

**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM****1. GENERAL INFORMATION**A. Re-evaluation Type: Design Change, Preliminary Engineering PhaseB. Original approved Environmental Document:**Document Type:** EA**Date of Approval:** 01/25/1993**Project Numbers:**

N/A

258043-1

RS-7810(4)

712592-2-11-01

416564-1-22-01

712592-1-11-01

ETDM (if applicable)

Financial Management

Federal-Aid

**Project Name:** SR 56 (Formerly SR 54) from Cypress Creek Road to US 301**Project Location:** FDOT District 7 ( Pasco County )**Project Limits:** SR 56 from Cypress Creek Road to US 301C. Prior Re-evaluation(s):

FM Number	Type				Date District Approved	Date Lead Agency Consultation	Date Lead Agency Concurred (if applicable)
	PE	DC	ROW	CON			
416575-1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	03/19/2007		04/06/2007
<b>Description of Approval:</b> Design Change Re-Evaluation for SR 56 from Meadow Pointe Boulevard to US 301; changes included: - Alignment shift to the south - Identification of 12 pond sites, since the original PD&E study did not include a detailed Stormwater Management Plan. - Addition of a frontage road system along SR 56 as Phase II of the project's implementation, to be constructed within the FDOT right-of-way (ROW).							
408074-1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	12/09/2005		01/25/2006
<b>Description of Approval:</b> Design Change Re-Evaluation for SR 56 from SR 581 to Meadow Pointe Boulevard; changes included: - Alignment shift to the north - Planned frontage road that was to provide access to Crescent Properties in the southeast quadrant of the SR 581 and SR 56 intersection.							
258734-1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10/14/1998	10/14/1998	10/14/1998
<b>Description of Approval:</b> Construction Re-Evaluation/phase approval for the I-75/SR 56 Interchange and SR 56 from Cypress Creek to CR 581							
258734-1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	05/05/1995	05/16/1995	05/16/1995
<b>Description of Approval:</b> ROW Re-Evaluation/phase approval for the I-75/SR 56 Interchange and SR 56 from Cypress Creek to CR 581; Phase III roadway plans were reviewed and one design change was needed (replace the existing substandard bridge over Cypress Creek).							

D. Project or project segment(s) being evaluated

## RE-EVALUATION FORM

FAP Number	FM Number	Project/ Segment Name	Project/ Segment Location	Type				Project/ Segment Letting Type	Funding
				PE	DC	ROW	CON		
D717-038-B	416564-2	US 301/SR 41/GALL FROM S OF SR 56(PROPOSED) TO S OF SR 39/PAUL BUCHMAN	District 7 - PASCO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other ()	Federal

## 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The limits of the original Environmental Assessment with a Finding of No Significant Impact (EA/FONSI), approved January 25, 1993, included State Road (SR) 54 (currently SR 56) from Cypress Creek Road to US 301 and extended northward along US 301 (Gall Boulevard) to Zephyrhills East By-pass/Chancey Road. During the Design Change Reevaluation for the segment of the EA/FONSI from SR 56 to Chancey Road, including the Chancey Road/US 301 (Gall Boulevard) intersection, the limit was extended to the north from Chancey Road to SR 39 (Buchman Highway), for an additional 0.4 mile. Therefore, the new limits of this design segment are from south of the proposed connection of SR 56 (mile post 1.395) to south of the proposed future realignment of SR 39 (Buchman Highway) (mile post 3.505), which is now approximately 2.1 miles. Refer to the attached map for status of the design segments. The improvements proposed for the segment being advanced with this Design Change Reevaluation include widening the existing two-lane segment of US 301 (Gall Boulevard) to four lanes with a median.

Supporting environmental and engineering documents have been prepared to evaluate the limits of the design segment being advanced as part of the EA/FONSI Design Change Reevaluation, including the 0.4 mile extension.

[\[Attachment 3\]](#)

## 3. CHANGES IN APPLICABLE LAW OR REGULATION

**Are there changes in federal or state laws, rules, regulations, or guidance that require consideration since the date of the original Environmental Document or subsequent Re-evaluation(s)?** Yes

Since the preparation of the approved 1993 EA/FONSI, the status of the following state and federally listed species have changed pursuant to Chapter 68A-27, F.A.C - *Rules Relating to Endangered or Threatened Species* and 50 CFR 17.11 and 17.12 - *Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants*:

- Bald Eagle delisted from state and federal listing but still protected by the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act in accordance with 16 U.S.C. 668 and the FWS Migratory Treaty Act in accordance with 16 U.S.C. 703-712.
- American alligator state listed status of "species of special concern" removed.
- Gopher tortoise state status changed from "species of special concern" to "threatened" and added to federal list of candidate species.
- Wood stork status changed from "endangered" to "threatened".
- Florida black bear removed from the state listing, but still protected and managed by the FWC pursuant to the Florida Black Bear Conservation Rule 68A-4.009, F.A.C.

The *Imperiled Species Management Plan (ISMP)* was also approved by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) in November 2016, with rule changes in effect as of January 2017, including changes in listing status

**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM**

for 23 species.

In addition, major changes to the noise regulations were made on July 13, 2010, with an effective date of July 13, 2011. Therefore, per the FDOT PD&E Manual Part 2, Chapter 18, all noise re-evaluations conducted after July 13, 2011 will be done in accordance with 23 CFR Part 772 dated July 13, 2010.

Further details regarding species listings and determinations are provided in Section 7.c of this Re-evaluation Form. A summary of the methodologies and results of the updated traffic noise analysis are presented in Section 7.d.

#### **4. EVALUATION OF MAJOR DESIGN CHANGES AND REVISED DESIGN CRITERIA**

**Are there major design changes, including but not limited to changes in the alignment(s), typical section(s), drainage/stormwater requirements, design control and criteria, or temporary road or bridge? Yes**

Major design changes are required for the design segment and are presented in the *Final Preliminary Engineering Report* (PER), located in the Statewide Environmental Project Tracker (SWEPT) project file. A summary of the changes are provided below.

The following changes have occurred within the original project limits of the 1993 FONSI:

##### **SUBURBAN SECTION (S. OF SR 56 TO CHANCEY ROAD)**

- Proposed typical section reduction: overall ROW width from 250 feet to 172 feet (78-foot reduction)
- Proposed typical section reduction: median from 74 feet to 54 feet (20-foot reduction)
- Proposed typical section reduction: borders from 54 feet to 35 feet (38-foot reduction)
- Proposed typical section reduction: outside shoulders from 10 feet to 7 feet (6-foot reduction, but adds buffered bike lanes)
- Proposed typical section addition: 7-foot buffered bike lanes in both directions
- Proposed typical section addition: 5-foot sidewalk (east side) and 10-foot shared use path (west side)

The following typical section has been added to account for the 0.4-mile extension of the original 1993 FONSI limits:

##### **URBAN SECTION (CHANCEY ROAD TO S. OF SR 39)**

###### Proposed typical section

- Overall ROW width varies from 135 feet to 156 feet
- Four 11-foot travel lanes (44 feet)
- Variable median width (33 feet to 54 feet)
- 29-foot borders (58 feet)
- 7-foot buffered bike lanes in both directions (14 feet)
- 5-foot sidewalks in both directions (10 feet)

There are also new pond sites (3) and floodplain compensation sites (2) required to accommodate the 0.4-mile extension.

#### **5. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

**Were there additional public involvement activities? Yes**

The FDOT conducted a public hearing for the proposed improvements to US 301 in Pasco County, Florida. The hearing was held at the New Hope Baptist Church, 3514 Allen Road, Zephyrhills, Florida. The Open House began at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 22, 2015, and the formal hearing presentation began at 6:00 p.m. Following the formal presentation, the Open House continued until 7:00 p.m. The public were given the opportunity to provide their comments in writing

**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM**

during the Open House or by mail to be postmarked by October 2, 2015; verbally at the microphone following the formal presentation; or verbally to the court reporter during the Open House portions of the hearing. FDOT representatives were available during the Open House to speak one-on-one with attendees, take comments and answer questions.

Thirty (30) members of the public signed in at the public hearing. Kirk Bogen, Environmental Management Engineer, and Stephanie Pierce, FDOT Project Manager, made the presentation during the formal session. FDOT and consultant staff were available to answer questions and take comments following the presentation.

Attendees were provided with a project newsletter and a comment form. The public hearing provided interested persons an opportunity to express their views concerning the location, conceptual design, and social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed improvements to US 301.

One comment form was collected at the meeting, three additional comments were received by mail following the public hearing, and one person spoke during the formal session. The comments received included:

- One request to be placed on the mailing list;
- A request for information about another project;
- One property owner requested information as to how her property would be affected by the proposed build alternative.
- The Pasco County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) submitted a letter requesting that FDOT provide a 10-foot wide multi-use path along the western side of US 301 for the entire project length.
- Mr. Vande Berg from the City of Zephyrhills spoke during the formal session to request that a 10-foot trail on the west side of US 301 be included in the final plans for the project.

A copy of the Public Hearing transcript is attached to this re-evaluation form.

[\[Attachment 4\]](#)

## 6. PROJECT or SEGMENT(S) PLANNING CONSISTENCY

**Segment FM Number:** 416564-2

<b>Currently Adopted CFP-LRTP</b>	<b>Comments</b>				
Yes	The widening of US 301 (Gall Boulevard) from proposed SR 56 to the proposed realignment of SR 39 (Buchman Highway) is identified as a 'Cost-Affordable Capital Improvement' in the Pasco County MPO Mobility 2040 Plan [Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)] with construction funded within the 2031-2040 timeframe. The project has also been identified on the latest Pasco County Transportation Capital Improvement Projects (2014-2028) map. It should additionally be noted that \$2.48 million is programmed for the design phase in FY 2018 within the FDOT Five Year Work Program. Further, the project is reflected on Map 7-22: Future Number of Lanes (2035) in the Transportation Element of the adopted Pasco County Comprehensive Plan.				
<b>Phase</b>	<b>Currently Approved TIP</b>	<b>Currently Approved STIP</b>	<b>TIP/STIP \$</b>	<b>TIP/STIP FY</b>	<b>Comments</b>
PE (Final Design)	Yes	Yes	\$2,315,786 (TIP)/\$2,323,468 (STIP)	2017/2018	
R/W	Yes	Yes	\$13,642,100 (TIP)/\$13,642,100 (STIP)	2021/2022	

**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM**

Construction	No	No			Not funded in the next five years (\$12,224,273 identified >2022 in TIP)
--------------	----	----	--	--	--

[\[Attachment 2\]](#)

## 7. EVALUATION OF CHANGES IN IMPACTS

### a. SOCIAL & ECONOMIC

**Are there changes in impacts to the social, economic, land use, mobility, and/or aesthetic effects?** No

**Are there changes in right-of-way needs?** Yes

**Is there a change in anticipated relocation(s)?** No

Additional ROW will be required to support the proposed improvement of US 301. Based on analysis, the widening of US 301 will not result in any residential or business relocations with the exception of a single commercial sign relocation at the intersection of US 301 and Chancey Road. In addition, the footprint of the segment has been reduced since the FONSI approval. Therefore, this category has been designated as **NO** on the Re-Evaluation Form.

**Are there changes in impacts to Prime or Unique Farmlands?** No

### b. CULTURAL

**Are there changes in impacts to cultural resources pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (historic sites/districts and archaeological sites)?** No

A *Cultural Resource Assessment Survey* (CRAS) was completed for this project and is located in the SWEPT project file. The CRAS was undertaken in accordance with Chapter 267, *Florida Statutes* (FS) and follows the procedures in Part 2, Chapter 12 ("Archaeological and Historical Resources") of the FDOT PD&E Manual (1999). It was carried out in conformity with the standards contained in the Florida Division of Historical Resource's (FDHR) *Cultural Resource Management Standards and Operational Manual* (2003). The resulting report meets the specifications set forth in Chapter 1A-46, Florida Administrative Code (FAC).

The archaeological Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the project was defined as the land within the existing and proposed ROW; for the historical/architectural survey, the project APE included the properties adjacent to the existing and proposed ROW to take into account potential indirect effects such as visual and access. The archaeological field survey was conducted in February 2015; the historical/architectural survey was performed in December 2013 and February 2015.

Archaeological background research indicated that 19 previously recorded archaeological sites are located within one mile of the US 301 (Gall Boulevard) project corridor. Of these, three sites, 8PA00382, 8PA01140, and 8PA02053 are located proximate to, but outside, the US 301 (Gall Boulevard) ROW. Given the known patterns of aboriginal settlement in the vicinity, combined with the results of previous surveys, five areas along the US 301 (Gall Boulevard) corridor are considered to have a moderate potential for prehistoric period archaeological site occurrence. Given the results of the historic research, no historic period archaeological sites, including nineteenth century homesteads, forts, trails, roads, or

**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM**

Indian encampments were expected. As a result of field survey, no new archaeological resources were discovered and no evidence of any previously recorded sites was found.

Historical background research indicated that nine previously recorded historic resources were located in the US 301 (Gall Boulevard) project APE: (8PA00674, 8PA00675, 8PA01164, 8PA02675, and 8PA02720 through 8PA02724). They include one resource group (8PA01164), one road segment (8PA02675), and seven buildings (8PA00674, 8PA00675, and 8PA02720 through 8PA02724). Site 8PA01164, Clyde's Cottages, was determined eligible for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listing in 2010, and a Section 106 report was prepared in 2012. The evaluation of effects to Clyde's Cottages (8PA01164) resulted in a finding of No Adverse Effect. The segment of US 301 (8PA02675) within the project APE was not evaluated by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the seven other previously recorded historic resources were determined ineligible [Florida Master Site File (FMSF)].

In addition to the previously recorded historic resources, five historic resources were newly recorded within the US 301 (Gall Boulevard) project APE (8PA02838 through 8PA02842). They include one resource group (8PA02838) comprised of two buildings (8PA02839 and 8PA02840) and two other buildings (8PA02841 and 8PA02842). None is considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.

With the exception of 8PA01164, the results of background research and field survey indicate that no historic resources that are listed, determined eligible, or considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP are located within the US 301 (Gall Boulevard) project APE. These recommendations and findings (as presented in the CRAS report dated August 2015) were transmitted to SHPO in a letter dated September 8, 2015 and received SHPO concurrence on October 13, 2015. The concurrence documentation is attached to this Re-evaluation Form and included in the SWEPT project file.

In addition to the CRAS report, a *CRAS Technical Memorandum* to evaluate seven proposed Stormwater Management Facilities (SMF) and three Floodplain Compensation (FPC) sites along US 301 (Gall Boulevard) was also prepared and is located in the SWEPT project file. The CRAS for the Technical Memorandum was conducted in compliance with the provisions of the *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966* (Public Law 89-665), as amended, and the implementing regulations 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800, as well as the provisions contained in the revised Chapter 267, FS. All work was conducted in conformity with Part 2, Chapter 12 ("Archaeological and Historical Resources") of the FDOT PD&E Manual (2016), and in accordance with the standards contained in the FDHR's *Cultural Resource Management Standards and Operational Manual* (2003). In addition, the survey meets the specifications in Chapter 1A-46, FAC.

Background research included a review of the FMSF, the NRHP listings, and a review of relevant CRAS reports and memoranda. In March 2015, a preliminary probability analysis of seven proposed SMFs and three FPC sites was conducted (ACI 2015b) for US 301 from SR 56 (Proposed) to the Proposed SR 39 Realignment. As a result of background research, one previously recorded archaeological site, 8PA01140, was identified within the archaeological APE within proposed FPC 1 and adjacent to proposed SMF 3. This lithic scatter site was evaluated by the SHPO as not eligible for listing in the NRHP in 2005 (FMSF). Background research also revealed that no historic buildings or structures had been previously recorded within or adjacent to the proposed SMF or FPC Sites. However, one linear resource, 8PA02675 (US 301), is situated adjacent to portions of the archaeological and historical APE, but the resource was determined not eligible for listing in the NRHP by the SHPO in 2015 (Bendus 2015).

As a result of archaeological field survey, no evidence of archaeological site 8PA01140 was found and no new archaeological sites were recorded within the archaeological APE. The historical field survey did not result in the

**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM**

discovery of any historic buildings or structures within the historic APE. In addition, 8PA02675 (US 301) is still extant but the FMSF form was not updated because it was recently recorded in this area (in 2015) and has not changed in appearance (Bendus 2015).

Thus, it was determined that the project will have no effect on any archaeological sites or historic resources that are listed, determined eligible, or considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. These recommendations and findings (as presented in the CRAS Technical Memorandum dated April 2017) were transmitted to SHPO in a letter dated May 2, 2017 and received SHPO concurrence on May 15, 2017. The concurrence documentation is attached to this Re-evaluation Form and included in the SWEPT project file.

Based on the information presented in this section, this category has been designated as **NO** on the Re-Evaluation Form.

[\[Attachment 5\]](#)[\[Attachment 6\]](#)

**Are there changes in effects to Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act protected resources or other protected public lands?** N/A

**Are there changes in impacts to lands purchased under Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act?** N/A

### **c. NATURAL**

**Are there changes in impacts to protected species and habitat, wetlands and other surface waters, and/or essential fish habitat?** Yes

#### **Wetlands and Other Surface Waters**

Pursuant to Presidential Executive Order 11990 entitled "*Protection of Wetlands*", and in accordance with Part 2, Chapter 9 of the FDOT PD&E Manual, the project has been evaluated to determine any potential impacts to state and federal jurisdictional wetlands or other surface waters resulting from construction of the proposed project. Details of the evaluation are documented in the *Final Natural Resources Evaluation* (NRE), located in the SWEPT project file. Environmental scientists familiar with Florida natural communities conducted field reviews of the project area on June 26, 2013 and January 7, 2015. The purpose of the reviews was to verify and/or refine preliminary habitat boundaries and classification codes established through in-office literature reviews and aerial photo interpretation.

For comparison purposes, it was assumed that all wetlands/other surface waters located within the proposed ROW would be impacted by the proposed US 301 (Gall Boulevard) improvements; therefore, all were included in the impact assessment. The impact area of each wetland/other surface water equals its total acreage within the project ROW. All wet ditches were included in the impact analysis due to the presence of aquatic vegetation and the potential for this surface water to serve as suitable foraging habitat for the wood stork (*Mycteria americana*).

Based on the evaluation, permanent impacts to the wetlands and other surface waters located within the project area are anticipated as a result of construction of the proposed project. Construction of the Preferred Build Alternative will result in

**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM**

a total of 1.6 acres of wetland and other surface water impacts. The functional value of these wetlands was evaluated using the Uniform Mitigation Assessment Method (UMAM). The estimated total numeric value of functions to fish and wildlife lost as a result of construction of the Preferred Build Alternative is 0.61. Note that the impacts are based solely on the current project limits of the re-evaluation and do not include a comparison to the original EA/FONSI. This is due to the fact that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation (approved in 1993) did not include a breakdown of the wetland impacts that is comparable with the current project limits of the re-evaluation.

Avoidance and minimization of wetland impacts has been employed to the maximum extent practicable. The project has been conceptually designed to avoid wetland impacts, where practicable, although complete avoidance is not feasible. Wetland impacts resulting from construction of the project will be mitigated to satisfy all mitigation requirements of 33 United States Code (USC) 1344 and Part IV, Chapter 373 FS. The mitigation will be sufficient to offset the UMAM functional loss resulting from the wetland impacts. Compensatory mitigation will be completed through the use of mitigation banks (e.g. Hillsborough River Mitigation Bank and/or the North Tampa Mitigation Bank) and any other mitigation options (e.g. FDOT Mitigation Program) which satisfy state and federal requirements. The exact type of mitigation methods used will be coordinated with the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) during the state and federal permitting phase of the project.

A *Draft Wetland Evaluation and Biological Assessment Report* (WEBAR) was transmitted to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in a letter dated September 30, 2015. FDOT received USFWS concurrence with the determinations in the Draft WEBAR on October 27, 2015. A copy of this correspondence is attached to this Re-evaluation Form and included in the SWEPT project file. After NEPA Assignment, the FDOT Office of Environmental Management requested that the Draft WEBAR document be renamed to a Final NRE (June 2017).

**Wildlife and Habitat**

The potential effects of the Preferred Build Alternative on state- and federally-listed species were assessed by determining the natural habitats that would be affected by the project and the potential use of these habitats by listed species. The project area was assessed for the presence of suitable habitat for federal- and state-listed species in accordance with 50 CFR Part 402 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, (ESA); Chapter 5B-40, FAC - Preservation of Native Flora of Florida; Chapter 68A-27, FAC - Rules Relating to Endangered or Threatened Species; and Part 2, Chapter 16 - Protected Species and Habitat of the FDOT PD&E Manual. Potential effects of the Preferred Build Alternative on other species of concern that are neither state- nor federally-listed but are protected by state and/or federal law were also assessed.

Along with database searches, field reviews of the project area were conducted in June 2013 and January 2015. The field review consisted of pedestrian transects throughout all habitat types found within the project area. Of the 50 listed and protected species known to occur or that have historically been documented in Pasco County, 17 animal species and five plant species have the potential to occur within the project area. Evaluations were based on the availability of appropriate habitat, documentation of the species within one mile of the project area, and direct sightings of each species during field reviews.

General field surveys did not detect the occurrence of any protected plant species within the project area. In addition, Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) databases and the FNAI data report do not list any protected plant species as having been documented within one mile of the Preferred Build Alternative. Coordination with the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) will be initiated and efforts will be made prior to construction to allow for



**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM**

seed collection and/or relocation to adjacent habitat or other suitable protected lands if protected plant species are observed within the project area during the design phase. As a result, it is anticipated that the Preferred Build Alternative would have "no effect" on listed plant species.

The **eastern indigo snake** (*Drymarchon corais couperi*) is listed as threatened by the USFWS. Suitable habitat for this species is available throughout the corridor. However, no eastern indigo snakes or gopher tortoise burrows were observed during the June 2013 or January 2015 field reviews and none have been documented within one mile of the Preferred Build Alternative, based on review of FNAI data. To minimize the potential for adverse impacts to the eastern indigo snake, FDOT will commit to implementing the latest USFWS's standard protection measures for the eastern indigo snake (updated August 2013), during construction of the project. Based on these commitments and the *2010 USFWS Programmatic Concurrence Letter for the Eastern Indigo Snake* (see attached), it has been determined that the Preferred Build Alternative "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" the eastern indigo snake.

The **Florida scrub jay** (*Aphelocoma coerulescens*) is listed as threatened by the USFWS. The Preferred Build Alternative falls within the USFWS Consultation Area for this species. However, there is no suitable habitat available within the Preferred Build Alternative for this species, none were observed during the field reviews of the project area, and none have been documented within one mile of the Preferred Build Alternative, based on review of FNAI data. Therefore, it has been determined that the Preferred Build Alternative would have "no effect" on the Florida scrub jay.

The **gopher tortoise** (*Gopherus polyphemus*) is listed as threatened by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) and is considered a candidate species by the USFWS. Suitable habitat for the gopher tortoise is present within the Preferred Build Alternative in open pasture areas and unpaved ROW, but no individuals or burrows were observed within the project area during the field reviews. In order to protect this species, current FWC regulations require a permit for any ground disturbance activity occurring within 25-feet of a potentially occupied gopher tortoise burrow. Based on the FWC regulations, any gopher tortoise burrows located within 25 feet of the project construction area must be relocated to a permitted FWC recipient site (on- or off-site). During the design and permitting phases, FDOT will commit to survey the proposed project area for gopher tortoise burrows prior to construction. If gopher tortoises or potentially occupied burrows are observed, FDOT will coordinate with the FWC to secure all permits needed and perform relocation activities. With this commitment, it has been determined that the Preferred Build Alternative would have "no effect" on the gopher tortoise.

The **crested caracara** (*Polyborus plancus audubonii*) is listed as threatened by the USFWS. Suitable foraging and nesting habitat exists for this species within the improved pastures and open lands of the Preferred Build Alternative. In addition, the Preferred Build Alternative is located within the far north boundary of the USFWS consultation area for this species. No caracara individuals or pairs were observed within the project area during the June 2013 or January 2015 field reviews and no caracaras have been documented within one mile of the Preferred Build Alternative, based on review of FNAI data. Based on this information, it is anticipated that the Preferred Build Alternative would have "no effect" on the crested caracara.

The **wood stork** (*Mycteria americana*) is listed as threatened by the USFWS. Construction of the Preferred Build Alternative would result in impacts to wetlands and other surface waters expected to be used by wood storks. The USFWS has defined the core foraging area (CFA) for the wood stork in Pasco County as a 15-mile radius from breeding colonies. Based on information provided by the USFWS, FWC, and FNAI, seven (7) active wood stork nesting colonies are located within the 15-mile radius core foraging area of the Preferred Build Alternative. No wood storks were observed within the project area during the field reviews.

**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM**

Because suitable habitat exists for the wood stork in the Preferred Build Alternative, the FDOT is committed to reinitiating Section 7 consultation prior to permitting. At that time, the FDOT will evaluate the current information and provide suitable foraging habitat compensation within the service area of an USFWS-approved wetland mitigation bank or wood stork conservation bank (preferably located within the CFA of the wood stork foraging habitat lost). Based on these commitments and the 2010 USFWS Programmatic Concurrence Letter for the Wood Stork (located in the SWEPT project file), it is anticipated that the Preferred Build Alternative "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" the wood stork.

The **limpkin** (*Aramus guarauna*), **little blue heron** (*Egretta caerulea*), **snowy egret** (*Egretta thula*), **tricolored heron** (*Egretta tricolor*), **roseate spoonbill** (*Platalea ajaja*), and **white ibis** (*Eudicimus albus*) were listed as species of special concern by the FWC. Suitable foraging habitat for wading birds is available within the Preferred Build Alternative in the wetlands and other surface waters. During the June 2013 and January 2015 field reviews, white ibises and a little blue heron were observed foraging within the project area. As part of the proposed project, all wetland impacts will be mitigated to prevent a net loss of wetland habitat functions and values. Note that based on the ISMP, the listing status of these species changed in 2017 to delisted (limpkin, snowy egret, white ibis) or threatened (little blue heron, tricolored heron, roseate spoonbill). However, the effects determinations provided in the Draft WEBAR and Final NRE have not changed for those species still listed. Based on this information, it has been determined that the Preferred Build Alternative "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" these species.

The **Florida burrowing owl** (*Athene cunicularia floridana*) is listed as a species of special concern by the FWC. Suitable habitat for this species exists throughout the Preferred Build Alternative; however, no burrowing owls have been documented within one mile of the Preferred Build Alternative and none were observed within the project area during the June 2013 or January 2015 field reviews. The FDOT will survey areas of suitable habitat and coordinate with the FWC and USFWS (as required) during the design and permitting phase to secure all necessary approvals regarding this species. Note that based on the ISMP, the listing status of this species changed in 2017 to threatened. However, the effect determination provided in the Draft WEBAR and Final NRE has not changed. Therefore, it has been determined that the Preferred Build Alternative "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" the Florida burrowing owl.

The **southeastern American kestrel** (*Falco sparverius paulus*) is listed as threatened by the FWC. Suitable foraging habitat is available within the Preferred Build Alternative for the southeastern American kestrel in the pastures; however, no individuals were observed within the project area during the June 2013 or January 2015 field reviews, and none have been documented within one mile of the project area, based on review of FNAI data. Due to its mobility and ability to use adjacent open areas for foraging, it has been determined that the Preferred Build Alternative would have "no effect" on the southeastern American kestrel.

The **Florida sandhill crane** (*Grus canadensis pratensis*) is listed as threatened by the FWC. Several sandhill cranes were observed foraging within the US 301 (Gall Boulevard) ROW during the June 2013 and January 2015 field reviews. As part of the proposed project, all adverse wetland impacts will be mitigated to prevent a net loss of wetland functions and values. In addition, FDOT will commit to survey the project area for Florida sandhill crane nests during the design and permitting phase and prior to construction. If Florida sandhill crane nests are found within the proposed project area, FDOT will coordinate with the FWC to ensure construction will not adversely impact this species. With this commitment, it has been determined that the Preferred Build Alternative "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" the Florida sandhill crane.

**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM**

The **Sherman's fox squirrel** (*Sciurus niger shermani*) is listed as a species of special concern by the FWC. Based on information received from FNAI, no individuals have been documented within one mile of the Preferred Build Alternative and no individuals were observed during the field reviews. Due to its mobility and ability to use adjacent upland habitats for foraging, it has been determined that the Preferred Build Alternative would have "no effect" on the Sherman's fox squirrel.

The **American alligator** (*Alligator mississippiensis*) is federally-listed as 'threatened due to similarity of appearance'. Alligators are common in coastal Florida, and in many parts of their range the alligator is not actually endangered or threatened. Similarity of appearance to a listed species is a regulatory designation used to facilitate the enforcement of the ESA. It is used when a species is so similar to a listed species that enforcement personnel would have substantial difficulty in attempting to differentiate between the listed and unlisted species. The American alligator has this designation due to similarity of appearance to the endangered American crocodile (*Crocodylus acutus*) and other rare crocodylians. The final rule (52 FR 21059) for the American alligator designation removes federal agency responsibilities for the alligator under Section 7 of the ESA. During the field reviews, no alligators were observed within the proposed construction limits of the Preferred Build Alternative.

Though the **bald eagle** (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) has been removed from federal and state listings, it is still protected by the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act in accordance with 16 USC 668 and the USFWS Migratory Treaty Act in accordance with 16 USC 703-712. The FWC online bald eagle nest locator website indicates that there are no nest sites documented within one mile of the Preferred Build Alternative, with the nearest active nest documented approximately 1.5 miles north of the project area. No bald eagle nests were observed within the project area during the field reviews. Because bald eagle nests within Florida are closely monitored by the FWC, if a nest is observed within 660 feet of the Preferred Build Alternative, an Eagle Disturbance Permit may be required. If a bald eagle nest is found within 660 feet of the project area during the design and permitting phase, FDOT will coordinate with FWC and USFWS to secure any and all approvals regarding this species.

Although the **Florida black bear** (*Ursus americanus floridanus*) has been removed from the state list, it is still protected and managed by the FWC pursuant to the Florida Black Bear Conservation Rule 68A-4.009, FAC. Marginal suitable habitat for the black bear is available within the Preferred Build Alternative in the upland forests. According to FWC, the Preferred Build Alternative is not located within the FWC-designated Primary or Secondary Florida black bear range. No black bears were observed within the project area during the field reviews.

The project area was also evaluated for the occurrence of listed species Critical Habitat designated by Congress in 50 CFR 424.12. No designated Critical Habitat for any federally-listed species occurs within the Preferred Build Alternative. Based on this information, it has been determined that the Preferred Build Alternative would not affect any Critical Habitat.

FDOT received USFWS concurrence with the Draft WEBAR determinations of "may affect, but not likely to adversely affect" for the eastern indigo snake and wood stork and "no effect" for the Florida scrub jay. A copy of this correspondence, dated October 27, 2015, is attached to this Re-evaluation Form and included in the SWEPT project file. After NEPA Assignment, the FDOT Office of Environmental Management requested that the Draft WEBAR document be renamed to a Final NRE (June 2017). None of the species effects determinations that were previously approved by USFWS in 2015 were changed. Therefore, the Final NRE did not warrant resubmittal to USFWS.

There are no significant impacts to any state- or federally-listed species as a result of the project. Refer to Section 8.0 *Commitment Status* of this re-evaluation form for new species commitments.

**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM****Essential Fish Habitat**

No Essential Fish Habitat is located within the project area.

[\[Attachment 7\]](#)

**Are there changes in impacts to designated Aquatic Preserves, Coastal Barrier resources, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and/or Outstanding Florida Waters?** N/A

**Are there changes in impacts to Floodplains and/or Water Quality and Water Quantity?** Yes

**Floodplains**

As stated in the *Final Location Hydraulic Report* (LHR), located in the SWEPT project file, the following Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) panels were reviewed for the project area: 1201C0458F, 12101C0454F and 12101C0462F for Pasco County, Florida, all dated September 26, 2014. The majority of the project area is located within Flood Zone X (areas that have a 0.2% probability of flooding every year (500-year floodplain)). The proposed roadway expansion will result in a total of 0.64 acres of impacts to Flood Zone A, (areas with a 1% probability of flooding every year (100-year floodplain) and predicted flood water elevations have not been established). The proposed roadway expansion will also result in a total of 0.76 acres of impact, all located north of Chancey Road, to Flood Zone AE (areas which are 100-year floodplains with established base flood elevations).

The impacted Flood Zone AE floodplain is located in an area of high-density residential use located adjacent to Zephyr Creek, and the encroachment areas are classified as "minimal". Minimal encroachments on a floodplain occur when there is 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. In the case of this project, three FPC areas will be created applying the FDOT drainage design standards and following the SWFWMD procedures to achieve results that will not increase or significantly change the flood elevations and/or limits.

A total of seven existing cross drains have been identified for the length of the project. The transverse impacts resulting from the extension or replacement of the culverts will be analyzed during the final design phase. To minimize upstream impacts due to modification of the cross drains, FDOT design criteria for conveyance systems will be utilized during the design phase. It is not anticipated that upsizing of the individual culverts will be required although all of the culverts will be lengthened to account for the increased ROW width. The proposed modifications to the existing cross drains will perform hydraulically in a manner equal to or greater than the existing structures, and backwater surface elevations are not expected to increase. As a result, there will be no significant adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values.

There is no change in flood "Risk" associated with this project. Neither the identified encroachments on the floodplain nor the modifications to the cross drains will have a significant potential for interruption or termination of transportation facilities needed for emergency vehicles or use as an evacuation route. The proposed roadway will follow the same alignment as the existing roadway, so natural or beneficial floodplain values will not be significantly affected.

**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM****Water Quality**

According to the *Final Preliminary Pond Siting Report* (PPSR), located in the SWEPT project file, the land use across the southern one-half of the project area (south of Chancey Road) is dominated by agricultural use (improved pastures), open land, commercial use (Festival Park) and correctional facilities (Zephyrhills Correctional Institution) with high-density residential areas located in the vicinity of the intersection of US 301 (Gall Boulevard) and Chancey Road. The northern one-half of the project area is dominated by high-density residential areas and mixed wetlands and freshwater marshes. The addition of impervious surface within the project corridor will increase stormwater runoff.

Portions of the US 301 (Gall Boulevard) project corridor, from the southern end of the project to the north side of the intersection of US 301 (Gall Boulevard) and Chancey Road, are located within an area of impaired water quality. This portion of the project lies within Watershed Basin I.D. (WBID) No. 1443A (Tampa Bay Tributaries), and comprises a portion of the watershed for the Hillsborough River. This reach of the river is a Class 3F water body, and the river is classified as impaired with respect to nutrients and dissolved oxygen. The FDEP has not adopted any Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for this portion of the river.

A *Water Quality Impact Evaluation* (WQIE) has been conducted for this project and is located in the SWEPT project file. Water quality and quantity issues will be mitigated through compliance with the design requirements of authorized regulatory agencies. The project will be designed to treat all stormwater runoff generated from the additional impervious area in roadside stormwater management ponds, designed to meet criteria set forth by the SWFWMD. Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be utilized during construction of the project to reduce or eliminate turbidity, erosion, and sedimentation into adjacent wetlands and surface waters found along the project corridor. The BMPs will prevent water quality degradation to surrounding or nearby waters during construction activities.

**d. PHYSICAL**

**Are there changes in Air Quality?** No

**What is the status of Highway Traffic Noise?**

**Noise**

A traffic noise analysis has been prepared in accordance with all applicable guidelines as stated within both 23 CFR 772 and Part 2, Chapter 17 of the FDOT PD&E Manual. The analysis was performed using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)'s Traffic Noise Model (TNM, Version 2.5). Use of the TNM is required when evaluating the potential for traffic noise impacts during the design year of roadway improvement projects for which the regulations, policies and guidelines with 23 CFR 772 and Part 2, Chapter 17 of the PD&E Manual are applicable. For properties with uses other than residential, the methodologies described in the FDOT's *A Method to Determine Reasonableness and Feasibility of Noise Abatement at Special Use Locations* were also used. Special land uses include community pools and recreational areas.

One-hundred twenty one noise sensitive receptors (i.e., discrete representative locations on a property that has noise sensitive land uses) were evaluated within eight noise sensitive areas. One-hundred eighteen receptors were evaluated on residential property, two were evaluated at community pools located at the Palm View Gardens RV Resort and Bramblewood Mobile Home Park and one receptor was evaluated at the shuffleboard court at the Palm View Gardens RV

**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM**

Resort.

Future traffic noise levels with the proposed improvements are predicted to approach, meet, or exceed the NAC at 70 noise sensitive sites. These sites are predicted to experience future traffic noise levels with the proposed improvements to US 301 that would range from 66.0 to 74.4 dB(A).

The results of the evaluation indicate that construction of noise barriers is a potentially reasonable and feasible noise abatement method to reduce the predicted traffic noise levels for up to 69 of the 70 impacted sites at the following locations:

- Barrier 1: Residences at the Palm View Gardens RV Park (Receptors 4-59, 64, 66, 72, 73, and 77)
- Barrier 3: Residences at the Shady Oaks Mobile Home Park (Receptors 86-93)

The FDOT is committed to the construction of noise barriers at the locations above, contingent upon the following:

- Detailed noise analysis during the final design process supports the need for, and the feasibility and reasonableness of providing the barriers as abatement;
- The detailed analysis demonstrates that the cost of the noise barrier will not exceed the cost effective limit;
- The residents/property owners benefitted by the noise barrier desire that a noise barrier be constructed; and
- All safety and engineering conflicts or issues related to construction of a noise barrier are resolved.

A detailed review of potential noise impacts can be found in the *Final Noise Study Report* (NSR), located in the SWEPT project file.

**What is the status of Contamination?****Contamination**

Seventeen (17) mainline locations were investigated for sites that may present the potential for finding petroleum contamination or hazardous materials, and therefore may impact the proposed improvements for this project. Specific details for each site can be found in the *Final Contamination Screening Evaluation Report* (CSER), located in the SWEPT project file.

Of the seventeen (17) mainline sites investigated, the following risk rankings have been applied: five (5) "High" ranking sites, three (3) "Medium" ranking sites, six (6) "Low" ranking sites, and three (3) sites ranked "No" for potential contamination concerns.

For the sites ranked "No" for potential contamination, no further action is planned. These sites have been evaluated and determined not to have any potential environmental risk to the project area at this time.

For sites ranked "Low" for potential contamination, no further action is required at this time. These sites/facilities have the potential to impact the project in the future, but based on select variables have been determined to have low risk, at this time. Variables that may change the risk ranking include a facility's non-compliance to environmental regulations, new discharges to the soil or groundwater, and modifications to current permits. Should any of these variables change, additional assessment of the facilities will be conducted to determine if the low risk ranking is still appropriate.

For those locations with a risk ranking of "Medium" or "High", Level II field screening will be conducted if it is determined during the project's design that its construction activities could be within their vicinity. These sites have been determined to have potential contaminants, which may impact the proposed roadway improvement project. A soil and groundwater

**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM**

sampling plan could be developed for each site, if applicable. The sampling plan would provide sufficient detail as to the number of soil and groundwater samples to be obtained and the specific analytical test to be performed. A site location sketch for each facility showing all proposed boring locations and groundwater monitoring wells would be prepared.

**Are there changes in impacts to Utilities and Railroads? Yes**

Existing utilities and railroads are addressed in Section 4.1.11 of the PER; potential utility impacts are addressed in Section 8.12 of the PER and the *Utility Assessment Report (UAR)*, located in the SWEPT project file. The PER prepared in 1989 in support of the original EA/FONSI identified two impacted utilities on US 301 between SR 54 (now SR 56) and Chancey Road - Withlacoochee River Electric Cooperative and General Telephone Company (now Verizon). Given the almost 30-year age of the original EA/FONSI documentation and the 0.4-mile extension of the current design segment to just south of the proposed future realignment of SR 39 (Buchman Highway), eight existing utilities have been identified in the Design Change Reevaluation as potentially impacted by the Preferred Build Alternative. These existing utilities include overhead and underground electric lines, fiber optic, copper, and coax cables with and without conduit, water, wastewater, and gas mains.

The exact locations of existing utilities and the extent of impacts will be determined during the final design phase through coordination with the utility owners; however, some impacts are expected as a result of widening the roadway to the outside. Disruptions to service and utility relocations will be minimized to the greatest extent feasible. Preliminary utility coordination and anticipated costs are documented in the appendix of the UAR.

There are no at-grade railroad crossings along the US 301 Corridor.

**Are there changes in impacts to Navigation? N/A****8. COMMITMENT STATUS**

**Are there prior commitments from the Environmental Document or previously approved re-evaluation(s)? Yes**

**Are there new environmental commitments? Yes**

**List new environmental commitments added since the last approval.**

1. Mitigation for impacts to 1.6 acres of wetlands and other surface waters will be conducted pursuant to USC 1344 and Part IV, Chapter 373 FS, as necessary, to meet the permitting agencies' requirements. The exact type of mitigation used to offset wetland impacts from the proposed US 301 (Gall Boulevard) improvements will be coordinated with the USACE and the SWFWMD during the state and federal permitting phase of this project.
2. To minimize the potential for adverse impacts to the eastern indigo snake, the FDOT will incorporate the "Construction Precautions for the Eastern Indigo Snake" guidelines into the final project design plans and is committed to implementing the USFWS standard protection measures for the eastern indigo snake (updated August 2013), during construction of the project.
3. During the design phase, the FDOT will conduct comprehensive surveys of the project within construction limits for gopher tortoise burrows prior to construction. If gopher tortoises or potentially occupied burrows are observed, the FDOT will coordinate with the FWC to secure all permits needed and perform relocation activities.
4. Because suitable habitat exists for the wood stork in the Preferred Build Alternative, the FDOT is committed to reinitiating Section 7 consultation in conjunction with undertaking the permitting process for the proposed project. At that time, the FDOT will evaluate the current information and provide suitable foraging habitat compensation within the service area of an FWC-approved wetland mitigation bank or wood stork conservation bank (preferably located within the CFA of the wood stork foraging habitat lost).
5. During the design phase, the FDOT is committed to survey areas of suitable habitat and coordinate with the FWC and USFWS (as required) to secure all necessary approvals regarding the Florida Burrowing Owl.

**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM**

6. The FDOT will conduct surveys of the project area for Florida sandhill crane nests during the design phase and prior to construction. If Florida sandhill crane nests are found within the proposed project area, the FDOT will coordinate with the FWC to ensure construction will not adversely impact this species.
7. During the design phase, the FDOT will conduct a survey of the project area for bald eagle nests. If a bald eagle nest is found within 660 feet of the project area during the design and permitting phases, the FDOT will coordinate with FWC and USFWS to secure any and all approvals regarding this species.
8. The FDOT is committed to further consideration of noise barriers during the final design process at Palm View Gardens RV Park and Shady Oaks Mobile Home Park. The traffic noise barrier evaluation for these locations will be refined using specific horizontal and vertical alignment data for US 301 along with other factors developed during final design. During final design, a commitment to construct feasible and reasonable noise abatement will be contingent upon the following conditions:
  - Detailed noise analysis during the final design process supports the need for, and the feasibility and reasonableness of providing the barriers as abatement;
  - The detailed analysis demonstrates that the cost of the noise barrier will not exceed the cost effective limit;
  - The residents/property owners benefitted by the noise barrier desire that a noise barrier be constructed; and
  - All safety and engineering conflicts or issues related to construction of a noise barrier are resolved.

[\[Attachment 1\]](#)

## 9. STATUS OF PERMITS

### Federal

Name	Status	Issuance Date
USACE Section 10 or Section 404 Permit	Needed	

### State

Name	Status	Issuance Date
DEP or WMD Environmental Resource Permit (ERP)	Needed	
DEP National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit	Needed	

### Local

None anticipated.

### Other

None anticipated.

**Comment/explanation if permit listed in original Environmental Document is no longer required.**

## 10. CONCLUSION

- The above Environmental Document has been re-evaluated as required by 23 CFR § 771.129. It has been determined that there have been no changes to the project that affect the original environmental determination. Therefore, the Administrative Action remains valid.

## 11. DISTRICT REVIEW AND APPROVAL

**Name and title of FDOT Preparer:** Robin Rhinesmith

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.



**RE-EVALUATION  
FORM****OEM signature required?**Yes

Robin Rhinesmith

May 8, 2018

District approving authority or designee

Date

Electronically signed within SWEPT  
on May 8, 2018 1:59:17 PM EDT  
(electronic signature on file)**12. OEM CONCURRENCE**

Jason Watts

May 15, 2018

Print Name

Date

Director of the Office of Environmental Management or Designee

**13. Links to Supporting Documentation**

- 1 - [2580431-EA-D7-416564\\_US\\_301\\_PCR\\_v4-2018-0417.pdf](#)
- 2 - [2580431-EA-D7-416564\\_Plan\\_Consistency\\_Pages-2017-1108.pdf](#)
- 3 - [2580431-EA-D7-Re-evaluation\\_Segments\\_Map-2018-0406.pdf](#)
- 4 - [2580431-EA-D7-416564\\_Public\\_Hearing\\_Transcript-2015-1006.pdf](#)
- 5 - [2580431-EA-D7-416564\\_SHPO\\_Concurrence\\_CRAS-2015-0908.pdf](#)
- 6 - [2580431-EA-D7-416564\\_SHPO\\_Concurrence\\_CRAS\\_Tech\\_Memo\\_FPC\\_and\\_SMF\\_Sites-2017-0502.pdf](#)
- 7 - [2580431-EA-D7-416564-1\\_US\\_301\\_USFWS\\_Concurrence\\_Letter-2015-1027.pdf](#)