FINAL LOCATION HYDRAULIC REPORT

SR 600 (US 92) PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENT (PD&E) STUDY RE-EVALUATION

From East of I-4 to East of County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida





District Seven

Work Program Item Segment #: 435749-1 Federal Aid Project Number: MAF-212-1(34) May 2017

FINAL LOCATION HYDRAULIC REPORT

Florida Department of Transportation District Seven

SR 600 (US 92) Project Development & Environment Study Re-evaluation

From East of I-4 to East of County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida

Work Program Item Segment No.: 435749-1 Federal Aid Project No.: MAF-212-1(34)

The Florida Department of Transportation, District Seven, conducted a Project Development and Environment Study Re-evaluation for the proposed widening of State Road 600 (US 92) from east of Interstate 4 to east of County Line Road in Hillsborough County, Florida. The total project length is approximately 18.1 miles. The environmental document that was reevaluated is a Type 2 Categorical Exclusion (Approved by the FHWA on March 24, 1994).

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) pursuant to 23 U.S.C. § 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 14, 2016 and executed by the Federal Highway Administration and FDOT.

Renato E. Chuw. ProfessionaPE

Any reference contained herein to the Project Development & Environment Manual is referring to the 2016 revision.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION	5
SECTION 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	5
SECTION 3 DATA COLLECTION	10
SECTION 4 EXISTING DRAINAGE CONDITIONS	11
4.1 Drainage Patterns	11
4.2 Topography & Hydrologic Features	12
4.3 Existing Bridge Study	13
4.4 Soils Data and Geotechnical Investigations	13
4.5 Environmental Characteristics	15
4.5.1 Land Use Data	15
4.5.2 Cultural Features	16
4.5.3 Natural and Biological Features	16
4.6 Floodplains/Floodways	16
4.6.1 Flooding History and Maintenance Concern	18
SECTION 5 PROPOSED CONDITIONS	18
5.1 Longitudinal & Transverse Floodplain Impacts	18
5.2 Project Classification	19
5.3 Risk Evaluation	19
5.4 PD&E Manual Requirements with Minimal Encroachment	20
SECTION 6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	22

TABLES

Table 1 – Summary of Existing Cross Drains and Bridges	12
Table 2 – Existing Bridge Data	13
Table 3 – USDA NRCS Soil Survey Information	14
Table 4 – Summary of Floodplain Compensation (FPC) Sites	17

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Exhibits

Appendix 2 – Cross Drain Pictures, Review Checklist and FDOT SLD

Appendix 3 – FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)

Appendix 4 – Correspondence

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), District Seven conducted a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation for the proposed widening of SR 600 (US 92) from east of Interstate 4 (I-4) to east of County Line Road in Hillsborough County, Florida. The original PD&E Study was completed in 1994. Due to a change in design standards and existing conditions, the project's PD&E Study was re-evaluated.

The purpose of this Final Location Hydraulic Report is to address base floodplain encroachments resulting from the roadway improvements evaluated in the PD&E Study Re-evaluation. In accordance with Executive Order 11988 "Floodplain Management", USDOT Order 5650.2, "Floodplain Management Protection", and Federal-Aid Policy Guide 23 CFR 650A, floodplains must be protected. The intent of these regulations is to avoid or minimize highway encroachments within the 100-year (base) floodplains and to avoid supporting land use development incompatible with floodplain values.

The majority of the project is designated Zone 'X' which means those areas have a 0.2% probability of flooding every year (500-year floodplain). Some parts (mostly streams and waterbodies crossing) are in the Zone 'AE' which have a 1% probability of flooding every year (100-year floodplain), and where predicted flood water elevations have been established. Please refer to Section 4.6 for discussion.

In conclusion, the following statement summarizes the results of the findings:

"Replacement drainage structures for this project are limited to hydraulically equivalent structures. The limitations to the hydraulic equivalency being proposed are basically due to restrictions imposed by the geometrics of design, existing development, cost feasibility, or practicability. An alternative encroachment location is not considered in this category since it defeats the project purpose or is economically unfeasible. Since flooding conditions in the project area are inherent in the topography or are a result of other outside contributing sources, and there is no practical alternative to totally eradicate flood impacts or even reduce them in any significant amount, existing flooding will continue, but not be increased. The proposed structure will be hydraulically equivalent to or greater than the existing structure, and backwater surface elevations are not expected to increase. As a result, the project will not affect existing flood heights or floodplain limits. This project will not result in any new or increased adverse environmental impacts. There will be no significant change in the potential for interruption or termination of emergency service or emergency evacuation routes. Therefore, it has been determined that this encroachment is not significant."

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), District Seven conducted a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation for the proposed widening of SR 600 (US 92) from east of Interstate 4 (I-4) to east of County Line Road in Hillsborough County, Florida. US 92 is an east-west roadway and is classified as an urban other principal arterial facility. Within the project limits, US 92 runs parallel to I-4. Part of the project is located within Plant City while the remainder of the project is in unincorporated Hillsborough County. From Garden Lane to Thonotosassa Road, US 92 is a two-lane rural roadway. From Thonotosassa Road to Mobley Street, US 92 consists of two eastbound travel lanes and two westbound travel lanes. East of Park Road, US 92 is again a two-lane roadway. Pease refer to **Exhibits 2A, 2B, 2C and 2D (Appendix 1)** for existing typical sections.

Eleven evaluation segments have been developed based on similarities in existing roadway characteristics, land use, the location of I-75, and the location of the one-way-pair in Plant City. The total project length is approximately 18.1 miles. The **Project Location Map** is shown in **Exhibit 1, Appendix 1**. The project site is within Township 28 South, Range 20 East; Township 28 South, Range 21 East; Township 28 South, Range 22 East and Township 29 South, Range 20 East. A reproduction of the **United States Geological Survey (USGS) Quadrangle Maps** for the project vicinity is shown in **Exhibit 3, Appendix 1**. There are three (3) major confining watersheds- Tampa Bay, Hillsborough River and Alafia River which are further divided into 14 sub-basins, each with its own Water Body Identification (WBID) number (**Exhibit 8, Appendix 1**).

The purpose of this Final Location Hydraulic Report is to address base floodplain encroachments resulting from the proposed roadway improvements evaluated in the PD&E Study Re-evaluation. In accordance with Executive Order 11988 "Floodplain Management", USDOT Order 5650.2, "Floodplain Management Protection", and Federal-Aid Policy Guide 23 CFR 650A, floodplains must be protected. The intent of these regulations is to avoid or minimize highway encroachments within the 100-year (base) floodplains and to avoid supporting land use development incompatible with floodplain values. All exhibits for this report are included in **Appendix 1**. A summary of the Floodplain Impacts are included in Section 4.6, and calculations provided in the Final Stormwater Management Facility Report (Technical Memo) under Appendix C. Other supporting information and data is included in the remaining appendices. Please note that the vertical datum used for this project is NAVD 88, unless otherwise specified.

SECTION 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Throughout the project limits, US 92 currently displays a number of different typical sections. As shown in **Exhibit 2A (Appendix 1)**, from the start of the project at Garden Lane to Thonotosassa Road, US 92 is generally a two-lane roadway with 12-foot-wide lanes, grass

shoulders, and drainage ditches. From Thonotosassa Road to Mobley Street (Exhibit 2B), the roadway is in transition and consists of two 12-foot-wide eastbound lanes and two 12-foot-wide westbound lanes, of which the outside westbound lane transitions to a right turn at Thonotosassa Road.

Exhibits 2C and 2D (Appendix 1) present the existing typical sections of US 92 from east of downtown Plant City to County Line Road. From North Gordon Street to Park Road, an approximately 0.5-mile-long segment, US 92 is a four-lane divided roadway with a 18-foot-wide grassed median and concrete curb and gutters. Sidewalks are provided along this segment. The through travel lanes are 12.0 feet wide. East of Park Road to County Line Road, US 92 becomes a rural facility with two 12-foot-wide lanes and with grass shoulders and drainage ditches on both sides. This segment is approximately 3 miles long.

From Garden Lane to Falkenburg Road, the preferred improvement consisted of a six-lane urban facility with a 22-foot median within 122 feet of right-of-way and with a 45 miles per hour (mph) design speed.

From Falkenburg Road to Kingsway Road, from Forbes Road to Mobley Street, and from Park Road to County Line Road, the preferred improvement consisted of a four-lane urban facility with a 46-foot median allowing for future expansion to six lanes within 122 feet of right-of-way and a 45 mph design speed.

From Kingsway Road to Forbes Road, the preferred improvement consisted of a four-lane rural facility with a 46-foot median within 198 feet of right-of-way and a 60 mph design speed.

Between Mobley Street and Park Road, the existing alignment and typical section of the one-way pair system (No-Build) was recommended with the exception that the section of Baker Street between Mobley Street and Whitehall Street be converted to an urban section.

This PD&E Study Re-evaluation divided the project in eleven segments and each of the proposed typical sections are described below:

Segment 1 from east of I-4 (Garden Lane) to west of CR 579 (Mango Road):

From Garden Lane to west of I-75 and from just east of I-75 to west of Mango Road, the preferred typical section is a suburban roadway with two 11-foot travel lanes and a seven-foot buffered bike lane in each direction. The travel lanes are separated by a 44-foot median with eight-foot inside shoulders. Type F curb and gutter is used along the outside lanes and curb inlets collect stormwater runoff which is then conveyed to stormwater retention ponds. A 17-foot border is provided along both sides of the roadway and accommodates five-foot sidewalks and a five-foot additional width to provide for slope embankment connection to the existing grade at the edge of the road right-way. This typical section requires a minimum of

136 feet of right-of-way and complies with the FDOT minimum design speed of 45 mph. The preferred typical section for Segment 1 is shown in **Exhibit 2E**, **Appendix 1**.

From just west of I-75 to just east of I-75, the preferred typical section is constrained by the piers for I-75. The preferred typical section under I-75 is an urban roadway with two 11-foot travel lanes and a seven-foot buffered bike lane in each direction. The travel lanes are separated by a 40.5-foot median with eight-foot inside shoulders. Pier protection barrier is located between the bike lanes and the piers and six-foot sidewalks are located behind the piers on both sides of the roadway. Inlets collect stormwater runoff which is then conveyed to stormwater retention ponds. This typical section complies with the FDOT minimum design speed of 45 mph. This recommended typical section is shown in **Exhibit 2F, Appendix 1**.

The preferred alignment for Segment 1 from Garden Lane to west of Mango Road follows the preferred alignment from the original PD&E Study. From Garden Lane to Falkenburg Road, the preferred alignment is a north alignment with right-of-way to be acquired from the north side of the roadway. From Falkenburg Road to just west of Mango Road, the alignment shifts to a south alignment with right-of-way to be acquired from the roadway.

Segment 2 from west of CR 579 (Mango Road) to east of CR 579:

The preferred typical section for this segment is the same as for the major portion of Segment 1 and is shown in **Exhibit 2E**, **Appendix 1**.

The preferred alignment from the original PD&E Study alignment in this segment was a centered alignment. The preferred alignment for Segment 2 from west of Mango Road to east Mango Road is the north alignment. This alignment was selected to minimize impacts to the Seffner Christian Academy in the southwest quadrant of the US 92 and Mango Road intersection and to minimize impacts to the Hardees Restaurant in the southeast quadrant of the intersection. The alignment is a south alignment adjacent to Segment 1. Then it transitions to the north side of US 92 through the intersection, and then transitions to a south alignment at the beginning of Segment 3.

Segment 3 from east of CR 579 to North Parsons Avenue:

The preferred typical section for this segment is the same as for the major portion of Segment 1 and is shown in **Exhibit 2E**, **Appendix 1**.

The preferred alignment for Segment 3 from east of Mango Road to North Parsons Avenue follows the preferred alignment from the original PD&E Study and is a south alignment.

Segment 4 from North Parsons Avenue to east of Crow Wing Drive:

The preferred typical section for this segment is the same as for the major portion of Segment 1 and is shown in **Exhibit 2E**, **Appendix 1**.

The preferred alignment for Segment 4 follows the preferred alignment from the original PD&E Study and is a north alignment.

Segment 5 from east of Crow Wing Drive to Castlewood Road:

The preferred typical section for this segment is a high speed suburban roadway with two 12foot travel lanes and a seven-foot buffered bike lane in each direction. The travel lanes are separated by a 54-foot median with eight-foot inside shoulders. Type E curb and gutter is used along the outside lanes and curb inlets collect stormwater runoff which is then conveyed to stormwater retention ponds. A 29-foot border is provided along both sides of the roadway and accommodates five-foot sidewalks on both sides of the road. This typical section requires a minimum of 160 feet of right-of-way and complies with the FDOT minimum design speed of 50 mph. The preferred typical section for Segment 5 is shown in **Exhibit 2G, Appendix 1**.

The preferred alignment for Segment 5 from east of Crow Wing Drive to Castlewood Road follows the preferred alignment from the original PD&E Study and is a north alignment.

Segment 6 from Castlewood Road to west of Gallagher Road:

The preferred typical section for this segment is the same as for Segment 5 and is shown in **Exhibit 2G, Appendix 1**.

The preferred alignment from the original PD&E Study alignment in this segment was a north alignment. The preferred alignment for Segment 6 from Castlewood Road to west of Gallagher Road is the south alignment. The south alignment was selected because the estimated total estimated cost estimate is less than the north alignment, and it eliminates impacts to Driscoll's of Florida. It also minimizes impacts to the newly constructed Independence Academy stormwater treatment facilities. The Hess and Marathon gas stations on the south side of the roadway are now impacted.

Segment 7 from west of Gallagher Road to Lynn Oaks Circle:

The preferred typical section for Segment 7 is the same as for Segment 5 and is shown in **Exhibit 2G**, **Appendix 1**.

The preferred alignment for Segment 7 from west of Gallagher Road to Lynn Oaks Circle follows the preferred alignment from the original PD&E Study and is a south alignment.

Segment 8 from Lynn Oaks Circle to east of Bethlehem Road:

The preferred typical section for Segment 8 is the same as for Segment 5 and is shown in **Exhibit 2G**, **Appendix 1**.

The preferred alignment for Segment 8 from Lynn Oaks Circle to east of Bethlehem Road follows the preferred alignment from the original PD&E Study and is a centered alignment.

Segment 9 from east of Bethlehem Road to Mobley Street:

The preferred typical section for the portion of Segment 9 from east of Bethlehem Road to Edwards Street is the same as for Segment 5 and is shown in **Exhibit 2G**, **Appendix 1**.

The preferred typical section for the portion of Segment 9 from Edwards Street to Mobley Street is an urban roadway with two 11-foot travel lanes and a seven-foot buffered bike lane in each direction. The travel lanes are separated by a 22-foot median. Type E curb and gutter is along the inside and Type F curb and gutter is used along the outside lanes. Curb inlets collect stormwater runoff which is then conveyed to stormwater retention ponds. A minimum 12-foot border is provided along both sides of the roadway and accommodates five-foot sidewalks on both sides of the road. This typical section requires a minimum of 114 feet of right-of-way and complies with the FDOT minimum design speed of 45 mph. The recommended typical section for Segment 9 from Edwards Street to Mobley Street is shown in **Exhibit 2H**, **Appendix 1**.

The preferred alignment for Segment 9 from east of Bethlehem Road to Woodrow Wilson follows the preferred alignment from the original PD&E Study and is a south alignment from east of Bethlehem Road to Turkey Creek Road and then it transitions to a north alignment from Turkey Creek Road to Woodrow Wilson Street. From Woodrow Wilson Street to Mobley Street, the preferred alignment is a centered alignment due to geometric constraints at the Thonotosassa Road intersection and the Baker Street (US 92) intersection.

Segment 10 from Mobley Street to west of Park Road:

The preferred alternative for this segment from the original PD&E Study is No-Build with the exception that the section of Baker Street between Mobley Street and Whitehall Street be converted from a rural to urban roadway in order to provide sidewalks. Improvements have been completed in this section of the roadway which meet the intent of the original PD&E Study recommendation for this segment of the project. Therefore, the preferred alternative for this segment is the No-Build Alternative.

Segment 11 from west of Park Road to east of County Line Road:

The preferred typical section for Segment 11 is Typical Section 5. It consists of two 12-foot travel lanes, a five-foot sidewalk, and a seven-foot buffered bike lane in each direction separated by a 40-foot median with eight-foot inside shoulders. The design speed is 50 mph and the typical section is shown in **Exhibit 2I**, **Appendix 1**. A 24-foot border and a 24-foot clear zone are provided along both sides of the roadway. This four-lane typical section requires a minimum of 136 feet of right-of-way. A design variation would be required for border width. The typical section complies with clear zone criteria so no design variation or exception would be required for clear zone.

The preferred alignment for Segment 11 from Park Road to County Line Road follows the preferred alignment from the original PD&E Study and is a north alignment.

SECTION 3 DATA COLLECTION

The design team collected and reviewed data from the following sources:

- > FDOT Drainage Manual, January 2016
- > FDOT Drainage Handbook Hydrology, February 2012
- ➢ FDOT PD&E Manual, 2008
- Southwest Florida Water Management District Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) Information Manual, 2014
- US 92 (SR 600) Final Preliminary Engineering Report, F.A. Project No. MAF-212-1(34), February 1994
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Panel Nos. 12057C0240H, 12057C0245H, 12057C0385H, 12057C0263H, 12057C0264H, 12057C0268H, 12057C0269H, 12057C0288H, and 12057C0290H for Hillsborough County, Florida dated August 28, 2008, and 12057C0380J dated September 27, 2013
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Survey of Hillsborough County, Florida, 1989
- > USDA NRCS Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database from SWFWMD, 2010
- > Land Boundary Information System (LABINS) Quadrangle Maps
- > 5-foot contours from Hillsborough County, 2010
- > Hillsborough County Property Appraiser's Website (GIS parcel lines), 2013
- > FDOT Straight Line Diagrams (SLD's) of Road Inventory for SR 600
- Field Reconnaissance (October 2015)

SECTION 4 EXISTING DRAINAGE CONDITIONS

4.1 Drainage Patterns

In the existing condition, the runoff from Pickron Street to Garden Lane is conveyed via roadside swales westward to the Tampa Bypass Canal, and eventually outfalls to Tampa Bay. The runoff from Pickron Street to Peach Avenue is conveyed through a combination of storm sewer and roadside swales to Kennedy Hill Creek which outlets to the Tampa Bypass Canal, and eventually outfalls to Tampa Bay.

The runoff from the area from Peach Avenue to the east of Taylor Road drains via roadside ditches to a concrete box culvert (CD-02; 24") west of Pine Street and flows south to a depressional area surrounding Mango Lake.

The runoff from east of Taylor Road to Lynn Oaks Circle is conveyed via roadside ditches to Baker Creek which drains north to Lake Thonotosassa. The runoff from the area east of Lynn Oaks Circle to Forbes Road drains via roadside ditches to Pemberton Creek which flows north and outfalls to Lake Thonotosassa. The runoff from the area from Forbes Road to Whitehurst Road/Walter Drive is conveyed via roadside swales to Spartman Branch, which is a tributary of Pemberton Creek. Pemberton Creek flows northwest to Lake Thonotosassa.

West of Whitehurst/Walter Drive to Woodrow Wilson Street, the runoff drains to a box culvert (CD-15; 6'x4') that crosses US 92 at milepost 18.579, and eventually combines with the West Side Canal north of US 92. From Woodrow Wilson Street to North Wheeler Street, the runoff drains east to the West Side Canal which feeds a tributary of Pemberton Creek.

The runoff from the area between North Wheeler Street and Park Road drains to the East Side Canal. The runoff from Park Road to east of Wilder Road drains north through two box culverts located at mileposts 21.663 (CD-16; 5'x2') and 21.963 (CD-17; 5'x2') and continues until joining with the East Side Canal north of US 92.

From east of Wilder Road to west of Thrasher Road the runoff drains south through a box culvert at milepost 22.931 (CD-19; 5'x3') and continues to English Creek. From west of Thrasher Road to east of Wiggins Road the runoff drains through a box culvert located at milepost 23.384 (CD-20; 6'x4') and continues to English Creek.

From east of Wiggins Road to beyond the eastern project terminus at the Hillsborough/Polk County line the runoff drains north through a box culvert located at milepost 24.214 (CD-21; 4'x2').

4.2 Topography & Hydrologic Features

The topography of the project area is steep and elevations range from a high of 150 feet to a low of 10 feet NAVD 88. Please refer to USGS Quadrangle Map, **Exhibit 3**, in **Appendix 1**. There are twenty one (21) existing cross drains and four (4) existing bridge culverts within the project limits allowing for conveyance of offsite and onsite runoff to the Alafia and Hillsborough rivers. The size and geometry of all cross drains and bridges have been verified from the FDOT SLD's, 1-foot LiDAR contours, as well as field survey. Please refer to **Table 1** for a Summary of Existing Cross Drains and Bridges. **Appendix 2** contains descriptions for all cross drains within the project limits, field photos and notes.

Structure Number	FDOT Milepost*	Stations	Description
CD-01	7.791	177 + 95.44	Single 6'X4' CBC
Bridge-01 (#100024)	8.531	216 + 00.00	Length 42'
CD-02	9.629	274 + 55.28	Single 24" RCP
CD-03	10.470	319 + 53.45	Single 24" RCP
CD-04	11.034	348 + 55.36	Single 30" RCP
CD-05	11.344	364 + 74.56	Single 2'X2' CBC
Bridge-02 (#100025)	12.055	403 + 00.00	Length 47'
CD-06	12.628	431 + 49.73	Single 48" RCP
CD-07	13.558	481 + 89.85	Single 6'X4' CBC
CD-08	14.093	510 + 22.30	Single 24" RCP
CD-09	14.169	514 + 42.37	Single 3'X3' CBC
Bridge-03 (#100097)	15.012	558 + 50.00	Length 26'
CD-10	15.387	578 + 24.48	Single 2'X2' CBC
CD-11	15.956	607 + 50.42	Single 24" RCP
CD-12	16.363	628 + 94.33	Single 36" RCP
Bridge-04 (#100098)	16.623	643 + 50.00	Length 26'
CD-13	17.016	664 + 33.35	Single 4'X2' CBC
CD-14	17.719	700 + 50.28	Single 36" RCP
CD-15	18.579	746 + 18.99	Single 6'X4' CBC
CD-16	21.663	1032 + 53.17	Single 5'X2' CBC
CD-17	21.963	1048 + 11.69	Single 5'X2' CBC
CD-18	22.505	1077 + 03.12	Single 5'X3' CBC
CD-19	22.931	1099 + 06.20	Single 5'X3' CBC
CD-20	23.384	1123 + 04.72	Double 6'X4' CBC
CD-21	24.214	1166 + 96.05	Single 4'X2' CBC

Table 1 – Summary of Existing Cross Drains and Bridges

* Mileposts have been adjusted based on field survey

4.3 Existing Bridge Study

All of the bridge culverts along this project were constructed in 1930 and reconstructed in 1943. Information gathered from the Bridge Inspection Reports, was used to provide some of the parameters as summarized in **Table 2**.

	Bridge No. 100024	Bridge No. 100025	Bridge No. 100097	Bridge No. 100098
Year Constructed	1930	1930	1930	1930
Year Reconstructed	1943 1943		1943	1943
Structure Name	US-92/SR-600 over KENNEDY HILL CREEK	US-92/SR-600 over BAKER CREEK BRANCH	US-92/SR-600 over PEMBERTON CREEK	US-92/SR-600 over PEMBERTON CREEK SLOUGH
Approximate Location	0.9 MI EAST OF I-75	1.4 MI E of KINGSWAY RD	1.4 MI WEST OF FORBES RD	0.2MI EAST OF FORBES RD
Owner/Maintenance FDO		FDOT	FDOT	FDOT
Bridge Length	42.0 feet	47.0 feet	26.0 feet	26.0 feet
Deck Type	Concrete Cast- in-Place	Concrete Cast-in-Place	Concrete Cast- in-Place	Concrete Cast- in-Place

Table 2 – Existing Bridge Data

4.4 Soils Data and Geotechnical Investigations

The Soil Survey of Hillsborough County, Florida, published by the USDA NRCS (dated 1989) has been reviewed for the project vicinity. USDA SSURGO was also obtained from SWFWMD to create a soils map in the project area using GIS ArcMap. The soil survey map for the project vicinity is illustrated in **Exhibit 4A & 4B of Appendix 1**.

The soils encountered along the project limits are mostly Hydrological Soil Group (HSG) A and A/D with B, C and D also encountered throughout the project. Group A soils have low runoff potential and high infiltration rates even when thoroughly wetted. They consist chiefly of deep, well to excessively drained sand or gravel and have a high rate of water transmission.

Group B soils have a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of moderately deep or deep, moderately well drained or well drained soils that have moderately fine texture to moderately coarse texture. These soils have a moderate rate of water transmission.

Group C soils have low infiltration rates when thoroughly wetted and consist chiefly of soils with a layer that impedes downward movement of water and soils with moderately fine to fine texture.

Group D soils have high runoff potential. They have very low infiltration rates when thoroughly wetted and consist chiefly of clay soils with a high swelling potential, soils with a permanent high water table, soils with a claypan or clay layer at or near the surface, and shallow soils over nearly impervious material. These soils have a very low rate of water transmission.

According to the Soil Survey, there are thirty four (34) different soil types located along the project limits. **Table 3** – USDA NRCS Soil Survey Information summarizes and lists the soil types and relevant information. The ground water depth varies from 0 - 1' to greater than 6' along the project.

Soil	Hillsborough County		Seasonal High Ground Water Table	
No.	USDA Soil Name		Depth* (feet)	Months
2	Adamsville Fine Sand	A/D	2.0 - 3.5	Jun-Nov
3	Archbold Fine Sand	Α	3.5 - 6.0	Jun-Nov
4	Arents	Α	2.2	
5	Basinger, Holopaw, and Samsula Soils	A/D	+2 - 1.0	Jan-Dec
7	Chandler Fine Sand	Α	> 6.0	
8	Chandler Fine Sand	Α	> 6.0	
10	Chobee Loamy Fine Sand	C/D	0 - 1.0	Jun-Feb
11	Chobee Muck	C/D	+2 - 1.0	Jun-Dec
14	Eaton Mucky Sand	C/D	+2 - 1.0	Jun-Feb
15	Felda Fine Sand	A/D	0 - 1.0	Jul-Mar
17	Floridana Fine Sand	C/D	0 - 1.0	Jun-Feb
18	Fort Meade Loamy Fine Sand	Α	> 6.0	
19	Gainesville Loamy Fine Sand	Α	> 6.0	
21	Immokalee Fine Sand	B/D	0 - 1.0	Jun-Nov
23	Kendrick Fine Sand	Α	> 6.0	
25	Lake Fine Sand	Α	> 6.0	
26	Lochloosa-Micanopy Fine Sand	С	2.5 -5.0	Jul-Oct
27	Malabar Fine Sand	A/D	0 - 1.0	Jun-Nov
29	Myakka Fine Sand	A/D	0 - 1.0	Jun-Nov
32	Myakka-Urban Complex	A/D	0 - 1.0	Jun-Nov
33	Ona Fine Sand	B/D	0 - 1.0	Jun-Nov
35	Orlando Fine Sand	Α	> 6.0	

Table 3 – USDA NRCS Soil Survey Information

Soil	Hillsborough County USDA Soil Name		Seasonal High Ground Water Table	
No.			Depth* (feet)	Months
37	Paisley Fine Sand	C/D	+2 - 1.0	Jun-Feb
41	Pomello Fine Sand	А	2.0 - 3.5	Jul-Nov
43	Quartzipsamments	А	> 6.0	
46	St. Johns Fine Sand	B/D	0 - 1.0	Jun-Apr
47	Seffner Fine Sand	A/D	1.5 - 3.5	Jun-Nov
51	Haplaquents	D	0	
52	Smyrna Fine Sand	A/D	0 - 1.0	Jul-Oct
53	Taveres-Milhopper Fine Sand	А	3.5 - 6.0	Jun-Dec
57	Wabasso Fine Sand	C/D	0 - 1.0	Jun-Oct
59	Windor Fine Sand	C/D	0 - 1.0	Jun-Dec
60	Windor Fine Sand	C/D	0 - 1.0	Jun-Dec
61	Zolfo Fine Sand	А	2.0 -3.5	Jun-Nov

*Seasonal High Groundwater Table: Depth is referenced below existing grade, except where indicated as "+".

4.5 Environmental Characteristics

4.5.1 Land Use Data

Existing land uses along US 92 within the study area vary significantly between Garden Lane and County Line Road (**Exhibit 5, Appendix 1**). The area from Garden Lane to Taylor Road comprises a mix of land uses and is nearly completely developed. Residential uses include single-family residences and mobile homes. Commercial uses include highway retail, service stations and motels. In addition, there are a number of offices and some industrial land uses such as salvage yards. The area also includes Armwood High School.

Between Taylor Road and Turkey Creek Road, US 92 becomes more rural with open fields, citrus groves and rural residential housing. There are scattered commercial uses including motels, tractor sales and service stations. Between Turkey Creek Road and Plant City, a transition to more urban uses, including multifamily residential uses, begins. The landmark Parksdale Farms and Tomlin Jr. High are located within this area. In addition, a large high-quality wetland, Pemberton Slough, is located on both sides of US 92.

Plant City is predominantly developed for single-family residential uses. The development pattern for Plant City was influenced by both the railroad, in the early days, and the agricultural economy throughout the past and present. Diversification in the economy has redirected growth to the south and southeast. The downtown still remains the office and financial center although commercial uses are moving south. There is a significant amount of vacant land within the city limits that is not expected to be developed because of environmental constraints. From downtown Plant City and to the east, CSX railroad runs contiguous to US 92. Land uses within vary and include industrial and manufacturing uses, mobile home parks and vacant land. Highway commercial uses and scattered agricultural uses also exist east of the project's terminus at County Line Road.

4.5.2 Cultural Features

A separate Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) has been prepared in conjunction with the undertaking of the PD&E Study Re-evaluation. Information regarding cultural features can be found within the CRAS.

4.5.3 Natural and Biological Features

A separate Final Natural Resources Evaluation (NRE) has been prepared in conjunction with the undertaking of the PD&E Study Re-evaluation. Information regarding natural and biological features can be found within the NRE.

4.6 Floodplains/Floodways

According to The FEMA, the relevant FIRM panel numbers are 12057C0240H, 12057C0245H, 12057C0385H, 12057C0263H, 12057C0264H, 12057C0268H, 12057C0269H, 12057C0288H, and 12057C0290H for Hillsborough County, Florida dated August 28, 2008, and 12057C0380J dated September 27, 2013. The majority of the project is designated Zone 'X' which means those areas have a 0.2% probability of flooding every year (500-year floodplain). Some parts (mostly streams and waterbodies crossing) are in the Zone 'AE' which have a 1% probability of flooding every year (100-year floodplain), and where predicted flood water elevations have been established. Please refer to **Exhibit 7, Appendix 1** for the FEMA Flood Zones Maps and **Appendix 3** for FEMA FIRM.

General comments relating to floodplains include the fact that any development within the 100year floodplain has the potential for placing citizens and property at risk of flooding and producing changes in floodplain elevations and plan view extent. Development, such as roadways, housing developments, strip malls, and other commercial facilities, within floodplains increases the potential for flooding by limiting flood storage capacity and exposing people and property to flood hazards. Development also reduces vegetated buffers that protect water quality and destroys important habitats for fish and wildlife. The area surrounding the proposed roadway widening project has and will continue to experience growth.

Whenever it is determined that the proposed project will involve a regulatory floodway, the District Drainage Engineer, or designee, will work with local agencies and FEMA, as required, to ensure the project is developed consistent with local floodway plans and floodplain management programs. A "No-Rise" certification will be required for any anticipated impacts to regulatory floodways and will be obtained during the design phase of this project. There is one regulatory

floodway underneath bridge #100025 and another one along the Spartman Branch stream (Bridge #100098).

Any floodplain impacts will be mitigated for with offsite floodplain compensation sites, or cut ditch sections on a cup for cup basis. From the available data, approximate Floodplain Compensation (FPC) Areas have been calculated (**Table 4**). Within the Project Limits and Right-of-Way, sixteen (16) segments have been identified which are impacted by the 100-year floodplain (Zone AE).

Length and width are measured using the alignment chain and typical sections respectively. Depth of impact has been calculated from the difference between the floodplain elevation and existing ground elevation or seasonal high water table (SHWT) elevation depending on the type of soil. It was concluded that the project will impact approximately 57.33 ac of floodplain area based on the most conservative roadway alternative. Please refer to the Final Stormwater Management Facility Report (Technical Memo), **Appendix C**, for detailed floodplain calculations.

FPC	Station	-	Station	Total Length of Impact (ft)	(Avg.) 100-yr Flood Elevation (ft)	Impact Volume (Ac-Ft)	FPC Area* (Ac)
FPC-1A	168+04.88	-	185+71.88	1,767	25.50	1.29	1.29
FPC-1B	174+77.12	-	184+00.00	923	23.40	0.06	0.06
FPC-2	362+31.19	-	367+95.97	565	40.00	8.18	8.18
FPC-3	381+00.00	-	393+00.00	1,200	46.30	2.30	2.30
FPC-4	393+47.34	-	414+25.22	2,078	44.00	1.45	1.45
FPC-5	418+00.00	-	443+66.59	2,567	47.00 to 57.00	3.76	3.76
FPC-6	443+86.96	-	460+86.08	1,699	57.00	1.41	1.41
FPC-7	481+87.52	-	482+20.94	33	64.00	0.01	0.01
FPC-8	507+64.54	-	509+82.28	218	68.00	0.72	0.72
FPC-9	550+58.09	-	560+00.00	942	83.00	6.52	6.52
FPC-10	601+50.35	-	613+00.00	1,150	91.40	1.44	1.44
FPC-11	624+22.39	-	629+86.70	564	95.00	5.30	5.30
FPC-12	639+41.41	-	652+08.61	1,267	97.00	8.09	8.09
FPC-14	738+41.80	-	756+65.44	1,824	111.35	16.80	16.80
TOTAL 57.33							

Table 4 – Summary of Floodplain Compensation (FPC) Sites

*The areas are based on 1-ft depth for compensation.

**Impacts to floodplain areas associated with FPC 13 & 15 do not require R/W acquisition due to the minor encroachment. Those impacts are planned to be compensated for within the FDOT R/W.

4.6.1 Flooding History and Maintenance Concern

The FDOT District 7 Maintenance office was contacted to discuss any flooding history and maintenance concerns. Based on our coordination with the maintenance office, there have been flooding issues during every summer at East 702 Reynolds/Baker US 92, East 11730 US 92, East 11309 US 92, East 10604 Black Dairy Road, and East 9715 US 92 (Appendix 4: Correspondence).

A Drainage Complaint Investigation Report was conducted by ICON for the Department in December 2015; Hillsborough County reported flooding complaints from several property owners along the south side of US 92, between Darby Lake Street and Baker Creek. The proposed typical section in this segment follows the recommendation by ICON with an enclosed storm sewer system and replacement of the existing boardwalk with sidewalk. Please refer to **Appendix 4** for further information.

SECTION 5 PROPOSED CONDITIONS

The project does not directly outfall to any Outstanding Florida Water (OFW). The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) list of impaired water bodies has been reviewed and it has been identified that Sixmile Creek (WBID 1536B) and Mango Drain (WBID 1576) are impaired for nutrients. Nutrient loading calculations have been performed as part of the Final Stormwater Management Facility Report (Technical Memo). Because of the karstic nature in some areas of the project, shallow SMFs will be considered as well as avoidance of any existing wells or contaminated sites.

The stormwater runoff from the project limits will be collected and conveyed in roadside ditches or closed drainage systems to the proposed offsite wet detention and dry retention SMFs. The SMFs will discharge at or near the same cross drains that carry the roadway runoff in the existing condition. The water quality treatment and water quantity attenuation will be achieved through the construction of offsite wet detention and dry retention SMFs, which will require the acquisition of additional right-of-way. Please refer to the Final Stormwater Management Facility Report, which was prepared in conjunction with the undertaking of the PD&E Study Re-evaluation, for detailed information.

5.1 Longitudinal & Transverse Floodplain Impacts

This project will impact the 100-year floodplain in three (3) different ways;

1. Longitudinal impacts resulting from filling the floodplain areas associated with proposed roadway widening within the Project Limits, isolated wetlands, wetland systems, and depressional areas.

2. Transverse impacts resulting from the extension and replacement of the existing cross drain culverts.

3. Transverse impacts resulting from widening of the bridge.

The longitudinal impacts cannot be avoided since the floodplains associated with the water bodies extend in both north and south direction. The floodplain impact area was quantified based on the FEMA 100-year base flood elevation estimated as described in **Section 4.6** and the existing ground elevations from 1-foot contours from LiDAR. To be conservative, it was assumed that any filling from the proposed roadway outside of the existing roadway was quantified as floodplain impacts.

The transverse impacts resulting from the extension or replacement of the culverts will be analyzed in the design phase. To minimize upstream impacts, FDOT design criteria for a conveyance system (e.g. culvert) allow no significant increase in flood stages at the upstream end of the structures. During the final design phase of the project, every necessary action should be taken to minimize upstream impacts.

During the design phase, each cross drain should be analyzed for existing and proposed conditions with more defined data and they should be designed to ensure no conflicts with the proposed roadway and no significant increase in headwater elevation. Also, a more detailed inspection of the cross drains will be necessary to verify their structural integrity and assess the need for complete reconstruction. Based on the available data for this planning phase, there are no indications that any of the existing cross drains will require upsizing.

5.2 Project Classification

The floodplain is located in a low density, non-urbanized area, and the encroachments area is classified as "minimal". Minimal encroachments on a floodplain occur when there is a floodplain involvement, but the impacts on human life, transportation facilities, and natural and beneficial floodplain values are not significant and can be resolved with minimal efforts. Normally, these minimal efforts to address the impacts will consist of applying the Department's drainage design standards and following the Water Management District's procedures to achieve results that will not increase or significantly change the flood elevations and/or limits.

5.3 Risk Evaluation

There is no change in flood "Risk" associated with this project. The encroachments will not have a significant potential for interruption or termination of transportation facilities needed for emergency vehicles or used as an evacuation route. In addition, no significant adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values are anticipated and no significant impacts to highway users are expected.

5.4 PD&E Manual Requirements with Minimal Encroachment

Chapter 24 Floodplains of the FDOT's PD&E Manual, Part 2, defines four categories of encroachments as they pertain to base floodplain involvement; significant, minimal, none and no involvement, and also lists the report criteria corresponding to these encroachment categories. The FDOT has different requirements based on the category of the encroachment. The proposed widening project was determined to have minimal encroachments and as a result the requirements for this category are listed as follows:

1. The history of flooding of the existing facilities and/or measures to minimize any impacts due to the proposed project improvements.

There have been flooding issues during the summer times at East 702 Reynolds/Baker US 92, East 11730 US 92, East 11309 US 92, East 10604 Black Dairy Road and East 9715 US 92. The flooding conditions in the project are inherent in the topography or are a result of other outside contributing sources and are expected to be continued, but not increased. The proposed structures and stormwater management improvements will be designed to ensure existing flood heights and floodplain limits are not affected.

2. Determination of whether the encroachment is longitudinal or transverse, and if it is a longitudinal encroachment an evaluation and discussion of practicable avoidance alternatives.

With the increase in the number of travel lanes proposed, there will be longitudinal and transverse impacts to the floodplain. Longitudinal impacts will be minimized by utilizing the maximum allowable roadway embankment slope.

The transverse floodplain impacts from the project occur due to the extension or replacement of the existing cross drains and widening of the bridge structures. The impacts at the bridge structures are not analyzed during this study and will need to be addressed during the design phase.

The existing roadway bisects the floodplain. There are no economically feasible avoidance alternatives.

3. The practicability of avoidance alternatives and/or measures to minimize impacts.

This project will take every effort to minimize the floodplain impacts resulting from the roadway fill. The maximum allowable roadway embankment slope will be used within the floodplain area to minimize the floodplain impacts.

4. Impact of the proposed improvements on emergency services and evacuation.

The proposed drainage structures (to be analyzed in the design phase) will perform hydraulically in a manner equal to or greater than the existing condition, and backwater surface elevations are not expected to increase. As a result, there will be no significant change in flood risk, and there will not be a significant change in the potential for interruption or termination of emergency service or in emergency evacuation routes. 5. Impacts of the proposed improvement on the base flood, likelihood of flood risk, overtopping, location of overtopping, backwater, etc.

The proposed cross drains will perform hydraulically in a manner equal to or greater than the existing condition, and backwater surface elevations are not expected to increase. As a result, there will be no significant change in flood risk or overtopping.

6. Determination of the impact of the proposed improvements on regulatory floodways, if any, and documentation of coordination with FEMA and local agencies to determine the project's consistency with the regulatory floodway.

A FEMA "No Rise" Certification for each regulatory floodway will be obtained during the design phase.

7. The impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values, and measures to restore and preserve these values (this information may also be addressed as part of the wetland impact evaluation and recommendations).

Addressed as part of the wetland impact evaluation.

8. Consistency of the proposed improvements with the local floodplain development plan or the land use elements in the Comprehensive Plan, and the potential impacts of encouraging development within the 100 year base floodplain.

The project will remain consistent with local floodplain development plans. The project will not support base floodplain development that is incompatible with existing floodplain management programs.

9. A map showing project, location and impacted floodplains. Provide copies of all applicable FIRM maps should be included within the final LHR report appendix.

See Exhibit 1 & Exhibit 7 in Appendix 1.

10. Results of any and all project risk assessments performed.

The proposed drainage structures (to be analyzed in the design phase) will perform hydraulically in a manner equal to or greater than the existing condition, and backwater surface elevations are not expected to increase. As a result, there will be no significant change in flood risk.

SECTION 6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The modifications to drainage structures included in the project will result in an insignificant change in their capacity to carry floodwater. This change will cause minimal increases in flood heights and flood limits. Replacement drainage structures for this project are limited to hydraulically equivalent structures. The limitations to the hydraulic equivalency being proposed are basically due to restrictions imposed by the geometrics of design, existing development, cost feasibility, or practicability. An alternative encroachment location is not considered in this category since it defeats the project purpose or is economically unfeasible. Since flooding conditions in the project area are inherent in the topography or are a result of other outside contributing sources, and there is no practical alternative to totally eradicate flood impacts or even reduce them in any significant amount, existing flooding will continue, but not be increased. The proposed structure will be hydraulically equivalent to or greater than the existing structure, and backwater surface elevations are not expected to increase. As a result, the project will not affect existing flood heights or floodplain limits. This project will not result in any new or increased adverse environmental impacts. There will be no significant change in the potential for interruption or termination of emergency service or emergency evacuation routes. Therefore, it has been determined that this encroachment is not significant.

Appendix 1

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – Project Location Map Exhibit 2A-2I – Typical Sections Exhibit 3 – USGS Quadrangle Map Exhibit 4A & 4B – NRCS Soils Map Exhibit 5 – Existing Land Use Map Exhibit 6 – Future Land Use Map Exhibit 7 – FEMA Map Exhibit 8 – WBID Map







US 92 FROM GARDEN LANE TO THONOTOSASSA ROAD EXISTING 2 LANE RURAL WITH SIDEWALK OR BOARDWALK DESIGN SPEED = 45 MPH



Florida Department of Transportation District 7

US 92 PD&E Study Re-evaluation

from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida Work Program Item Segment No: 435749-1

TYPICAL SECTION EXISTING TWO LANE RURAL GARDEN LANE TO THONOTOSASSA ROAD

Figure

2A



FROM EAST OF THONOTOSASSA ROAD TO MOBLEY STREET EXISTING 4 LANE RURAL DESIGN SPEED = 45 MPH



Florida Department of Transportation District 7

US 92 PD&E Study Re-evaluation

from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida Work Program Item Segment No: 435749-1

TYPICAL SECTION EXISTING FOUR LANE RURAL THONOTOSASSA ROAD TO MOBLEY STREET

Figure

2B



EXISTING 4 LANE URBAN DESIGN SPEED = 45 MPH



Florida Department of Transportation District 7

US 92 PD&E Study Re-evaluation

from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida

Work Program Item Segment No: 435749-1

TYPICAL SECTION EXISTING FOUR LANE URBAN US 92 FROM NORTH GORDON STREET TO PARK ROAD

Figure 2C

—Natural Ground



US 92 EAST OF PARK ROAD TO EAST OF COUNTY LINE ROAD **EXISTING 2 LANE RURAL** DESIGN SPEED = 45 MPH



Florida Department of Transportation District 7

US 92 PD&E Study Re-evaluation

from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida

Work Program Item Segment No: 435749-1

TYPICAL SECTION EXISTING TWO LANE RURAL US 92 EAST OF PARK RD TO EAST OF COUNTY LINE ROAD

Figure 2D



FROM EAST OF GARDEN LANE TO WEST OF I-75 - SEGMENT 1 FROM WEST OF CR 579 TO EAST OF CR 579 - SEGMENT 2 FROM EAST OF CR 579 TO NORTH PARSONS AVENUE - SEGMENT 3 FROM NORTH PARSONS AVENUE TO EAST OF CROW WING DRIVE - SEGMENT 4 DESIGN SPEED = 45 MPH



Florida Department of Transportation District 7

US 92 PD&E Study Re-evaluation

from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida Work Program Item Segment No: 435749-1

TYPICAL SECTION 1 PROPOSED FOUR LANE 45 MPH DESIGN SPEED TYPICAL SECTION

Figure

2E



UNDER I-75 BRIDGE FROM WEST OF I-75 TO EAST OF I-75 - SEGMENT 1 DESIGN SPEED = 45 MPH





Florida Department of Transportation District 7

US 92 PD&E Study Re-evaluation

from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida

Work Program Item Segment No: 435749-1

TYPICAL SECTION 2 PROPOSED FOUR LANE 45 MPH DESIGN SPEED TYPICAL SECTION UNDER I-75

BRIDGE DALA LABLE							
681.0GE	DIG "X"	DIM "Z" (ft.)					
NO.	(ft.)	(ft.)	PIER Z	PIER 3			
100414	10.235	18.500	4.135	3,135			
100415	19.069	19.333	2.552	2.552			
100422	17.673	17.938	2.745	2.245			
100424	16 038	15 302	7 4 7 5	7 438			

Figure

2F



FROM EAST OF CROW WING DRIVE TO CASTLEWOOD ROAD - SEGMENT 5 FROM CASTLEWOOD ROAD TO WEST OF GALLAGHER ROAD - SEGMENT 6 FROM WEST OF GALLAGHER ROAD TO LYNN OAKS CIRCLE - SEGMENT 7 FROM LYNN OAKS CIRCLE TO EAST OF BETHLEHEM ROAD - SEGMENT 8 FROM EAST OF BETHLEHEM ROAD TO EDWARDS STREET - SEGMENT 9 DESIGN SPEED = 50 MPH





US 92 PD&E Study Re-evaluation

from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida

Work Program Item Segment No: 435749-1

TYPICAL SECTION 3 PROPOSED FOUR LANE 50 MPH DESIGN SPEED TYPICAL SECTION

Figure

2**G**



DESIGN SPEED = 45 MPH



Florida Department of Transportation District 7

US 92 PD&E Study Re-evaluation

from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida

Work Program Item Segment No: 435749-1

TYPICAL SECTION 4 PROPOSED FOUR LANE 45 MPH DESIGN SPEED EDWARDS STREET TO MOBLEY STREET

Figure

2H

-NATURAL GROUND <u> X/ X</u>.

1:2 OR TO SUIT PROPERTY OWNER, NOT FLATTER THAN 1:6



FROM PARK ROAD TO COUNTY LINE ROAD - SEGMENT 11 DESIGN SPEED = 50 MPH



Florida Department of Transportation District 7

US 92 PD&E Study Re-evaluation

from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida Work Program Item Segment No: 435749-1

TYPICAL SECTION 5 PROPOSED FOUR LANE 50 MPH DESIGN SPEED PARK ROAD TO COUNTY LINE ROAD

Figure

21





Soil Names

Hillsborough County

- 2: Adamsville Fine Sand, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes 3: Archbold Fine Sand 4: Arents, Nearly Level 5: Basinger, Holopaw, and Samsula Soils, Depressional 7: Chandler Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes 8: Chandler Fine Sand, 5 to 12 Percent Slopes
- 10: Chobee Loamy Fine Sand
- 11: Chobee Muck

- 14: Eaton Mucky Sand, Depressional 15: Felda Fine Sand 17: Floridana Fine Sand 18: Fort Meade Loamy Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes 19: Gainesville Loamy Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes 21: Immokalee Fine Sand 23: Kendrick Fine Sand, 2 to 5 Percent Slopes 25: Lake Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes 26: Lochloosa-Micanopy Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes
- 27: Malabar Fine Sand 47: Seffner Fine Sand 29: Myakka Fine Sand, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes 51: Haplaquents, Clayey 32: Myakka-Urban Complex 52: Smyrna Fine Sand, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes 33: Ona Fine Sand 53: Taveres-Milhopper Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes 57: Wabasso Fine Sand 35: Orlando Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes 59: Windor Fine Sand 37: Paisley Fine Sand, Depressional 41: Pomello Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes 60: Windor Fine Sand, Frequently Flooded 61: Zolfo Fine Sand 43: Quartzipsamments, Nearly Level 46: St. Johns Fine Sand 99: Water



Florida Department of Transportation District 7

SR 600 (US 92) PD&E Study Re-Evaluation

from East of I-4 to County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida Work Program Item Segment No.: 435749-1



Polk County

- 7: Pomona Fine Sand
- 15: Tavares Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes
- 17: Smyrna and Myakka Fine Sands
- 33: Holopaw Fine Sand, Depressional
- 99: Water

NCRS SOILS MAP

EXHIBIT 4A


Soil Names

Hillsborough County

- 2: Adamsville Fine Sand, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes
- 3: Archbold Fine Sand
- 4: Arents, Nearly Level
- 5: Basinger, Holopaw, and Samsula Soils, Depressional
- 7: Chandler Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes
- 8: Chandler Fine Sand, 5 to 12 Percent Slopes
- 10: Chobee Loamy Fine Sand
- 11: Chobee Muck

- 14: Eaton Mucky Sand, Depressional 15: Felda Fine Sand 17: Floridana Fine Sand 18: Fort Meade Loamy Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes 19: Gainesville Loamy Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes 21: Immokalee Fine Sand 23: Kendrick Fine Sand, 2 to 5 Percent Slopes 25: Lake Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes 26: Lochloosa-Micanopy Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes
- 27: Malabar Fine Sand 47: Seffner Fine Sand 29: Myakka Fine Sand, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes 51: Haplaquents, Clayey 32: Myakka-Urban Complex 52: Smyrna Fine Sand, 0 to 2 Percent Slopes 33: Ona Fine Sand 53: Taveres-Milhopper Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes 35: Orlando Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes 57: Wabasso Fine Sand 37: Paisley Fine Sand, Depressional 59: Windor Fine Sand 41: Pomello Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes 60: Windor Fine Sand, Frequently Flooded 43: Quartzipsamments, Nearly Level 61: Zolfo Fine Sand 46: St. Johns Fine Sand 99: Water



Florida Department of Transportation District 7

SR 600 (US 92) PD&E Study Re-Evaluation

No. 2. 10.

from East of I-4 to County Line Road Hillsborough County, Florida Work Program Item Segment No.: 435749-1



Polk County

- 7: Pomona Fine Sand 15: Tavares Fine Sand, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes 17: Smyrna and Myakka Fine Sands 33: Holopaw Fine Sand, Depressional 99: Water

NCRS SOILS MAP

EXHIBIT 4B





















District 7

Work Program Item Segment No.: 435749-1

7 (3 OF 3)



		1									
	5 YR INV SLD REV BMP EMP INV SLD REV DATE 03/04/2010[04/27/2010 3.532 4.772 09/06/2013	_	STRAIGHT LI	NE DIAGR	AM OF	F ROAD) inven	NTORY		INT. or US ROUTE NO	STATE ROA
	41	<u> </u>		FLORIDA DEPARTI	MENT OF TR.	ANSPORTATION	N 2			US 41, US 92	SR 60
ROADWAYA	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	N 22ND ST	POFICE POFICE ← 1.401 626902-L ■ CSX	- E N 32ND ST - E N 32ND ST - N 30TH ST	LSBOROU A 1.758 A 1.758	GH AVE GH AVE N 36TH ST	- A 2.008	41 % US 92 N 42ND ST 41 % A 2.285 41 % A 40TH ST 2.285 2.255	- N 43RD ST	- SCHIPMAN CT N 4.714 ST N 4.714 ST - N 4614 ST A 2.665 N 4514 ST N 4514 ST	- 2.865 N 48TH ST 2 812
FEATURES	N N 10 <th10< th=""> 10 <th10< th=""> 10<td>N 22ND ST 585</td><td>ENTR A FESTIVAL CENTER 84.0' - 66.0' 86-51.0' FD MED -2'2.0' C&G SHLD1</td><td>I. I. I.</td><td>1.758 A N 34TH ST</td><td>1.884 N 36TH ST</td><td>N 39TH ST</td><td>2.284 5 2.292 N 40TH ST 41 2.255 2.255 2.255 2.137</td><td>2.518 N 43RD ST</td><td>2.763A N 47TH ST 2.665A N 45TH ST N 45TH ST N 44TH ST</td><td>LILAC LN</td></th10<></th10<>	N 22ND ST 585	ENTR A FESTIVAL CENTER 84.0' - 66.0' 86-51.0' FD MED -2'2.0' C&G SHLD1	I. I.	1.758 A N 34TH ST	1.884 N 36TH ST	N 39TH ST	2.284 5 2.292 N 40TH ST 41 2.255 2.255 2.255 2.137	2.518 N 43RD ST	2.763A N 47TH ST 2.665A N 45TH ST N 45TH ST N 44TH ST	LILAC LN
	08/FC-0					I		28/FC-4 ± 08/F			I
COMPOSITION	28/FC-0						2.14	28/FC-4	°C-0		
HORIZONTAL	CURVE DATA IS NOT FIELD VERIFIED	∆=0'04'00" ∧									PI=3.
ALIGNMENT		PI=0.999	1								∆=0*
	B=N89.20.30 E	B=N89'46	30 E								B=
STRUCTURE											
DESCRIPTION											
DISTRICT USE											
	FM+255069-15201 (MP 0.000-MP 3.000) 1983-STATE RESURFACE/ REPAVE		CFM+255388-15201 (MP 1.2)	29-MP 1.429)							
SIS	1 m-235125-15201 1m- 0.000-MF- 3.311/2001-RESURF AGING		שווככשאס שהסיוביארי ינפין ש								
FUN CLASS	URBAN OTHER PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL										
1											













D NO.		COUNTY		DISTRICT		ROADWAY	ID	SHEET
00	HILL	SBORO	UGH	7	10	030	000	OF. <u>4</u> 24
92 6	500)-	I	Ğ	- CHARIE & 23.554		3	MIC MIC 19 5.7 19 5.7 19 5.7 10 5.7 10 10 5.7 10 10 5.7 10 10 5.7 10 10 10 5.7 10 10 1	ELA 23 ELA 23903
					Ċ	MC A MC A SBIO		1.0' WY
		1		1	1		0.2 ± 4.0° PV[№6.0' LWN № 8.0' LWN	SHLD1 SHLD2 - LT SHLD2 - RT
			23.506 Ž-6' X 4' X 64' CB(
	1		I	I	I		T	27
		I	I	I	I	I	1	
			— E	XHIB	IT	9 (4	OF	4) =

Appendix 2

Cross Drain Pictures, Review Checklist and FDOT SLD









	(0						I
ATTENDEES:	Mirt	a Laos & Kamrul Islam					
DATE:		October 22, 2015	DESCRIPTION	US 9	2 PD&E Study Re-I	Evaluation	
FPID:		435749-1-22-01	SR		600		_

STRUCT.	DES	CRIPTI	ON	RRELS			CULVERT SILTATION	CONDITION OF ENDWALL/CULVERT	SCOUR	SIGNS OF HIGHWATER	CHANNEL DESCRIPTION	ROADWAY ISSUES		РНОТО	
NO.	LOCATION	SIDE	STR. TYPE	# OF BA	SIZE	MATERIAL	NOTE USE PROBE TO DETERMINE DEPTH OF SILT	NOTE CRACKING, SPALLING, DETERIORATION	MEASURE DEPTH OF SCOUR HOLE	MEASURE HEIGHT OF WATER STAIN ABOVE CULVERT INVERT	(WET, DRY, VEGETATION, DEBRIS, EROSION, SOIL, ETC.)	NOTE DEPRESSIONS, CRACKING, CURB ISSUES, ETC.	NUMBER	DIRECTION	NOTES
CD-01	177 + 95.44 (MP 7.791)	LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☑ OTHER <u>6' x 4'</u>	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	GOOD CONDITION UPERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.	 		
CD-02	274 + 55.28 (MP 9.629)	🗆 LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☑ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☐ OTHER	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	GOOD CONDITION VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER <u>VEGETATION</u>	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			
CD-03	319 + 53.45 (MP 10.47)	LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☑ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☐ OTHER	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT (2")</u>	GOOD CONDITION UPERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			
CD-04	348 + 55.36 (MP 11.034)	LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☑ 30" ☐ 36" ☐ OTHER	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT (1")</u>	GOOD CONDITION VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.		□ N □ S □ E □ W □ N □ S □ E □ W □ N □ S □ E □ W	
CD-05	364 + 74.56 (MP 11.344)	LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☑ OTHER <u>2' x 2'</u>	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT □ OTHER	GOOD CONDITION URRY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			

FPID:	435749-1-22-01	SR	600	
DATE:	October 22, 2015	DESCRIPTION	US 92 PD&E Study Re-Evaluation	
ATTENDEES:	Mirta Laos & Kamrul Islam			

STRUCT	DES	CRIPTI	ON	RELS			CULVERT SILTATION	CONDITION OF ENDWALL/CULVERT	SCOUR	SIGNS OF HIGHWATER	CHANNEL DESCRIPTION	ROADWAY ISSUES		РНОТО	
NO.	LOCATION	SIDE	STR. TYPE	# OF BAI	SIZE	MATERIAL	NOTE USE PROBE TO DETERMINE DEPTH OF SILT	NOTE CRACKING, SPALLING, DETERIORATION	MEASURE DEPTH OF SCOUR HOLE	MEASURE HEIGHT OF WATER STAIN ABOVE CULVERT INVERT	(WET, DRY, VEGETATION, DEBRIS, EROSION, SOIL, ETC.)	NOTE DEPRESSIONS, CRACKING, CURB ISSUES, ETC.	NUMBER	DIRECTION	NOTES
CD-06	431 + 49.73 (MP 12.628)	LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☑ OTHER <u>48"</u>	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER SILT	☐ GOOD CONDITION ☐ VERY LIGHT ☐ LIGHT ☑ MODERATE ☐ SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			
CD-07	481 + 89.85 (MP 13.558)	🗆 lt	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☑ OTHER <u>6' x 4'</u>	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	☐ GOOD CONDITION ☐ VERY LIGHT ☐ LIGHT ☑ MODERATE ☐ SEVERE	☑ NO SCOUR □ VERY LIGHT □ LIGHT □ MODERATE □ SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.		□ N □ S □ E □ W □ N □ S □ E □ W □ N □ S □ E □ W	
CD-08	510 + 22.30 (MP 14.093)	🗆 lt	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☑ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☐ OTHER	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	GOOD CONDITION UPERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.		□ N □ S □ E □ W □ N □ S □ E □ W □ N □ S □ E □ W	
CD-09	514 + 42.37 (MP 14.169)	□ LT □ RT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☑ OTHER <u>3' x 3'</u>	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER SILT	GOOD CONDITION UREY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.		□ N □ S □ E □ W □ N □ S □ E □ W □ N □ S □ E □ W	
CD-10	578 + 24.48 (MP 15.387)	□ LT □ RT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☑ OTHER <u>2' x 2'</u>	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	GOOD CONDITION UPERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO SCOUR □ VERY LIGHT □ LIGHT □ MODERATE □ SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.	 	□ N □ S □ E □ W □ N □ S □ E □ W □ N □ S □ E □ W	

	FPID: DATE: ATTENDEES:	Mirt	435749-1- October 22 a Laos & Ka	22-01 2, 2015 amrul Islam	SR DESCRIPTION	US 9	600 2 PD&E Study Re-I	Evaluation	-
Г		(0	1						<u> </u>

STRUCT.	DES	CRIPTI	NC	RREL			SILTATION	ENDWALL/CULVERT	SCOUR	HIGHWATER	DESCRIPTION	ROADWAY ISSUES		РНОТО	
NO.	LOCATION	SIDE	STR. TYPE	# OF BAI	SIZE	MATERIAL	NOTE USE PROBE TO DETERMINE DEPTH OF SILT	NOTE CRACKING, SPALLING, DETERIORATION	MEASURE DEPTH OF SCOUR HOLE	MEASURE HEIGHT OF WATER STAIN ABOVE CULVERT INVERT	(WET, DRY, VEGETATION, DEBRIS, EROSION, SOIL, ETC.)	NOTE DEPRESSIONS, CRACKING, CURB ISSUES, ETC.	NUMBER	DIRECTION	NOTES
CD-11	607 + 50.42 (MP 15.956)	LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	⊻ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☑ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☐ OTHER	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	☐ GOOD CONDITION ☐ VERY LIGHT ☐ LIGHT ☑ MODERATE ☐ SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	☐ NO HIGHWATER ☐ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			
CD-12	628 + 94.33 (MP 16.363)	LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☑ 36" ☐ OTHER	☐ RCP ☐ CMP ☐ SRAP ☐ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	GOOD CONDITION VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			
CD-13	664 + 33.35 (MP 17.016)	LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☑ OTHER 4 <u>' x 2'</u>	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	GOOD CONDITION UPERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			
CD-14	700 + 50.28 (MP 17.719)	LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☑ 36" ☐ OTHER	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	GOOD CONDITION UVERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			
CD-15	746 + 18.99 (MP 18.579)	LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☑ OTHER <u>6' x 4'</u>	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	☐ GOOD CONDITION ☐ VERY LIGHT ☑ LIGHT ☐ MODERATE ☐ SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			

FPID:		435749-1-	22-01	SR		600		
DATE:		October 22	, 2015	DESCRIPTION	US 9	2 PD&E Study Re-I	Evaluation	-
ATTENDEES:	Mir	ta Laos & Ka	amrul Islam					-
	လု					SIGNS OF	CHANNEL	

STRUCT.	DES	CRIPTI	ON	RRELS			CULVERT SILTATION	CONDITION OF ENDWALL/CULVERT	SCOUR	SIGNS OF HIGHWATER	CHANNEL DESCRIPTION	ROADWAY ISSUES		РНОТО	
NO.	LOCATION	SIDE	STR. TYPE	# OF BA	SIZE	MATERIAL	NOTE USE PROBE TO DETERMINE DEPTH OF SILT	NOTE CRACKING, SPALLING, DETERIORATION	MEASURE DEPTH OF SCOUR HOLE	MEASURE HEIGHT OF WATER STAIN ABOVE CULVERT INVERT	(WET, DRY, VEGETATION, DEBRIS, EROSION, SOIL, ETC.)	NOTE DEPRESSIONS, CRACKING, CURB ISSUES, ETC.	NUMBER	DIRECTION	NOTES
CD-16	1032 + 53.17 (MP 21.663)	LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☑ OTHER <u>5' x 2'</u>	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	☐ GOOD CONDITION ☐ VERY LIGHT ☑ LIGHT ☐ MODERATE ☐ SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			
CD-17	1048 + 11.69 (MP 21.963)	🗆 LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☑ OTHER <u>5' x 2'</u>	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	☐ GOOD CONDITION ☐ VERY LIGHT ☐ LIGHT ☑ MODERATE ☐ SEVERE	□ NO SCOUR □ VERY LIGHT □ LIGHT □ MODERATE □ SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.		□ N □ S □ E □ W □ N □ S □ E □ W □ N □ S □ E □ W	
CD-18	1077 + 03.12 (MP 22.505)	🗆 LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☑ OTHER <u>5' x 3'</u>	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	☑ NO SILT	GOOD CONDITION UPERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			
CD-19	1099 + 06.20 (MP 22.931)	LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☑ OTHER <u>5' x 3'</u>	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	☑ NO SILT ☐ OTHER	GOOD CONDITION UPERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			
CD-20	1123 + 04.72 (MP 23.384)	🗆 LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☐ 1	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☑ OTHER <u>6' x 4'</u>	CMP SRAP OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	GOOD CONDITION VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER <u>VEGETATION</u>	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			

	FPID:		435749-1	-22-01		SR		600		
	DATE:		October 2	2, 2015		DESCRIPTION	US 9	2 PD&E Study Re-I	Evaluation	-
	ATTENDEES:		Mirta Laos & K	amrul Islam						-
-										1
		CULVERT						SIGNS OF	CHANNEL	

STRUCT.	DES	DESCRIPTION		RREL			CULVERT	CONDITION OF ENDWALL/CULVERT	SCOUR SIGNS OF HIGHWATER		CHANNEL DESCRIPTION ROADWAY ISSUES	ROADWAY ISSUES	РНОТО		
NO.	LOCATION	SIDE	STR. TYPE	PE H	SIZÉ LO #	MATERIAL	NOTE USE PROBE TO DETERMINE DEPTH OF SILT	NOTE CRACKING, SPALLING, DETERIORATION	MEASURE DEPTH OF SCOUR HOLE	MEASURE HEIGHT OF WATER STAIN ABOVE CULVERT INVERT	(WET, DRY, VEGETATION, DEBRIS, EROSION, SOIL, ETC.)	NOTE DEPRESSIONS, CRACKING, CURB ISSUES, ETC.	NUMBER	DIRECTION	NOTES
CD-21	1166 + 96.05 (MP 24.214)	LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	⊻ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☑ OTHER <u>8' x 2'</u>	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	GOOD CONDITION UVERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY REOSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			
		LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☑ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☐ OTHER	☐ RCP ☐ CMP ☐ SRAP ☐ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT</u>	GOOD CONDITION VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			
		LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☑ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☐ OTHER	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT (2")</u>	GOOD CONDITION VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			
		LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☑ 30" ☐ 36" ☐ OTHER	☑ RCP □ CMP □ SRAP □ OTHER	□ NO SILT ☑ OTHER <u>SILT (1")</u>	GOOD CONDITION UREY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			
		🗆 LT	☐ INLET ☐ MH ☑ HW ☐ MES ☐ EW ☐ OTHER	☑ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ 15" ☐ 18" ☐ 24" ☐ 30" ☐ 36" ☐ OTHER <u>2' x 2'</u>	☐ RCP ☐ CMP ☐ SRAP ☐ OTHER	□ NO SILT □ OTHER	GOOD CONDITION UPERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	NO SCOUR VERY LIGHT LIGHT MODERATE SEVERE	□ NO HIGHWATER □ OTHER	MAINTENANCE DESILT ONLY EROSION RE-ESTABLISH DITCH L= OTHER VEGETATION	DEPRESSION CRACKING CURB TRANS.			

	INTERIM REVISIONS		T
	5 YR INV SLD REV BMP EMP INV SLD REV DATE 03/04/2010[04/27/2010] 3.532 4.772 09/06/2013	STRAIGHT LINE DIAGRAM OF ROAD INVENTORY	INT. or US ROUTE NO STATE ROA
<u> </u>	0 BY MEI/JM-KA MEI/KA CONSTRUCTION ÉTE/KA	FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 2	US 41, US 92 SR 60
NEBRASKA	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	- <u>2.865</u> N 48T <u>H ST</u> - SCHIPMAN C12 N 47TH 2.763 N 47TH 2.765 N 46TH ST N 45TH ST N 45TH ST
FEATURES RASKA (24) Break and Control of Con	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	ENTRA R 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.1 1.200 A 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2	LILAC LN 2.763 N 47TH ST 2.665 N 45TH ST 2.613 A
ROADWAY COMPOSITION	08/FC-0	28/FC-4 * 08/FC-0	
	28/FC-0	28/FC-4 28/FC-0	<u> </u>
HORIZONTAL	Δ =0'04'00' curve data is not field verified Δ		PI=
ALIGNMENT	PI=0.999 B=N89'50'30"E B=N89'46'	30"E	B=
STRUCTURE			
DISTRICT USE			
	FM+255069-15201 (MP 0.000-MP 3.000) 1983-STATE RESURFACE/ REPAVE	୍ଲାମM•255388-15201 (MP−1.229-MP−1.429)	
	FM+255729-15201 (MP 0.000-MP 3.511) 2001-RESURFACING	2 1997-RAILROAD CROSSING	
SIS			
FUN CLASS	URBAN OTHER PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL		









THOM	566 A A A MORE	600) Z Z PLEN A IO	RECT A A A ODRI S			N WALKER N DANIELS N HOWARD N HOWARD N FRANKLIN	и тномая 201	SK- SR 600 PALMER 20.4 +
ROADWAY		SAV F NO K O	જે પૈ 🐴 🗞	Z 00 ST ST	ST 64 Cray 25 ST	ST S		
FEATURES	LEMON ST 19.046 4 5029 19.0246 4 5029 19.02 19.046 4 51.0° - 35.0° 19.02 1	200 - 24.0 200 - 200 - 24.0 200 -	19.4 4 30 A 750 A 75	19, 522 19, 522 19, 522 19, 522 10, 523 10, 522 10, 523 10, 522 10, 523 10, 522 10, 523 10, 503 10,	92 600) 19.864 PEARL ST PEARL ST	N WALKER ST 20.117 N DANIELS ST 20.066 N HOWARD ST 20.016 N FRANKLIN ST	20.323 N EVERS ST 20.270 20.270 WHEELER ST 20.219 20.219 N THOMAS ST	20.478 CSX PALMER ST 20.373 4 20.373 4 COLLINS ST 9 20.373 4 9 20.373 4 9 20.424 9 20.424 9 20.478
	0 02.11.5' R0WY - RT 0 22.0' PVD WED 0 2.2.0' C&G SHLD1 0 2.0' - C&G SHLD1 0 2.0' - 0 4.1.5' 0 12.0' PV 0 2.2.5' C 0 2.12.0' PV 0 2.2.5' C	46.0' 46.0' RDWY VO MED PVD SHLD1 LWN SHLD2 -			1 1	32.0' - 24.0' 92-12.0' RDWY 90.0' RC SHLD1 - LT 90.0' RC SHLD1 - RT 0.0' RC SHLD2 - LT	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	€22.0° ₹22.10 ₹22.10 ₹22.10 ₹22.10
ROADWAY	28/FC-4 g 28/FC-4	28/FC-4						28/FC-4
COMPOSITION	28/FC-4 28/FC-4	으 일 28/FC-4						28/FC-4
		=16'50'54"	∆=0'07'57 "	∆=29'08'01" ∧	∆=111 D= <u>91</u>	4'57" 5'		ł
ALIGNMENT	PI=	∨ =19.185 B=S60*56`18"E	V PI=19.474 B=S60*48'21"E	PI=19.648 B=S89*56'22"E	PC= PI= PT=	^{19,994} 20.005 B=N78*48'41"E		
STRUCTURE				10 x 5 X 30 CBC				
DISTRICT USE	(MP 19.045-MP 24.593)1997	2-FEDERAL AD RESURFACE/ REPAVE DEFM=255615-15201 (MP 19.191-MP 24.593) 202001-FEDERAL AD RESURFACE/ REPAVE						Image: Constraint of the second sec
SIS								
FUN CLASS	URBAN OTHER PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL							



ND NO.		COUNTY		DISTRICT		ROADWAY	ID	SHEET
00	HILL	SBORO	UGH	7	10	030	000	OF. 4 24
	<u> </u>	1		CHARLE 23.554	1	- ~	MICCING 10	ELA 23903
<u>92</u> 6	500)			-	Ċ	S MCCMS R	, ,	
							46.0' - 24 62-12.0' B0 22-4.0' PV(M6.0' LWN 8.0' LWN	4.0' WY O SHLD1 SHLD2 - LT SHLD2 - RT
			23.506 2-6' X 4' X 64' CBĆ					
		1	1	1				27
	- 1	I		I		I	I	
				~		• • • •	~=	
			_E	XHIE	SIT	9 (4	OF	4)

Appendix 3

FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)























ł	MAP SCALE 1" = 500' 250 0 500 1000 E E FEET FEET	ER
3467	PANEL 0269H	
	Image: Properties of the state of the s	
	This is an official copy of a portion of the above referenced flood map. It was extracted using F-MIT On-Line. This map does not reflect changes or amendments which may have been made subsequent to the date on the title block. For the latest product information about National Flood Insuranc Program flood maps check the FEMA Flood Map Store at www.msc.fema.g	egov














+

Appendix 4

Correspondence

Kamrul Islam

From: Sent: To: Subject: Mirta Laos Monday, October 05, 2015 9:49 AM Kamrul Islam; Renato Chuw FW: SR 600 (US 92) From East of I-4 to County Line Road

FYI...

From: Mostyn, Jessica [mailto:Jessica.Mostyn@dep.state.fl.us]
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 9:18 AM
To: Mirta Laos <mlaos@inwoodinc.com>
Cc: ODonnell, Kevin <Kevin.ODonnell@dep.state.fl.us>; Wiwi, Robert <Robert.Wiwi@dep.state.fl.us>
Subject: RE: SR 600 (US 92) From East of I-4 to County Line Road

Good Morning Mirta,

I divided the WBIDs into which Group basin they are in because the Group 1 Cycle 3 assessments have been adopted by the Secretary and the Group 2 Cycle 3 assessments *will be* adopted by the Secretary in December. We are not proposing that the bold WBIDs, 1542A and 1561 are impaired for TN and TP at this time.

WBID	Group 1 Cycle 3 Impairments on the Verified List
1536B (Six Mile Creek)	Dissolved Oxygen, Dissolved Oxygen (BOD) Nutrients (Chlorophyll-a)
1536C (Tampa Bypass	
Canal)	Dissolved Oxygen, Fecal Coliform
1576 (Mango Drain)	Dissolved Oxygen (BOD), Fecal Coliform, Nutrients (Chlorophyll-a)

WBID	Group 2 Cycle 3 Impairments on the Verified List (assessments will be finalized in December)
	Fecal Coliform (Dissolved Oxygen is being delisted
	into category 4d Study List, Nutrients (Chlorophyll-
1518 (East Canal)	 a) is being delisted into category 2 Not Impaired)
1531 Wiggins Prairie Drain	No impairments
1542 (Pemberton Creek)	Fecal Coliform
	No impairments (Fecal Coliform is being delisted into category 4a TMDL Complete; Dissolved
	Oxygen and Nutrients (Chlorophyll-a) are being
1542A (Mill Creek)	delisted into category 2 Not Impaired)
1547 (Seffner Canal)	Dissolved Oxygen, Fecal Coliform
	No impairments (Fecal Coliform is being delisted
1552 (English Creek)	into category 4a TMDL Complete)

	No impairments (Dissolved Oxygen is being delisted into category 4c Natural Condition and Nutrients (Chlorophyll a) is being delisted into
1561 (Spartman Branch)	category 2 Not Impaired)
1565 (Moore Lake Drain)	Fecal Coliform

Please let me know if you have any additional questions, Jessica

From: Mirta Laos [mailto:mlaos@inwoodinc.com]
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 8:29 AM
To: Mostyn, Jessica; ODonnell, Kevin
Subject: RE: SR 600 (US 92) From East of I-4 to County Line Road

Thank you so much; I appreciate your time. Mirta

From: Mostyn, Jessica [mailto:Jessica.Mostyn@dep.state.fl.us]
Sent: Friday, October 02, 2015 3:50 PM
To: ODonnell, Kevin <<u>Kevin.ODonnell@dep.state.fl.us</u>>; Mirta Laos <<u>mlaos@inwoodinc.com</u>>
Subject: RE: SR 600 (US 92) From East of I-4 to County Line Road

Mirta,

We'll need to get back to you on these WBIDs first thing Monday. Jessica

From: ODonnell, Kevin
Sent: Friday, October 02, 2015 11:18 AM
To: Mirta Laos; Mostyn, Jessica
Subject: RE: SR 600 (US 92) From East of I-4 to County Line Road

Hi Mirta,

We would be glad to provide you an update on the impairment status. There are quite a few WBIDs here to review, but we should be able to provide you the information today or early next week.

Jess, Could you or Robert pull this information together for Mirta?

Thanks, Kevin

From: Mirta Laos [mailto:mlaos@inwoodinc.com]
Sent: Friday, October 02, 2015 10:19 AM
To: ODonnell, Kevin
Subject: SR 600 (US 92) From East of I-4 to County Line Road

Good morning Kevin,

I am working on the US 92 PD&E Study, and would like verification on the following WBID's below:

- 1518 (East Canal)
- 1531 Wiggins Prairie Drain
- 1536B (Six Mile Creek)
- 1536C (Tampa Bypass Canal)
- 1542 (Pemberton Creek)
- 1542A (Mill Creek)
- 1547 (Seffner Canal)
- 1552 (English Creek)
- 1561 (Spartman Branch)
- 1565 (Moore Lake Drain)
- 1576 (Mango Drain)

I have checked the WBID's and the two in bold seem to be impaired for TN, and TP. If you could please verify this information, I would really appreciate it.

Thank you, and have a wonderful weekend.

Mirta Laos, P.E. PROJECT ENGINEER INWOOD CONSULTING ENGINEERS 3000 Dovera Dr., Suite 200, Oviedo, FL 32765 P: 407-971-8850







Kamrul Islam

From:	Frick, Chad <chad.frick@dot.state.fl.us></chad.frick@dot.state.fl.us>
Sent:	Tuesday, October 27, 2015 10:11 AM
То:	Kamrul Islam
Cc:	Mirta Laos; Hunt, Harvey; Leipski, Andrew J; Montjoy, Anita W
Subject:	RE: US 92 PD&E Study; FPID 435749-1-22-01; From East of I-4 to County Line Road
-	

Hello Mr. Islam,

Importance:

I researched some recent flooding issues on US 92 in the following issues:

High

East 702 Reynolds/Baker US 92

East 11730 US 92

East 11309 US 92

East 10604 Black Dairy Road

East 9715 US 92

We all had issues in the summer months where runoff, flooding, private property flooding & driveway capacity had some issues. Please contact Andrew Leipski, Ron Gibson or myself if you need to look at these and/or data base issues for maintenance concerns. Thank you for the information!

Respectfully,



chad.frick@dot.state.fl.us

••••• Florida has a very broad public records law. Written communications to or from the Office of the Attorney General are public records available to anyone upon request. If you do not want your e-mail or e-mail address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.

From: Kamrul Islam [mailto:kislam@inwoodinc.com]
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2015 8:58 AM
To: Hunt, Harvey
Cc: Mirta Laos; Leipski, Andrew J; Frick, Chad
Subject: US 92 PD&E Study; FPID 435749-1-22-01; From East of I-4 to County Line Road

Good Morning Mr. Hunt,

We are working on the US 92 PD&E Study from East of I-4 to County Line Road, and wanted to discuss with you if there was any history of flooding or any other information available regarding maintenance concerns.

Please let me know when it would be a good time to contact you to discuss. Any written information over the email will also help us a lot.

We appreciate your support with this matter.



Sincerely, Kamrul Islam, El ENGINEERING INTERN

INWOOD CONSULTING ENGINEERS

3000 Dovera Dr., Suite 200, Oviedo, FL 32765 P: 407-971-8850 x6595 F: 407-971-8955 inwoodinc.com

