these areas.

With regard to contaminated sediments, the USEPA recommends using turbidity barriers with weighted skirts around all work areas in Palm River. These barriers should remain in place until project completion.
Additional Comments (optional):
The USEPA would like to review the following PD&E support document:

Contamination Screening Evaluation Report (PD&E Manual, Part 2, Chapter 20)

CLC Recommendations:

**Indirect Effects**
**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**

---

**Degree of Effect:** Minimal assigned 05/15/2018 by Monte Ritter, Southwest Florida Water Management District

**Coordination Document:** To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required

**Coordination Document Comments:**
The SWFWMD has assigned a Degree of Effect (DOE) based on the potential need for increased coordination or effort associated with the SWFWMD's proprietary or regulatory interests and obligations. For this project, a DOE of "Minimal" was assigned to these issues due to the present belief that little or no adverse impacts from Contaminated Sites are expected. Future permitting should involve routine interaction with the SWFWMD's regulatory staff.

---

**Direct Effects**
**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
The SWFWMD utilized the FDOT's Environmental Screening Tool (EST) (supplemented with information from the SWFWMD's Geographic Information System (GIS) for identifying potential contaminated sites that may affect subsequent Environmental Resource Permits (ERPs) for the FDOT. No contamination sites of particular interest to the SWFWMD are located within 200-feet of the proposed bridge replacement project:

From the SWFWMD's GIS, this proposed bridge replacement project lies within a Sensitive Karst Area. Also, one sinkhole was reported within a mile of this project.

From the SWFWMD's GIS and the FDOT's EST, the bridge replacement project area is characterized by a three-aquifer system that includes the Surficial, Intermediate and Floridan aquifers.

Within a 200 foot buffer of the proposed project, the pollution potential of the intact Surficial Aquifer is high as indicated by DRASTIC weighted index of 186. The pollution potential of the Floridan Aquifer is high as indicated by DRASTIC weighted indexes between 161 and 171. No data was available in the EST for the Intermediate Aquifer.

**FAVA Surficial Aquifer System:**
Classified as "Unknown Description" for 100% of the project area within a 200 foot buffer.

**FAVA Intermediate Aquifer System:**
Classified as "Unknown Description" for 100% of the project area within a 200 foot buffer.

**FAVA Floridan Aquifer System:**
Classified as "Unknown Description" for approximately 42% of the project area within a 200 foot buffer.
Classified as "More Vulnerable" for approximately 21% of the project area within a 200 foot buffer.
Classified as "Vulnerable" for approximately 37% of the project area within a 200 foot buffer.

Water use and well construction information is now available in the EST under Contamination > Permits > SWFWMD Well Construction Permits. Useful information includes the permit number, name of the permittee, well casing diameter(s), street address of the well(s), well driller name and the approximate location(s) by latitude / longitude. As of April, 2018, the EST indicated one (1)
permit has been issued within 200 feet of the proposed bridge replacement project area. Similar information can be obtained from the SWFWMD's Permits Map Viewer, Well Construction Permit Search and Water Use Permit Search web sites as follows:
http://www8.swfwmd.state.fl.us/ExternalPermitting/
http://www18.swfwmd.state.fl.us/search/search/wcpsimple.aspx
http://www18.swfwmd.state.fl.us/search/search/searchwupsimple.aspx

The EST also indicates no Limited Use Drinking Water Wells are located within 200 feet of the proposed bridge replacement project.

Comments on Effects to Resources:
If encountered and disturbed during construction, any contaminated site could result in surface and / or groundwater water pollution. While the proposed bridge replacement footprint may not directly impact contaminated sites, proposed storm water management systems (if applicable) and other project construction activities should avoid these areas.

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
To minimize groundwater and surface water pollution potential, the following actions should be considered by the FDOT:
- Conduct an Environmental Audit at the appropriate level to identify specific facilities of interest and to develop a plan for their proper removal or abandonment;
- Coordinate with FDEP & USEPA, and prepare an appropriate Contamination Assessment Report;
- Avoid known contaminated sites where possible in the selection of the project alignment. If discovered during the recommended soils investigation, contamination should be remediated properly so as to eliminate the potential for ground water contamination;
- If applicable, avoid / minimize all construction activity in proximity to known sinkholes along or near the project's alignment;
- Confirm the presence or absence of existing potable supply wells, both public and domestic (refer to the GIS well information above), and identify precisely all potential sources of contamination within the path of construction or in proximity of the proposed surface water management systems;
- Thoroughly evaluate potential stormwater treatment pond sites for the presence of contamination and eliminate contaminated sites as potential pond sites;
- Design and construct stormwater management facilities to avoid breaching the upper confining unit;
- Temporary drainage & erosion control through areas of potential contamination may be important considerations for the FDOT and their construction contractor.

Contamination sources such as existing fuel storage tanks, fuel pumps, and septic tanks shall be removed or abandoned properly. In addition, existing wells in the path of construction shall be properly plugged and abandoned by a licensed well contractor - Reference: Rule 40D-3.531, Florida Administrative Code, available at http://www.swfwmd.state.fl.us/permits/rules/.

Additional Comments (optional):
The SWFWMD has assigned a Degree of Effect (DOE) based on the potential need for increased coordination or effort associated with the SWFWMD's proprietary or regulatory interests and obligations. For this project, a DOE of "Minimal" was assigned to these issues due to the present belief that little or no adverse impacts from Contaminated Sites are expected. Future permitting should involve routine interaction with the SWFWMD's regulatory staff.

CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
None

Comments on Effects to Resources:
None

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
None

The following organization(s) were expected to but did not submit a review of the Contamination issue for this alternative: FL Department of Environmental Protection
Infrastructure
Project Effects
Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect: 3 Moderate assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

Comments:
SWFWMD DOE: Moderate
FDOT Recommended DOE: Moderate

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) and recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of Moderate.

The Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis did not identify any infrastructure facilities within the 500-foot project buffer area. There are no street lights, utility cabinet boxes, fire hydrants or landscaping present along the project corridor. However, there are overhead transmission lines and underground utilities within or adjacent to the project corridor. Utility relocations as a result of the construction of the project is anticipated.

Potential contaminated infrastructure sites are described in the Contaminated Sites DOE.

The SWFWMD has assigned a Degree of Effect based on the potential need for increased coordination or effort associated with the SWFWMD's proprietary or regulatory interests and obligations. For this bridge replacement project, a DOE of "Moderate" was assigned to this issue due to the belief that future ERP permitting is expected to be non-routine for potential new Right-of-Way and / or construction easements over the Tampa Bypass Canal. However, the expected permitting effort should be straightforward and a normal effort is expected on the part of SWFWMD's Regulatory, Operations and Land Management staff.

The SWFWMD also noted that, once completed by the applicant, the SWFWMD's Operations and Land Management Bureau will need to submit (on behalf of FDOT) the appropriate "Section 408 Review Package" to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The SWFWMD commented that a DOE of "Moderate" was assigned to these issues due to the fact that SWFWMD funded data collection sites and benchmarks are located within 500 feet of the proposed roadway improvement project. The SWFWMD requests that FDOT avoid disturbing the data collection sites and survey benchmarks. Coordination with the SWFWMD's Data Collection Bureau in Brooksville will be helpful in protecting these infrastructure components. The SWFWMD provided information on the locations of these data collection sites and benchmarks.

Hillsborough County will conduct continuous coordination with appropriate stakeholders and will take all measures to avoid and/or minimize harm to any infrastructure resources.

Degree of Effect: 3 Moderate assigned 05/15/2018 by Monte Ritter, Southwest Florida Water Management District

Coordination Document: To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required
Coordination Document Comments:
The SWFWMD has assigned a Degree of Effect based on the potential need for increased coordination or effort associated with the SWFWMD's proprietary or regulatory interests and obligations. For this bridge replacement project, a DOE of "Moderate" was assigned to this issue due to the present belief that future ERP permitting is expected to be non-routine for:
- Potential new Right-of-Way and / or construction easements over the Tampa Bypass Canal.

However, the expected permitting effort by FDOT should be straightforward and a normal effort is expected on the part of SWFWMD's Regulatory, Operations and Land Management staff. FDOT should coordinate with the following SWFWMD staff (in Brooksville) to minimize impacts to this regional drainage facility:
- Jeff Hagberg, Manager, Field Operations
- Carman Sanders, Assistant Bureau Chief, Operations and Land Management
- Jerry Mallams, Bureau Chief, Operations and Land Management

Please be advised that the SWFWMD's Operations and Land Management Bureau will need to submit (on behalf of FDOT) the appropriate "Section 408 Review Package" to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. FDOT-D7 staff will need to prepare this review package.

Direct Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
From the SWFWMD's Geographic Information System (GIS), the District owns the following lands along this bridge replacement project:
- The Tampa Bypass Canal, Section 1.
An approximate (graphical) location of the Tampa Bypass Canal can be viewed within the EST under the "Infrastructure" map and > Conservation > ARC > Water Management District Owned Lands layer.

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
The proposed bridge replacement project may require Right-of-Way acquisitions and construction easements for the Tampa Bypass Canal.

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**
None

**Additional Comments (optional):**
The SWFWMD has assigned a Degree of Effect based on the potential need for increased coordination or effort associated with the SWFWMD's proprietary or regulatory interests and obligations. For this bridge replacement project, a DOE of "Moderate" was assigned to this issue due to the present belief that future ERP permitting is expected to be non-routine for:
- Potential new Right-of-Way and / or construction easements over the Tampa Bypass Canal.

However, the expected permitting effort by FDOT should be straightforward and a normal effort is expected on the part of SWFWMD's Regulatory, Operations and Land Management staff. FDOT should coordinate with the following SWFWMD staff (in Brooksville) to minimize impacts to this regional drainage facility:
- Jeff Hagberg, Manager, Field Operations
- Carman Sanders, Assistant Bureau Chief, Operations and Land Management
- Jerry Mallams, Bureau Chief, Operations and Land Management

Please be advised that the SWFWMD's Operations and Land Management Bureau will need to submit (on behalf of FDOT) the appropriate "Section 408 Review Package" to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. FDOT-D7 staff will need to prepare this review package.

**CLC Recommendations:**

**Indirect Effects**
**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
None

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
None

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**
None

---

**Navigation**
**Project Effects**

**Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect:** 3 *Moderate* assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

**Comments:**
USACE DOE: Moderate
USCG DOE: Moderate
FDOT Recommended DOE: Moderate

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the US Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) and US Coast Guard (USCG) and recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of Moderate.

While the Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis did not identify an Florida Marine Facilities or Potential Navigable Waterways / Crossings, the Palm River has been determined to be Navigable. The Maydell Drive Bridge crosses over the Palm River.

The USACE stated that the project proposes to replace the existing Maydell Drive Bridge over the Palm River which is a Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) of the U.S. under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. Any discharge of fill material into waters of the U.S. in conjunction with replacing the bridge would require a Corps Section 404 permit.
The USCG will be the agency charged with insuring the clearance is met as it will also be the federal permitting agency. Any discharge of fill material into waters of the U.S. in conjunction with the bridge replacements will require a USACE permit. The permanent effects to the federal waterway are that the new bridge would be in compliance with bridge clearances to support navigation. There may be temporary impacts to navigation during construction activities. A Nationwide 15 may be applicable for any estuarine wetland impacts associated with the new bridge construction.

The USCG commented that a Bridge Permit will be required for the replacement of the existing Maydell Drive Bridge over the Palm River.

Navigation will be evaluated in Project Development and coordinated with the USCG and USACE.

**Degree of Effect:** 3 Moderate assigned 05/11/2018 by Lisa Lovvorn, US Army Corps of Engineers

**Coordination Document:** To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required

**Coordination Document Comments:**
Unsure whether Section 404 waters would be impacted. Need drawings to confirm.

**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
The proposed project is to replace an existing bridge over the Palm River, a traditionally navigable water (TNW) of the U.S. under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. The U.S. Coast Guard would be the agency charged with insuring the clearance is met as it would also be the lead federal permitting agency. Any discharge of fill material into waters of the U.S. in conjunction with replacing the bridge would require a Corps Section 404 permit. The level of importance is moderate.

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
The permanent effect to the water is that the replacement bridge would be in compliance with bridge clearances to support institutional, commercial and recreation navigation. There may be temporary impacts to navigation during construction activities.

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**
A Standard Individual Permit review be applicable for any estuarine wetland impacts associated with the bridge replacement construction. There is a possibility that a Nationwide 3 (Maintenance) or/and a Nationwide 15 (U.S. Coast Guard Approved Bridges) could be used as the project development and planning moves forward.

**Additional Comments (optional):**
Unsure whether Section 404 waters would be impacted. Need drawings to confirm.

**CLC Recommendations:**

**Indirect Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
See comments for direct effects.

**Comments on Effects to Resources:**
N/A

**Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:**
N/A

**Degree of Effect:** 3 Moderate assigned 05/11/2018 by Randall D Overton, US Coast Guard

**Coordination Document:** Permit Required

**Coordination Document Comments:**
Coast Guard bridge permit required for bridge crossing Palm River

**Direct Effects**

**Identified Resources and Level of Importance:**
Special Designations

Coast Guard bridge permit required for bridge crossing Palm River

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Coast Guard bridge permit required for bridge crossing Palm River

CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Coast Guard bridge permit required for bridge crossing Palm River

CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects

Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

---

ETAT Reviews and Coordinator Summary: Special Designations

Special Designations

Project Effects

Coordinator Summary Degree of Effect: Minimal assigned 08/05/2018 by FDOT District 7

Comments:

USEPA DOE: Minimal
SWFWMD DOE: None

FDOT Recommended DOE: Minimal

Hillsborough County in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has evaluated comments from the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) and US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and recommends a Degree of Effect (DOE) of Minimal.

Information regarding special designation resources and associated Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis may be found under the specific Floodplain, Farmland, and Recreational Areas DOEs.

The Environmental Screening Tool (EST) Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis did not identify any Wild and Scenic Rivers, Aquatic Preserves, Scenic Highways, or Outstanding Florida Waters within the project area.

The EPA noted that in light of the substantial impacts on Tampa Bay water quality caused by pollutants in stormwater, the USEPA is concerned that project stormwater runoff and its potential impact on water quality will not be properly evaluated and addressed during the PD&E phase. Consistent with MS4 permit requirements, appropriate stormwater treatment systems and best management practices must be employed during construction (i.e., temporary best management practices [BMPs]) and post-construction (i.e., permanent BMPs during the operational life of the facility).

Hillsborough County will take all measures to avoid and/or minimize harm to these resources that are present and those that are currently not present should they be identified within or adjacent to the project in the future. The project will be designed to meet state water quality and quantity requirements, and BMPs will be utilized during construction.

Degree of Effect: Minimal assigned 05/21/2018 by Kim Gates, US Environmental Protection Agency


Coordination Document Comments:

The USEPA would like to review the following PD&E support document:

Direct Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
The PD&E Manual (Part I, Chapter 3) defines the Special Designations category as comprised of Outstanding Florida Waters (Rule 62-302.700, F.A.C.), Aquatic Preserves (Rule 62-302.700(2)(f), F.A.C.), Scenic Highways (PD&E Manual, Part 2, Chapter 29), and Wild & Scenic Rivers (Rule 62-302.700(2)(d), F.A.C.). In addition, the Agency Operating and Funding Agreement for Continuing Participation in the Efficient Transportation Decision Making and Transportation Project Development Processes between United States Environmental Protection Agency and Federal Highway Administration and Florida Department of Transportation (AOFA), January 23, 2015, identifies Sole Source Aquifers as Special Designations under the USEPA's purview.

Although not specifically mentioned in either the PD&E Manual or the AOFA, special designations include Estuaries of National Significance as defined in the National Estuary Program established by Congress in 1987. The USEPA recognizes four Estuaries of National Significance in Florida (https://www.epa.gov/nep/local-estuary-programs): Tampa Bay, Sarasota Bay, Charlotte Harbor, and Indian River Lagoon. The project is located in the Palm River Tidal segment (WBID 1536E) of the Tampa Bypass Canal (https://ofmpub.epa.gov/waters10/attains_impaired_waters.show_tmdl_document?p_tmdl_doc_blobs_id=61100), which is contiguous with the McKay Bay portion of the Tampa Bay estuary (https://web.archive.org/web/20100303021650/http://www.protectingourwater.org/watersheds/map/tampa_bay/).

Comments on Effects to Resources:
According to the Preliminary Environmental Discussion Comments Report (PED), “[s]tormwater on the existing Maydell Drive Bridge structure is discharged directly from the bridge to the Palm River via scuppers located on the structure. As the proposed bridge replacement will not result in an increase in bridge or roadway travel lanes, or traffic capacity, runoff from the roadway and new structure will be discharged to the Palm River in a similar manner.” The PED also acknowledged the Palm River’s dissolved oxygen (DO) and nutrients impairments. However, no mention was made of the USEPA’s final DO and nutrients TMDLs (https://ofmpub.epa.gov/waters10/attains_impaired_waters.show_tmdl_document?p_tmdl_doc_blobs_id=61100), applicable Total Nitrogen (TN) and Total Phosphorus (TP) Waste Load Allocations, or the implementing requirements in Hillsborough County’s Phase I MS4 Permit FLS000006.

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
In light of the substantial impacts on Tampa Bay water quality caused by pollutants in stormwater (http://baysoundings.com/regional-report-card-highlights-impacts-to-tampa-bay/), the USEPA is concerned that project stormwater runoff and its potential impact on water quality will not be properly evaluated and addressed during the PD&E phase. Consistent with MS4 permit requirements, appropriate stormwater treatment systems and best management practices must be employed during construction (i.e., temporary BMPs) and post-construction (i.e., permanent BMPs during the operational life of the facility).

Additional Comments (optional):
The USEPA would like to review the following PD&E support document:


CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:

Degree of Effect: 0 None assigned 05/15/2018 by Monte Ritter, Southwest Florida Water Management District

Coordination Document: No Involvement

Direct Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
None

Comments on Effects to Resources:
None

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
None

Additional Comments (optional):

CLC Recommendations:

Indirect Effects
Identified Resources and Level of Importance:
None

Comments on Effects to Resources:
None

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Opportunities:
None
Eliminated Alternatives

There are no eliminated alternatives for this project.
## Project Scope

### General Project Recommendations

There are no general project recommendations identified for this project in the EST.

### Anticipated Permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Assigned By</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPDES General Permit</td>
<td>FDEP</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 404 Nationwide Permit</td>
<td>USACE</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Permit</td>
<td>USCG</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/19/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Resource Permit</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Anticipated Technical Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Study Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Assigned By</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Development Report</td>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement Plan</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Study Report</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination Screening Evaluation Report</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering Report</td>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Technical Memorandum</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Impact Evaluation (WQIE)</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource Assessment Survey</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II Categorical Exclusion</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) Determination of Applicability</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Evaluation (NRE)</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>03/20/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Class of Action

**Potential for Significant Impacts?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues/Resources</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Sig?</th>
<th>NoSig</th>
<th>NoInv</th>
<th>NoIm</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Potential Impact Determination: Sig = Significant Impact; Sig? = Question of Significance; NoSig = No Significant Impact; NoInv = No Involvement, Issue is absent; NoIm = No Impact

### Class of Action Determination

#### Class of Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 2 Categorical Exclusion</th>
<th>Other Actions</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Cooperating Agencies</th>
<th>Participating Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT Office of Environmental Management</td>
<td>US Coast Guard</td>
<td>No Participating Agencies have been identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Class of Action Signatures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Review Status</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>ETDM Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Christine Selly</td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td>10/01/2018</td>
<td>FDOT ETDM Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

Per discussions with OEM, this will be a Focused Type 2 CE.

Thu-Huong Clark            | FDOT Office of Environmental Management | ACCEPTED      | 10/18/2018 | Lead Agency ETAT Member    |
The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by FDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. §327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated 12/14/2016 and executed by FHWA and FDOT.

**Dispute Resolution Activity Log**

There are no dispute actions identified for this project in the EST.
Appendices

Preliminary Environmental Discussion Comments

Social and Economic

Land Use Changes

Alternative Level

Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement

Degree of Effect: Minimal

Comments:
The Build Alternative falls within the Tampa urbanized area. The area surrounding the alternative consists of medium-density residential as well as transportation corridors (Selmon Expressway) and industrial land uses. Areas north of the alternative are designated as part of the Hillsborough County Enterprise Zone and are comprised of industrial land uses. The City of Tampa 2040 Future Land Use Map identifies these areas as supporting light and heavy industrial land uses. Areas south of the alternative fall within the Palm River - Clair Mel unincorporated area. According to the Hillsborough County 2040 Future Land Use Map, these areas are anticipated to support medium-density residential development. Major employment centers consist primarily of industrial and office parks, with some commercial uses. The majority of the area surrounding the alternative has been built-out and future development will likely consist of redevelopment of existing developed areas. For these reasons, minimal impacts or changes to surrounding land uses are anticipated because of this project.

Social

Alternative Level

Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement

Degree of Effect: Minimal

Comments:
The Build Alternative falls within the Tampa urbanized area and within the Palm River - Clair Mel unincorporated area, a census designated place within Hillsborough County. The alternative does not fall within the boundary of a Development of Regional impact or Planned Unit Development, and no schools, cultural centers, or health care facilities are found within the project's 500-foot buffer. Compared to the demographic characteristics for Hillsborough County, the 500-foot project buffer contains a significantly larger percentage of minority populations; a smaller percentage of individuals age 65 and over; a smaller percentage of individuals age 18 and under; and a significantly lower median household income ($25,363 less). Limited English Proficiency (LEP) accommodations will be required during public involvement efforts of the Project Development and Environmental phase as 45% or 40 persons within the census block groups containing the alternative "speak English less than very well." No neighborhood division or social isolation is expected to occur as a result of the project, and while access to proximate residences could temporarily be affected during project construction, impacts on the social environment and community cohesion are anticipated to be minimal. A Public Involvement Plan will be developed and implemented for the project. The project is expected to have minimal impact to social resources.

Relocation Potential

Alternative Level

Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement

Degree of Effect: N/A / No Involvement

Comments:
The area surrounding the Build Alternative consists primarily of medium-density residential as well as transportation corridors (Selmon Expressway) and industrial land uses. As replacement of the existing bridge over the Palm River will occur at the existing location and all project construction will occur within existing right-of-way, no residences or business are expected to be relocated. For these reasons, no involvement regarding relocation potential is anticipated.

Farmlands

Alternative Level

Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement

Degree of Effect: None
Comments:
While the 200-foot buffer of the Build Alternative does not identify any agricultural land uses, this area does contain 5.8 acres (31.4%) of soils classified as Farmlands of Unique Importance. However, the alternative is located within a developed urban environment, and according to the Tampa 2040 Future Land Use Map, the areas north of Alternative 1 are identified as supporting light and heavy industrial land uses. In addition, the Hillsborough County 2040 Future Land Use Map identifies areas south of the alternative as supporting medium-density residential development. For these reasons, no involvement regarding farmlands is anticipated as a result of the Build Alternative. A Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form for the alternative corridor (NRCS-CPA-06) will be included in the Hillsborough County Project Development and Environment Study scoping recommendations to confirm that no farmland resources are impacted by this project alternative.

Aesthetic Effects
Alternative Level
Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement
Degree of Effect: Minimal
Comments:
The area surrounding the Build Alternative consists primarily of medium-density residential, transportation corridors (Selmon Expressway), and industrial land uses. Areas north of the project are designated as part of the Hillsborough County Enterprise Zone and are comprised of industrial land uses. The City of Tampa 2040 Future Land Use Map identifies these areas as supporting light and heavy industrial land uses. Areas south of the project falls within the Palm River - Clair Mel unincorporated area. According to the Hillsborough County 2040 Future Land Use Map, these areas are anticipated to support medium-density residential development. No schools, parks, or health care facilities are located within the project 500-foot buffer. However, there are three bridges identified as part of the National Bridge Inventory (Maydell Drive Bridge over the Palm River, and the east and west bound Selmon Expressway bridges). The Maydell Drive Bridge was closed in December 2015 due to structural deficiencies, and will be replaced as part of the proposed project, while the Selmon Expressway bridges are used to convey traffic to and from Tampa to the west. The Selmon Expressway bridges will not be affected by project construction, and the Maydell Drive Bridge will be replaced with a similar structure at its existing location as part of this project. Overall, the proposed project appears to be consistent with the future land use vision and aesthetic character of the corridor. Given this information, the aesthetics effects in the Build Alternative are expected to be minimal.

Economic
Alternative Level
Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement
Degree of Effect: None
Comments:
The Build Alternative is proposed as a replacement of the existing two-lane Maydell Drive Bridge over the Palm River with a similar two-lane structure with a 10-foot trail on the west side and a 5-foot sidewalk on the east side. The proposed project will not result in an increase in travel lanes or traffic capacity of the existing bridge structure. The existing Maydell Drive Bridge is presently closed to through traffic due to structural deficiencies (closed December 2015). According to the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization's 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, population and employment growth is projected to occur within the project area through 2040. Hillsborough County is expected to have an increase in financial activities and professional/business services. Additionally, based on the City of Tampa 2040 Future Land Use Map, areas north of the alternative are anticipated to support light and heavy industrial land uses, while the Hillsborough County 2040 Future Land Use Map identifies areas south of the alternative as supporting medium-density residential development. Because the proposed project will not result in an increase in traffic capacity on the existing roadway, it is not anticipated to result in a significant change in economic conditions of the area.

Mobility
Alternative Level
Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement
Degree of Effect: Enhanced
Comments:
The Build Alternative is proposed as a replacement of the existing two-lane Maydell Drive Bridge over the Palm River with a similar two-lane structure with a 10-foot trail on the west side and a 5-foot sidewalk on the east side. The proposed project will not result in an increase in travel lanes or in the traffic capacity of the existing bridge structure. The existing Maydell Drive Bridge is presently closed to through traffic due to structural deficiencies (closed December 2015). The proposed project should enhance the operational conditions of the area.
**Cultural**

**Section 4(f) Potential**

**Alternative Level**

**Alternatives:** #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement  
 **Degree of Effect:** Minimal  
 **Comments:**

There are no Section 4(f) resources located within the Build Alternative 200-foot buffer. From review of the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Greenways and Trails Plan update, there are two top countywide priority projects located within the Alternative 1 corridor. These projects are the Selmon Greenway Connector, which would cross the project area in an west to east direction north of the Palm River, and the South County Connector, which would cross over the proposed replacement bridge and continue south through the project corridor. While these project have not been funded for construction, the propose replacement bridge will include a 10-foot multiuse trail along its west side in order to accommodate future construction of these trails.

There are no previously recorded or potential historic resources within the vicinity of the Build Alternative based on surveys conducted within the area of the project. However, based on property appraiser data there appears to be nine structures constructed prior to 1970 located within the alternative's 200-foot buffer. As all project construction will occur within existing right-of-way, no direct impacts to historic resources are expected. For these reasons, minimal involvement regarding Section 4(f) is anticipated. A Cultural Resources Assessment Survey will be included in the Hillsborough County Project Development and Environment Study scoping recommendations.

The project is expected to have minimal involvement with Section 4(f) resources.

**Historic and Archaeological Sites**

**Alternative Level**

**Alternatives:** #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement  
 **Degree of Effect:** Minimal  
 **Comments:**

A review of the Florida Master Site File data indicates that the northern segment of the Build Alternative is within the boundaries of several previous surveys. No previously recorded resources are within 200 feet of this alternative. However, property appraiser data identified nine structures constructed prior to 1970 located within the alternative's 200-foot buffer. As all project construction will occur within existing right-of-way, no direct impacts to historic resources are expected. The existing Maydell Drive bridge structure was constructed in 1968 and is 50 years old, as such a determination as to whether or not the bridge is exempt from individual review under Section 106 will be required. However, the bridge type is not unique and there does not appear to be any unique features associated with the structure. Based the presence of previous surveys within parts of the alternative, and the absence of previously recorded resources, a minimal involvement with cultural resources is anticipated. A Cultural Resources Assessment Survey will be included in the Hillsborough County Project Development and Environment Study scoping recommendations.

The project is expected to have minimal involvement with historic and archeological resources.

**Recreation Areas**

**Alternative Level**

**Alternatives:** #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement  
 **Degree of Effect:** Minimal  
 **Comments:**

No parks or recreational facilities are reported within the 200-foot buffer of the Build Alternative. From review of the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Greenways and Trails Plan update, there are two top countywide priority projects located within the Alternative 1 corridor. These projects are the Selmon Greenway Connector, which would cross the project area in an west to east direction north of the Palm River, and the South County Connector, which would cross over the proposed replacement bridge and continue south through the project corridor. While these project have not been funded for construction, the propose replacement bridge will include a 10-foot multiuse trail along its west side in order to accommodate future construction of these trails.

The project is anticipated to have minimal involvement with recreational resources.
Natural

Wetlands and Surface Waters
Alternative Level
Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement
Degree of Effect: Minimal
Comments:
The National Wetlands Inventory reports 6.66 acres of estuarine and 0.35 acres palustrine wetlands within the 200-foot buffer of the Build Alternative. These wetlands consist primarily of the open water areas of the Palm River which will be crossed by the proposed replacement bridge structure. These wetlands and surface waters are associated with the Tampa Bypass Canal sub-basin of the Hillsborough River watershed. Avoidance and minimization measures will be incorporated into the project’s design, best management practices will be utilized during project construction activities, and compensatory mitigation will be provided for any unavoidable adverse wetland impacts resulting from construction of the proposed project. Minimal involvement regarding wetland resources is anticipated due to the extent and proximity of wetlands within the area of the Build Alternative, and the use of a bridge structure to cross the Palm River. A Natural Resources Evaluation will be included in the Hillsborough County Project Development and Environment Study scoping recommendations.

Water Quality and Quantity
Alternative Level
Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement
Degree of Effect: Minimal
Comments:
The 200-foot buffer of the Build Alternative occurs within an impaired watershed: Palm River [WBID 1536E (impaired for dissolved oxygen and nutrients)]. Also present within the alternative’s 200-foot buffer are several SWFWMD permits, including six Environmental Resource Permits (ERP), and one well construction permit. Two NPDES stormwater permits are also located within the Alternative 1 200-foot buffer. Stormwater runoff within the area of the Build Alternative currently runs into vegetated swales located along both sides of Maydell Drive and is then conveyed to the Palm River. Stormwater on the existing Maydell Drive Bridge structure is discharged directly from the bridge to the Palm River via scuppers located on the structure. As the proposed bridge replacement will not result in an increase in bridge or roadway travel lanes, or traffic capacity, runoff from the roadway and new structure will be discharged to the Palm River in a similar manner. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) will be implemented (as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit) to control the effects of stormwater runoff during construction. Minimal involvement regarding water quality and quantity resources is anticipated due to, 1) the project will not result in an increase in roadway travel lanes or traffic capacity and 2) the project area discharges into a tidal segment of the Palm River which does not require attenuation of stormwater. A Water Quality Impact Evaluation will be included in the Hillsborough County Project Development and Environment Study scoping recommendations.

Floodplains
Alternative Level
Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement
Degree of Effect: Minimal
Comments:
According to the DFIRM 100-Year Floodplain Data, approximately 15.3 (83%) of the Build Alternative 200-foot buffer is located within the 100-year floodplain. However, minimal impact to the 100-year floodplain will occur as a result of project construction as the proposed replacement bridge structure will span the Palm River and only fill associated with bridge piles and abutment construction will occur within the 100-year floodplain. In addition, the project is located within a tidal segment of the Palm River. Therefore, minimal involvement regarding floodplains is anticipated.

Wildlife and Habitat
Alternative Level
Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement
Degree of Effect: Minimal
Comments:
The 200-foot buffer of the Build Alternative occurs within the Greater Tampa Bay Ecosystem Management Area, FWS Consultation Area for the Florida scrub jay, piping plover, Florida manatee, occasional range for the Florida black bear, and core foraging area of the wood stork. Given the relatively low number of wildlife and habitat resources reported within the vicinity of the alternative and the fact that the alternative is located within a developing urban environment, minimal involvement regarding wildlife and habitat resources is anticipated. A Natural Resources Evaluation will be included in the Hillsborough County Project Development and Environment Study scoping recommendations.

Coastal and Marine

Alternative Level

Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement

Degree of Effect: Minimal

Comments:
The Build Alternative occurs within the Tampa Bay Estuarine Drainage Area, a part of the coastal assessment framework. It also contains a tidal segment of the Palm River that is located approximately 1.75 miles upstream of the McKay Bay, and 5.25 miles upstream of the Hillsborough Bay, segments of Tampa Bay. The proposed project will not result in an increase in roadway travel lanes or traffic capacity, and will not result in an increase in stormwater pollutant runoff. In addition, best management practices will be utilized during construction to prevent impacts to down-gradient estuarine and marine habitats associated with Tampa Bay. Therefore, minimal involvement regarding coastal and marine resources is anticipated.

Physical

Noise

Alternative Level

Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement

Degree of Effect: Minimal

Comments:
The area surrounding the Build Alternative is comprised of medium residential, transportation corridors (Selmon Expressway) and industrial land uses. Community features reported within the 200-foot buffer of the Build Alternative that may be sensitive to noise and vibration effects include residential developments located adjacent to the project corridor on the south side of the Palm River. While the proposed project may result in increased noise levels during construction, the proposed bride replacement will not result in an increase in travel lanes or traffic capacity. In addition, the proposed replacement bridge will be constructed at the same location as the existing bridge and will have a similar profile as the existing structure. As a result, potential noise and vibration related impacts are anticipated to be minimal. A Noise Study Memorandum will be included in the Hillsborough County Project Development and Environment Study scoping recommendations.

Air Quality

Alternative Level

Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement

Degree of Effect: Minimal

Comments:
The Build Alternative is located within a USEPA-designated Air Quality Maintenance Area for carbon monoxide. Air quality sensitive land uses found within the alternative's corridor include residential developments south of the Palm River. Because the replacement of the Maydell Drive Bride will not increase the capacity of the roadway nor result in the travel lanes being closer to the air quality sensitive land uses within the project area, no permanent effects to air quality are anticipated. Minimal, localized impacts to air quality could occur as a result of fugitive dust and exhaust emissions generated from equipment during project construction. An Air Quality Technical Memorandum will be included in the Hillsborough County Project Development and Environment Study scoping recommendations.

Contamination

Alternative Level

Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement

Degree of Effect: Minimal
Comments:
There are no reported sources of contamination within the 200-foot buffer of the Build Alternative. However, minimal involvement regarding contamination is anticipated due to the potential presence of unreported sources of subsurface contamination within the alternative alignment. A Contamination Screening Evaluation Report will be included in the Hillsborough County Project Development and Environment Study scoping recommendations.

Infrastructure
Alternative Level
Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement
Degree of Effect: Moderate
Comments:
There are no street lights, utility cabinet boxes, fire hydrants or landscaping present along the Build Alternative corridor. However, there are overhead transmission lines and underground utilities within or adjacent to the Build Alternative corridor. Due to potential need for utility relocations as a result of the construction of the Build Alternative, moderate involvement regarding infrastructure is anticipated.

Navigation
Alternative Level
Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement
Degree of Effect: Moderate
Comments:
The Palm River within the 200-foot buffer of the Build Alternative is tidal and is designated as a navigable water. As such, a Bridge Permit pursuant to the General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended, and the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, as amended, will be required from the US Coast Guard. As a result, a moderate level of navigation involvement is anticipated for the alternative.

Special Designations
Special Designations: Outstanding Florida Waters
Alternative Level
Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement
Degree of Effect: N/A / No Involvement
Comments:
No designated Outstanding Florida Waters are reported within the 200-foot buffer of the Build Alternative; therefore, no involvement regarding this specially designated resource is anticipated.

Special Designations: Aquatic Preserves
Alternative Level
Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement
Degree of Effect: N/A / No Involvement
Comments:
No designated Aquatic Preserves are reported within the 200-foot buffer of the Build Alternative; therefore, no involvement regarding this specially designated resource is anticipated.

Special Designations: Scenic Highways
Alternative Level
Alternatives: #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement
Degree of Effect: N/A / No Involvement
Comments:
There are no Scenic Highways reported within the project vicinity. Therefore, no involvement regarding these specially-designated resources is anticipated.

Special Designations: Wild and Scenic Rivers
**Alternative Level**

**Alternatives:** #1 Maydell Dr. Bridge Replacement  
**Degree of Effect:** N/A / No Involvement  
**Comments:**  
There are no Wild or Scenic Rivers reported within the project vicinity. Therefore, no involvement regarding these specially-designated resources is anticipated.

---

**Advance Notification Comments**

**Hillsborough County MPO Comment**

This project is consistent with the Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Master Plan.  

--Allison Yeh, 5/21/2018

No response

---

**US Army Corps of Engineers Comment**

No issues identified within the Advance Notification package.  

--Lisa Lovvorn, 5/11/2018

No response

---

**GIS Analyses**

Since there are so many GIS Analyses available for Project #14344 - Maydell Drive Bridge Replacement, they have not been included in this ETDM Summary Report. GIS Analyses, however, are always available for this project on the Public ETDM Website. Please click on the link below (or copy this link into your Web Browser) in order to view detailed GIS tabular information for this project:

[http://etdmpub.fla-etat.org/est/index.jsp?tpID=14344&startPageName=GIS%20Analysis%20Results](http://etdmpub.fla-etat.org/est/index.jsp?tpID=14344&startPageName=GIS%20Analysis%20Results)

**Special Note:** Please be sure that when the GIS Analysis Results page loads, the **Programming Screen Summary Report Re-published on 10/22/2018 by Wendy Lasher Milestone** is selected. GIS Analyses snapshots have been taken for Project #14344 at various points throughout the project's life-cycle, so it is important that you view the correct snapshot.

---

**Project Attachments**

There are no attachments for this project.

---

**Degree of Effect Legend**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color Code</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>ETAT</th>
<th>Public Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not Applicable / No Involvement</td>
<td>There is no presence of the issue in relationship to the project, or the issue is irrelevant in relationship to the proposed transportation action.</td>
<td>No community opposition to the planned project. No adverse effect on the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>None (after 12/5/2005)</td>
<td>The issue is present, but the project will have no impact on the issue; project has no adverse effect on ETAT resources; permit issuance or consultation involves routine interaction with the agency. The None degree of effect is new as of 12/5/2005.</td>
<td>No adverse effect on the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>Project has positive effect on the ETAT resource or can reverse a previous adverse effect leading to environmental improvement.</td>
<td>Affected community supports the proposed project. Project has positive effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Project has little adverse effect on ETAT resources. Permit issuance or consultation involves routine interaction with the agency. Low cost options are available to address concerns.</td>
<td>Minimum community opposition to the planned project. Minimum adverse effect on the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Implications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal to None</td>
<td>Project has little adverse effect on ETAT resources. Permit issuance or consultation involves routine interaction with the agency. Low cost options are available to address concerns.</td>
<td>Minimum community opposition to the planned project. Minimum adverse effect on the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Agency resources are affected by the proposed project, but avoidance and minimization options are available and can be addressed during development with a moderated amount of agency involvement and moderate cost impact.</td>
<td>Project has adverse effect on elements of the affected community. Public Involvement is needed to seek alternatives more acceptable to the community. Moderate community interaction will be required during project development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>The project has substantial adverse effects but ETAT understands the project need and will be able to seek avoidance and minimization or mitigation options during project development. Substantial interaction will be required during project development and permitting.</td>
<td>Project has substantial adverse effects on the community and faces substantial community opposition. Intensive community interaction with focused Public Involvement will be required during project development to address community concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Dispute (Planning Screen)</td>
<td>Project may not conform to agency statutory requirements and may not be permitted. Project modification or evaluation of alternatives is required before advancing to the LRTP Programming Screen.</td>
<td>Community strongly opposes the project. Project is not in conformity with local comprehensive plan and has severe negative impact on the affected community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution (Programming Screen)</td>
<td>Project does not conform to agency statutory requirements and will not be permitted. Dispute resolution is required before the project proceeds to programming.</td>
<td>Community strongly opposes the project. Project is not in conformity with local comprehensive plan and has severe negative impact on the affected community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ETAT Consensus</td>
<td>ETAT members from different agencies assigned a different degree of effect to this project, and the ETDM coordinator has not assigned a summary degree of effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ETAT Reviews</td>
<td>No ETAT members have reviewed the corresponding issue for this project, and the ETDM coordinator has not assigned a summary degree of effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This map and its content is made available by the Florida Department of Transportation on an "as is," "as available" basis without warranties of any kind, express or implied.