

STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
WATER QUALITY IMPACT EVALUATION CHECKLIST

650-050-37
ENVIRONMENTAL
MANAGEMENT
07/20

PART 1: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name:	US 301 (SR 41) PD&E Study
County:	Hillsborough & Pasco
FM Number:	255796-1-22-01
Federal Aid Project No:	N/A
Brief Project Description:	The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), District Seven, is conducting a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study for the proposed improvements to US 301 from Fowler Avenue (SR 582) in Hillsborough County to SR 56 in Pasco County. The total project length is approximately 13.1 miles. The proposed action includes widening US 301 from two lanes to four lanes and providing pedestrian and bicycle accommodations.

PART 2: DETERMINATION OF WQIE SCOPE

Does project discharge to surface or ground water? Yes No

Does project alter the drainage system? Yes No

Is the project located within a permitted MS4? Yes No
Name: _____

If the answers to the questions above are no, complete the applicable sections of Part 3 and 4, and then check Box A in Part 5.

PART 3: PROJECT BASIN AND RECEIVING WATER CHARACTERISTICS

Surface Water

Receiving water names: Hillsborough River, Flint Creek, Hollomans Branch, Clay Gully, Two Hole Branch, Indian Creek. All these are part of the Hillsborough River watershed.

Water Management District: Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD)

Environmental Look Around meeting date: 1/26/2015
Attach meeting minutes/notes to the checklist.

Water Control District Name(s) (list all that apply): N/A

Groundwater

Sole Source Aquifer (SSA)? Yes No

Name _____

If yes, complete Part 5, D and complete SSA Checklist shown in Part 2, Chapter 11 of the PD&E Manual

Other Aquifer? Yes No
Name Floridan

Springs vents? Yes No
Name _____

Well head protection area? Yes No
Name _____

Groundwater recharge? Yes No
Name Rainfall, Infiltration

Notify District Drainage Engineer if karst conditions are expected or if a higher level of treatment may be needed due to a project being located within a WBID verified as Impaired in accordance with Chapter 62-303, F.A.C.

Date of notification: 3/12/2021

PART 4: WATER QUALITY CRITERIA

List all WBIDs and all parameters for which a WBID has been verified impaired, or has a TMDL in [Table 1](#). This information should be updated during each re-evaluation as required.

Note: If BMAP or RAP has been identified in [Table 1](#), [Table 2](#) must also be completed. Attach notes or minutes from all coordination meetings identified in [Table 2](#).

EST recommendations confirmed with agencies? Yes No

BMAP Stakeholders contacted? Yes No

TMDL program contacted? Yes No

RAP Stakeholders contacted? Yes No

Regional water quality projects identified in the ELA? Yes No

If yes, describe:

Potential direct effects associated with project construction and/or operation identified? Yes No

If yes, describe:

Discuss any other relevant information related to water quality including Regulatory Agency Water Quality Requirements.

N/A


PART 5: WQIE DOCUMENTATION

- A. No involvement with water quality
- B. No water quality regulatory requirements apply.
- C. Water quality regulatory requirements apply to this project (provide Evaluator's information below). Water quality and stormwater issues will be mitigated through compliance with the design requirements of authorized regulatory agencies.
- D. EPA Ground/Drinking Water Branch review required. Yes No
Concurrence received? Yes No
If Yes, Date of EPA Concurrence: [Click here to enter a date..](#)
Attach the concurrence letter

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 December 14, 2016 and executed by FHWA and FDOT.

Evaluator Name (print): Renato Chuw

Title: Senior Drainage Engineer

Signature: 

Date: 9/14/2021

Table 1: Water Quality Criteria

Receiving Waterbody Name (list all that apply)	FDEP Group Number / Name	WBID(s) Numbers	Classification (I,II,III,IIIL,IV,V)	Special Designations*	NNC limits**	Verified Impaired (Y/N)	TMDL (Y/N)	Pollutants of concern	BMAP, RA Plan or SSAC
Hillsborough River	Group 2-Tampa Bay Tributaries	1443B	I	OFW	Stream	No	Yes	Nutrients	
Flint Creek	Group 2-Tampa Bay Tributaries	1522A	III	OFW	Stream	No	Yes	Nutrients	
Hollomans Branch	Group 2-Tampa Bay Tributaries	1520	III	OFW	Stream	Yes	No	Fecal Coliform / Bacteria	
Hillsborough River	Group 2-Tampa Bay Tributaries	1443C	III	OFW	Stream	No	Yes	Nutrients	
Clay Gully	Group 2-Tampa Bay	1505	III	OFW	Stream	Yes	No	Fecal Coliform / Bacteria	

	Tributaries								
Two Hole Branch	Group 2-Tampa Bay Tributaries	1489	III	OFW	Stream	Yes	No	Fecal Coliform / Bacteria	
Hillsborough River	Group 2-Tampa Bay Tributaries	1443D	III	OFW	Stream	No	Yes	Nutrients	
Indian Creek	Group 2-Tampa Bay Tributaries	1453	III	N/A	Stream	No	No	N/A	
Hillsborough River	Group 2-Tampa Bay Tributaries	1443A	III	OFW	Stream	No	Yes	Nutrients	

* ONRW, OFW, Aquatic Preserve, Wild and Scenic River, Special Water, SWIM Area, Local Comp Plan, MS4 Area, Other

** Lakes, Spring vents, Streams, Estuaries

Note: If BMAP or RAP has been identified in [Table 1](#), [Table 2](#) must also be completed.

Table 2: REGULATORY Agencies/Stakeholders Contacted

Receiving Water Name (list all that apply)	Contact and Title	Date Contacted	Follow-up Required (Y/N)	Comments
Hillsborough River	SWFWMD (Richard Alt, Lee Hughes)	1/14/2015	No	Pre-Application Meeting (1)
	FDOT D7 (Ashley Henzel, Abdul Waris, Anthony Celani)	3/12/2021, 7/14/2021	No	Pond longlist and shortlist meetings
	Hillsborough County (Junshan Su)	1/26/2015	No	Watershed model / ELA

THIS FORM IS INTENDED TO FACILITATE AND GUIDE THE DIALOGUE DURING A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING BY PROVIDING A PARTIAL "PROMPT LIST" OF DISCUSSION SUBJECTS. IT IS NOT A LIST OF REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMITTAL BY THE APPLICANT.



**SOUTHWEST FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
RESOURCE REGULATION DIVISION
PRE-APPLICATION MEETING NOTES**

FILE NUMBER:

PA 401835

Date: 1/14/2015
Time: 9:00
Project Name: FDOT US301 PD&E Study (Hillsborough & Pasco)
Attendees: Richard Alt, Lee Hughes; Renato Chuw - Inwood Consulting Engineers, rchuw@inwoodinc.com, Mark Easley - KCA

County: Hillsborough
Total Land Acreage: 400
Sec/Twp/Rge: various
Project Acreage: 100 acres

Prior On-Site/Off-Site Permit Activity:

- Existing 2 lane road
- ETDM under review - 14194

Project Overview:

- Design divided 4 lane

Environmental Discussion: (Wetlands On-Site, Wetlands on Adjacent Properties, Delineation, T&E species, Easements, Drawdown Issues, Setbacks, Justification, Elimination/Reduction, Permanent/Temporary Impacts, Secondary and Cumulative Impacts, Mitigation Options, SHWL, Upland Habitats, Site Visit, etc.)

- Provide the limits of jurisdictional wetlands.
- Provide appropriate mitigation using UMAM for impacts, if applicable.
- Demonstrate elimination and reduction of wetland impacts.
- Maintain minimum 15 foot, average 25 foot wetland conservation area setback or address secondary impacts.
- Mitigation Banks (North Tampa, Boarshead, Hillsborough River) with future forested and herbaceous mitigation credits proposed for release. Will need to have them officially released before they can be utilized for mitigation.
- If the project is located in a county which is listed as a coastal county under the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZM) and the project has wetland impacts, it will require a noticing period once the permit application is deemed complete. Wetland and/or surface waters impacts less than 1 acre in size will require a 10 day noticing period, prior to the issuance of the permit. Wetland and/or surface water impacts greater than 1 acre in size will require a 30 day noticing period, prior to the issuance of the permit. Permits could be issued as early as the 11th or 31st day, but staffs' schedule and workload will determine the actual issuance date.

Site Information Discussion: (SHW Levels, Floodplain, Tailwater Conditions, Adjacent Off-Site Contributing Sources, Receiving Waterbody, etc.)

- Existing roadway/intersections –
- WBIDs need to be independently verified by the consultant - WBID – 1443B, 1522A, 1520, 1443C, 1505, 1489, 1443D, 1453, 1443A, and 1446
- Discharging to impaired waters.

Water Quantity Discussions: (Basin Description, Storm Event, Pre/Post Volume, Pre/Post Discharge, etc.)

- Demonstrate that discharges from proposed project area will not cause an adverse impact for a 25-year, 24-hour storm event.
- Demonstrate that site will not impede the conveyance of contributing off-site flows.
- Demonstrate that the project will not increase flood stages up- or down-stream of the project area(s).
- Provide equivalent compensating storage for all 100-year, 24-hour riverine floodplain impacts if applicable.

Water Quality Discussions: (Type of Treatment, Technical Characteristics, Non-presumptive Alternatives, etc.)

- Provide water quality treatment for required project area.
- May need to meet OFW criteria in portions of project
- In addition, if the project discharges to an impaired water body, must provide a net environmental improvement.
- Applicant must demonstrate a net improvement for the parameters of concern by performing a pre/post pollutant loading analysis based on existing land use and the proposed land use.
- Also replace treatment function of existing ditches to be filled.
- Will acknowledge compensatory treatment to offset pollutant loads associated with portions of the project area that cannot be physically treated.

Sovereign Lands Discussion: (Determining Location, Correct Form of Authorization, Content of Application, Assessment of Fees, Coordination with FDEP)

- SSL in Hillsborough County will be processed through Tampa Port Authority; any within Pasco County will be processed through SWFWMD.

Operation and Maintenance/Legal Information: (Ownership or Perpetual Control, O&M Entity, O&M Instructions, Homeowner Association Documents, Coastal Zone requirements, etc.)

- The permit must be issued to the FDOT.
- Provide proof of ownership in the form of a deed or contract for sale.
- Provide appropriate O&M instructions.
- Provide detailed construction surface water management plan.

Application Type and Fee Required:

- SWERP – Sections A, C, and E of the ERP Application.
- < 640 acres of project area and < 50 acres of wetland or surface water impacts - \$4,141
- Fees will depend on project size determined during phasing

Other: (Future Pre-Application Meetings, Fast Track, Submittal Date, Construction Start Date, Required District Permits – WUP, WOD, Well Construction, etc.)

- In accordance with Rule 40D-1.603(2), F.A.C., no later than 30 days after submittal of an initial application of an Individual surface water management permit the applicant shall publish at the applicant's expense a notice of the District's receipt of the application in a newspaper having general circulation as defined in Chapter 50, F.S., in the county or counties in which the activity is proposed. Please provide documentation that such noticing has been accomplished. Note that the published notices of receipt for an ERP must be in accordance with the language provided in Rule 40D-1.603(11), F.A.C., and receipt of an affidavit establishing proof of this publication will be considered a completeness item of this ERP Application. Per Rule 40D-1.603(13), F.A.C., this must be received before the application will be considered complete and the 60-day timeframe for taking agency action on the application will commence.

40D-1.603(13) – “Applicants required to publish a notice of receipt of application must provide to the District a publisher’s affidavit establishing proof of publication pursuant to Sections 50.041 and 50.051, F.S., before the application will be considered complete and the applicable timeframe for taking agency action on the application will commence.”

Disclaimer: The District ERP pre-application meeting process is a service made available to the public to assist interested parties in preparing for submittal of a permit application. Information shared at pre-application meetings is superseded by the actual permit application submittal. District permit decisions are based upon information submitted during the application process and Rules in effect at the time the application is complete.

DATE: 3/26/2021; updated 4/1/2021

TO: Ashley Henzel, PE

FROM: Renato Chuw, PE

RE: US 301 PD&E from Fowler Avenue to SR 56; FPID 255796-1-22-01; Revised SMF and FPC sites per Longlist meeting comments

CC: Bob Finck

The following updates to the SMF and FPC sites for the US 301 PD&E Study in Hillsborough/Pasco Counties were done in response to the comments from the Longlist Pond Site Meeting with FDOT, discussion with the FDOT Project Manager and subsequent refinements to the sizes of the ponds. Below is a list of these updates:

- Easement for FPC 1 changed to be within Jackson Road and Ohio Avenue
- SMF 1A site relocated to the west side of US 301
- SMF 1B site reshaped to impact fewer parcels and have total takes of these parcels
- SMF 3B relocated to the west side of US 301 to avoid previous mobile home park to the east
- SMF 3C1 reshaped to avoid the FGT easement
- SMF 3C2 size was reduced, thus impacting one less parcel
- SMF 4B relocated to the west side of US 301
- SMF 4C was eliminated and instead, the 3rd alternative will be to use the permitted expansion of the existing borrow pit for Copart of Connecticut. The permitted information indicates runoff from portions of US 301 is already accounted in the expansion of the borrow pit
- FPC 2 site relocated to the other side of the floodplain (north side) and in the same parcel as SMF 7A
- SMF 7A slightly reshaped but same site and parcel
- SMF 7B reshaped to impact fewer parcels and have total takes on these parcels
- SMF 7C relocated to the west side of US 301. Previous site to the east was not feasible due to topography and hydraulic considerations
- SMF 9A easement relocated to the north side of the parcel
- SMF 10A reduced in size and is only on one parcel
- SMFs 11A and 11B eliminated. Compensating treatment will be provided in adjacent Basins 10 and 12
- SMF 12C increased in size due to refinement of analysis and topography
- Preferred SMF and FPC by adjacent design segment shown for Basin 14
- FPC 9 was eliminated. With coordination with adjacent design segment, their preferred FPC 1A will be included for evaluation for our study

DATE: 3/12/2021, revised 3/25/21

TO: Ashley Henzel, PE

FROM: Renato Chuw, PE

RE: US 301 PD&E from Fowler Avenue to SR 56; FPID 255796-1-22-01; Longlist Pond Siting Meeting

CC: IN ATTENDANCE: Kirk Bogen, Anthony Celani, Allison Conner, Timothy Drawhorn, Ashley Henzel, Art Mariano, Bill McTeer, Melissa Mulvaney, Zabrina Penton, Abdul Waris, Ana Zea, Bob Finck (AIM), Jeffrey Jacquin (AIM), Renato Chuw (Inwood), Zach Evans (Inwood), Forrest McClellan (Inwood)

The longlist pond siting meeting was held via a Teams meeting on Wednesday, March 10th, 2021 at 1:30 pm with FDOT, AIM Engineering and Inwood Consulting Engineers' staff for the US 301 PD&E Study in Hillsborough County from Fowler Avenue to SR 56 in Pasco County. The purpose of the meeting was to present to FDOT staff, the initial SMF (Stormwater Management Facilities) alternative sites for the study and obtain input. A brief introduction of the study was provided by Bob Finck (AIM Engineering) as the prime consultant for this study. Inwood Consulting Engineers are the sub-consultant to AIM for the drainage evaluation of the study and followed with the description of each SMF site per basin. Exhibits were displayed on the monitor and provided to all attendees to follow the discussions.

Basin 1 SMF alternatives

- FDOT asked if the FGT gas line was within the R/W and wanted to confirm if any of the SMF alternatives would impact the gas line. The gas line was confirmed to run along the east side of US 301 and just inside the existing R/W.
- Two SMF alternatives (1A and 1B) are located on the east side of US 301. FDOT indicated that on another project, FGT did not want FDOT to cross their gas line with a drainage pipe. However, after verifying with Dan Hunter (FDOT Utilities), it was indicated that for the US 301 PD&E Study, it would be possible to cross the FGT line and the gas line is about 4 to 6 ft in depth. Crossing the FGT gas line was mentioned to be avoided if possible.
- The easement to FPC 1 was discussed. The easement is necessary to allow FDOT to access the FPC in case of emergency or maintenance. Alternative routes for the easement to the FPC were discussed. FDOT mentioned that if the easement is on a private road, all residents on the private road would have to be notified and agreed on the FDOT access. Options to relocate the easement on public roads were explored. An easement from Jackson Rd and Ohio Avenue was discussed (both are public roads) and will be investigated.

Follow up telephone call with Ashley Henzel (3/12/21):

- Inwood will look at moving one of the SMF alternatives on the east (either SMF 1A or 1B) to the west side, to limit only one SMF option on the east for crossing the FGT line.

Basin 2 SMF alternatives

- FDOT asked if an ICE (Intersection Control Evaluation) study was performed at the intersection with Harney Rd. If a roundabout is implemented, it will impact the proposed SMF within the R/W. Only one SMF alternative was presented since it is within the FDOT R/W.
- Inwood stated that there is room to expand the SMF and it will be revised to allow for the potential of a roundabout at this intersection.

Basin 3 SMF alternatives

- The shape of SMF 3C will be revised to avoid impacting the FGT easement on the west side of US 301 where it makes a 90 degree turn to the east and crosses the road.
- FDOT may request moving the FGT easement south of Langshaw Dr., although it could be very expensive.
- The location of SMF 3B currently impacts a trailer park. This SMF will be moved to the west to impact 5 or 6 private residential parcels rather than the trailer park.

Basin 4 SMF alternatives

- FDOT asked if there was a possibility to expand the existing pond/lake south of SMF 4C. Inwood indicated that existing permits were researched but not permit was found for this pond.
- Inwood mentioned that further investigation will be made as to the nature of this existing pond and look for an opportunity to expand for joint-use/expand the pond.

Follow up telephone call with Ashley Henzel (3/12/21):

- Inwood indicated that SMF 4B and 4C are on the east side and the FGT line runs along the inside of the existing R/W. Similar to the SMFs in Basin 1, Inwood will investigate moving one of the SMFs options on the east side to the west, to limit only one SMF alternative that requires crossing of the FGT line.

Basin 5 SMF alternatives

- Inwood indicated that one SMF alternative was located within the R/W, however, because of the length of the basin, it was doubtful this alternative would be able to serve the requirements for the whole basin. Therefore, three offsite SMFs were located.
- SMF 5C and 5D are located within county parcels. FDOT asked if there was a possibility to combine Basins 5 and 6 and expand one of the sites within the county parcel. Inwood mentioned that combining basins was difficult for 5 and 6 due to hydraulics and crossing the bridge culvert at Flint Creek.
- Parcels to the west of US 301 are public owned lands. FDOT mentioned that for state funded projects, ponds can be placed in state owned lands that are not 4(f) resources.
- Coordination with the State Park occurred in 2017 and traditional stormwater ponds were not preferred by the park. The park would prefer using low lying areas or natural areas. The park was open to innovative ideas.
- Inwood will investigate if SMF 5D would block offsite flow to Flint Creek.
- Coordination with the county will occur regarding sites SMF 5C and 5D in their property.

Basin 6 SMF alternatives

- All three SMF alternatives are located on the east side of US 301 to avoid public lands and state park on the west side. All three SMFs are in county parcels.
- Coordination with the county will occur regarding the nature of these parcels (i.e., conservation lands or other).
- It was asked if SMF 6A would be within the floodway boundaries of Flint Creek. Inwood stated that the SMF is outside of the floodway limits.
- FDOT indicated that it would be more advantageous for FPC 2 to be located adjacent to the R/W and show cup for cup compensation rather than its current location which may require a floodplain model. Inwood will relocate FPC 2.

Basin 7 SMF alternatives

- FDOT mentioned that SMFs near ponds may cause seepage issues. Considerations for a barrier between the SMF and the home or full parcel takes should be consider.
- SMF 7B will be reshaped to impact fewer parcels (full takes rather than partial takes).

Basin 8 SMF alternatives

- No comments from the Department regarding the SMFs or the FPC

Basin 9 SMF alternatives

- The easement for SMF 9A will be relocated to the north side of the parcel and avoid potential conflicts with utilities.
- FDOT commented that SMF 9A would require a long conveyance pipe to the pond. Inwood stated that the pond was situated on the back of the parcel for best use of the remaining parcel for the property owner. The outfall for this SMF could be a spreader swale to the adjacent wetlands to Two Hole Branch rather than to run another separate outfall back to the US 301 R/W.

Basin 10 SMF alternatives

- Only two SMF alternatives were presented for this basin. SMF 10B would have slight impacts to the floodplain but these will be compensated for.

Basin 11 SMF alternatives

- FDOT indicated that a long conveyance pipe would be require for SMF 11B.
- FDOT asked if there was a possibility to eliminate Basin 11 and combine into Basins 10 and 12. Inwood will investigate but indicated that it could be feasible.

Basin 12 SMF alternative

- The FPC sites (6 and 7) were shaped to avoid floodplain boundaries, however, the exhibit provided did not show the remaining floodplain areas at this location. These will be shown in the updated exhibit.

Basin 13 SMF alternative

- No comments from the Department regarding the SMFs or the FPC

Basin 14

- Basin 14 is currently included in the design phase of the adjacent segment by Atkins. Their designation is Basin 1 and the preferred site they are moving forward with is SMF 1A.
- The exhibit will be updated to show the adjacent design segment's preferred SMF and FPC.
- Coordination occurred after the longlist pond meeting for CADD files and calculations from the adjacent design segment.
- Further coordination will continue as the SMF and FPC are being refined at the time of the meeting.

Revisions to the pond sites based on the longlist pond siting meeting will occur. A revised pond exhibit will be provided to FDOT staff. FDOT agreed that a 2nd meeting is not necessary and the coordination for updated pond sites can be done via email, meeting minutes and revised exhibit attachments.

After the updated pond sites are approved by FDOT, desktop analysis and screening can begin. R/W cost estimate request will be submitted to Bill McTeer.

Impacts to State or Conservation Lands will be identified (if applicable) for the SMF / FPC sites. The SMF evaluation matrix in the PSR will include a column to identify this in lieu of 4(f).

After preferred SMFs are identified (once desktop screening and R/W costs are provided), a meeting with FDOT staff will occur to review the final preferred pond sites.

These are the author's understanding of the discussions and decisions reached at this meeting. If there are comments or questions, please contact Renato Chuw at rchuw@inwoodinc.com or 407-971-8850.

Zach Evans

From: Henzel, Ashley <Ashley.Henzel@dot.state.fl.us>
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 3:02 PM
To: Renato Chuw; Bob Finck
Cc: Zach Evans; Conner, Allison; Geiger, Crystal; Bogen, Kirk
Subject: RE: 255796-1/US 301 from Fowler Ave to SR 56 - Preferred Pond Site Selection - desktop screening evaluations

I forgot to mention that for the preferred site Basin 6 (SMF 6C), you'll need to confirm if this is in the State Park or if this is Hillsborough County ELAPP property.

Thanks,

Ashley Henzel, PE
FDOT District 7, GEC
Office: 813-975-6433

From: Henzel, Ashley
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 2:59 PM
To: Renato Chuw <rchuw@inwoodinc.com>; Bob Finck <bfinck@aimengr.com>
Cc: Zach Evans <zevans@inwoodinc.com>; Conner, Allison <Allison.Conner@dot.state.fl.us>; Geiger, Crystal <Crystal.Geiger@dot.state.fl.us>; Bogen, Kirk <Kirk.Bogen@dot.state.fl.us>
Subject: RE: 255796-1/US 301 from Fowler Ave to SR 56 - Preferred Pond Site Selection - desktop screening evaluations

Hi Renato,

Per our pond siting meeting last week the Department was going to review the desktop analysis double check the preferred pond site in Basin 5.

After reviewing the materials and in coordination with Crystal and Allison, we suggest revising the preferred site in Basin 5 from SMF 5C to SMF 5B.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns regarding this change.

Thanks,

Ashley Henzel, PE
FDOT District 7, GEC
Office: 813-975-6433

From: Renato Chuw <rchuw@inwoodinc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 12:01 PM
To: Henzel, Ashley <Ashley.Henzel@dot.state.fl.us>; Bob Finck <bfinck@aimengr.com>
Cc: Zach Evans <zevans@inwoodinc.com>
Subject: 255796-1/US 301 from Fowler Ave to SR 56 - Preferred Pond Site Selection - desktop screening evaluations

EXTERNAL SENDER: Use caution with links and attachments.

Ashley,

Please find attached the desktop screening evaluation for contamination, CRAS and environmental provided to us and used for the preliminary rankings of the pond sites

Regards,

Renato

Renato E. Chuw

Associate Principal – Senior Drainage Engineer

INWOOD CONSULTING ENGINEERS

3000 Dovera Dr., Suite 200, Oviedo, FL 32765

P: 407-971-8850

inwoodinc.com

DRAFT

From: Su, Junshan [mailto:Suj@HillsboroughCounty.ORG]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 1:24 PM
To: Renato Chuw
Subject: RE: Hillsborough River watershed model/GIS/Report

Renato,

Attached please find a map showing the proposed stormwater projects in this area.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks

Junshan Su
Ph.D., PE.
Engineering and Construction Service Section
Public Works Department
Hillsborough County BOCC
p: 813.307.1776 | f: 813.272.5320
e: suj@hillsboroughcounty.org
w: <http://www.hillsboroughcounty.org>

Please note: all correspondence to or from this office is subject to Florida's Public Records laws.



From: Renato Chuw [<mailto:rchuw@inwoodinc.com>]
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 1:07 PM
To: Su, Junshan
Subject: Re: Hillsborough River watershed model/GIS/Report

Thanks,

Renato

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 26, 2015, at 1:01 PM, Su, Junshan <Suj@HillsboroughCounty.ORG> wrote:

We are working on this map. Please wait. Thanks. Junshan

From: Renato Chuw [<mailto:rchuw@inwoodinc.com>]
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 12:56 PM
To: Su, Junshan
Subject: Re: Hillsborough River watershed model/GIS/Report

Dr. Su,

Thank you for meeting with me this morning about the US 301 study and the ftp link.

As discussed this morning, you had mentioned that the county had identified future stormwater projects. I was interested in a map/list of projects near the U.S. 301 corridor that I can identify as potential regional stormwater use/joint use with FDOT for my presentation.

Thanks,

Renato

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 26, 2015, at 10:32 AM, Su, Junshan <Suj@HillsboroughCounty.ORG> wrote:

Renato,

Hillsborough River watershed model/GIS/Report are available at

<ftp://ftp.hillsboroughcounty.org/pwe/pub/masterplan%20update/Hillsborough/>

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks.

Junshan Su

Ph.D., PE.

Engineering and Construction Service Section

Public Works Department

Hillsborough County BOCC

p: 813.307.1776 | f: 813.272.5320

e: suj@hillsboroughcounty.org


w: <http://www.hillsboroughcounty.org>

Please note: all correspondence to or from this office is subject to Florida's Public Records laws.

<image001.gif>

DRAFT

US 301 from Fowler to County Line Area Proposed Stormwater Projects



12,000 6,000 0 12,000 Feet

